



2 August 2005

WORKS COMMITTEE MEETING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT A WORKS COMMITTEE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF RANDWICK WILL BE HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, 90 AVOCA STREET, RANDWICK, ON TUESDAY, 9TH AUGUST 2005 AT 6:00 PM.

Committee Members: His Worship the Mayor, Cr M. Matson, Crs Belleli, Hughes (Deputy Chairperson), Notley-Smith (Chairperson), Seng, Sullivan, Tracey & White.

Quorum: Five (5) members.

NOTE: AT THE EXTRAORDINARY MEETING HELD ON 28TH SEPTEMBER, 2004, THE COUNCIL RESOLVED THAT THE WORKS COMMITTEE BE CONSTITUTED AS A COMMITTEE WITH FULL DELEGATION TO DETERMINE MATTERS ON THE AGENDA.

1 Apologies

2 Minutes

CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE WORKS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, 12TH JULY, 2005.

3 Declaration of Pecuniary & Non-Pecuniary Interests

4 Addresses to Committee by the Public

5 Report of Committee

5 Report of the Greening Randwick Committee Meeting of the Council of the City of Randwick held on Tuesday, 12th July, 2005. 2

6 Works

6.1 DIRECTOR, CITY SERVICES' REPORT 91/2005 - DES RENFORD AQUATIC CENTRE CARPARK. 6

6.2 DIRECTOR, CITY SERVICES' REPORT 93/2005 - RANDWICK CITY COUNCIL DOMESTIC WASTE SERVICES CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY 2005. 8

7 General Business

8 Notice of Rescission Motions

.....
GENERAL MANAGER

**REPORT OF GREENING RANDWICK COMMITTEE MEETING OF
THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF RANDWICK
HELD ON TUESDAY, 12TH JULY 2005 AT 5:47 PM**

PRESENT:

His Worship the Mayor, Cr M. Matson (Chairperson) (East Ward)

North Ward	-	Crs P. Tracey & M. Woodsmith
East Ward	-	Cr B. Notley-Smith (Deputy Chairperson)
West Ward	-	Cr S. Nash
Central Ward		Cr A. Andrews
Community Representatives Batty		Mr R. Creighton, Ms J. McGirr & Ms J.

OFFICERS PRESENT:

General Manager	Mr. R. Brownlee.
Director, City Services	Mr. J. Frangoples.
Acting Director, City Planning	Mr. K. Kyriacou.
Director, Governance & Financial Services	Mr. G. Banting.
Acting Public Officer	Mr. D. Kelly.
Communications Manager	Ms. D. Brien.
Manager, Technical Services	Mr. M. Shaw.
Tree Management Officer	Mr. B. Bourke.

IN ATTENDANCE:

Crs Belleli, Hughes, Kenny, Seng and Sullivan.

1. APOLOGY:

An apology was received from Ms R. McCulloch.

RESOLVED: (Woodsmith/Nash) that the apology from Ms R. McCulloch for non-attendance at the Greening Randwick Committee Meeting of the Council held on Tuesday, 12th July , 2005 be received & accepted.

2. DECLARATION OF PECUNIARY & NON-PECUNIARY INTERESTS

Nil.

3. ADDRESSES TO COMMITTEE BY THE PUBLIC.

Nil.

4. MAYORAL MINUTES.

Nil.

5. GREENING RANDWICK.

THE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS:

5.1 DIRECTOR, CITY SERVICES' REPORT 83/2005 - ABBOTT STREET – FORMATION OF STREET COMMITTEE. (F2004/07359)

RECOMMENDATION: (Woodsmith/Nash) that the Director, City Services' Report 83/2005 be received and noted.

5.2 DIRECTOR, CITY SERVICES' REPORT 84/2005 – URBAN FOREST POLICY SOFTWARE COSTS & UPDATE ON EXHIBITION PROCESS. (F2004/07359)

RECOMMENDATION: (Woodsmith/Notley-Smith) that:

1. the Committee notes the conclusion date of 29 July for the exhibition period for the Draft Urban Forest and Street Tree Policy;
2. prior to the Committee's assessment of any public submissions received on the draft policy, it seeks advice from the US manufacturers (American Forests) of the CITYgreen software about whether the model can be adapted for Australian conditions;
3. any recommendation to Council to purchase the software is deferred until the Committee is both confident that the model is suitable for Australian conditions and has formed a recommendation on the draft policy itself; and
4. recommends to Council that it writes to SSROC and the LGSA:
 - a) informing them of Council's intentions to implement the objectives of the LGSA Urban Forest Policy via Council's Draft Urban Forest and Street Tree Policy currently on public exhibition;
 - b) requesting that SSROC and the LGSA also support a regional wide approach to "Urban Forest" management, monitoring and valuation;
 - c) noting that Council is seeking advice from the manufacturers of the CITYgreen software (American Forests) about whether the model can be adapted for Australian conditions;

- d) flagging, that if the advice is favourable, that SSROC and the LGSA will be asked to participate in an evaluation of the CITYgreen software;
- e) noting that any such evaluation would seek comments from relevant GIS staff of SSROC Councils and other specialist staff (eg. Bushland teams), on the merits, gaps, assumptions or deficiencies of the CITYgreen software as it relates to Australian conditions and equivalent areas of "urban forest" in our region;
- f) proposing that any such evaluation should aim to include approximate costings on the need or potential of customising the CITYgreen software, filling in missing data layers and other related issues and also provide a number of recommendations on how best to advance the proposed Urban Forest Policy across local government areas covered by SSROC; and
- g) other software providers be approached and that this software be assessed in conjunction with the CITYgreen software.

5.3 DIRECTOR, CITY SERVICES' REPORT 85/2005 - OPTIMAL WATERING PROGRAM FOR STREET TREES. (F2004/07359)

RECOMMENDATION: (Andrews/Woodsmith) that:

- (a) the matter be deferred to the next meeting of the Greening Randwick Committee; and
- (b) an onsite inspection be organised with the Mayor and interested members of the Committee to get a better idea of Council's street tree planting program.

5.4 DIRECTOR, CITY SERVICES' REPORT 86/2005 - ONGOING REVIEW OF STREET TREE MASTERPLAN. (F2004/07359)

RECOMMENDATION: (Andrews/Woodsmith) that:

- (a) the recommendations and Action Plans contained in Council's Street Tree Masterplan be reviewed every two years to assess their progress and ongoing viability;
- (b) any proposal to plant trees/shrubs not nominated in Council's Street Tree Masterplan only be decided by Council Resolution;
- (c) Council's Street Tree Officer forward a report to the next Greening Randwick Committee assessing both the impact to the integrity of the Street Tree Masterplan should the peppercorn tree species be removed and the impact on the Street Tree Masterplan from the increased impacts imposed by the Optus cables; and
- (d) the issue of the peppercorn trees also be referred to Council's Access Committee.

5.5 DIRECTOR, CITY SERVICES' REPORT 87/2005 - FUNDING FOR STREET TREE PROGRAM. (F2004/07359)

RECOMMENDATION: (Notley-Smith/Woodsmith) that Council considers funding for street tree planting on an annual basis.

The meeting was adjourned at 6.28 p.m. and resumed at 6.29 p.m.

5.6 DIRECTOR, CITY SERVICES' REPORT 89/2005 - SIGNIFICANT TREE REGISTER (F2004/07359)

RECOMMENDATION: (Woodsmith/Andrews) that the Director, City Services' Report 89/2005 be received and noted.

6. GENERAL BUSINESS.

6.1 GENERAL BUSINESS – DETERMINATION OF QUORUM. (F2005/00181)

RECOMMENDATION: (Woodsmith/Notley-Smith) that the quorum for the Greening Randwick Committee be set at six (6) and must include at least four (4) Councillors.

(Note: Cr Andrews requested that his name be recorded as opposed to the resolution.)

7. NOTICE OF RESCISSION MOTIONS.

Nil.

The meeting closed at 6.40 p.m.

.....
CHAIRPERSON

Director, City Services' Report 91/2005

SUBJECT:	DES RENFORD AQUATIC CENTRE CARPARK
-----------------	------------------------------------

DATE:	25 July, 2005	FILE NO:	F2004/08045 xr F2005/00171
--------------	---------------	-----------------	-------------------------------

REPORT BY: DIRECTOR, CITY SERVICES

INTRODUCTION:

At the Ordinary Council meeting on 24th May 2005, on the Motion of Councillor Belleli, it was resolved that:

“a report be brought back to Council on the need and costs of improved lighting in the DRAC car park”

The following report responds to the issue of lighting levels in the car park at the Des Renford Aquatic Centre.

ISSUES:

In the past complaints have been received from patrons regarding the low level of lighting in the car park particularly for patrons attending the facility in the early morning. Approximately 12 months ago lighting levels to the car park were upgraded. This involved the installation of extra floodlights to the entire area of the car park. The management of DRAC and the Electrical Contractor responsible for the installation believe that the lighting levels are now above the required lighting safety levels for this facility. Since the installation of enhanced lighting there have been no further complaints received by the DRAC management.

FINANCIAL IMPACT STATEMENT:

There is no direct financial impact for this matter.

CONCLUSION:

The lighting levels in the carpark at DRAC do not require improvement at this time.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Director City Services Report 91/2005 dated 25 July 2005 be received and noted.

ATTACHMENT/S:

Nil

.....
JORDE FRANGOPLES
DIRECTOR, CITY SERVICES

.....
KERRY COLQUHOUN
CO-ORDINATOR LANDSCAPE
DESIGN

Director, City Services' Report 93/2005

SUBJECT:	RANDWICK CITY COUNCIL DOMESTIC WASTE SERVICES CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY 2005.
-----------------	--

DATE:	27 July, 2005	FILE NO:	F2005/00192
--------------	---------------	-----------------	-------------

REPORT BY: DIRECTOR, CITY SERVICES

INTRODUCTION:

The Randwick City Council Domestic Waste Services Customer Satisfaction Survey was conducted in May 2005. This survey was a follow-up to the survey of the same title conducted in September 2003 that measured community satisfaction with the provision of domestic waste services including general garbage, recyclables, green waste and clean-up collection services.

The 2005 survey was intended as the first follow-up measure and it is envisaged that another follow-up will be undertaken in 2007 to track performance and guide service delivery improvements.

Council's corporate objective in 2003 was that *'75% of customers are satisfied with the range of services and the agreed level of service delivery'*. The level of satisfaction obtained in 2003 was 86.4% that exceeded the intended target. In 2005 this target was increased to 87%.

This report details the results of the satisfaction survey conducted in May 2005.

ISSUES:**Previous Survey**

The survey conducted in 2003 identified some opportunities for improvements in service delivery. Timely identification and quick action regarding illegal dumping, and accurate recording of on-call clean-up requests and coordination of timely collection were found to be some of the areas where further service improvements could be achieved.

Waste Management Database

With the objective to achieve further improvements in service delivery, Council has developed a customer focused Waste Management Database. The database allows illegal dumping information to be recorded, electronically distributed to appropriate staff for

law-enforcement or removal actions and following that a user-friendly run-sheet for efficient removal is printed out. Similarly, on-call clean-up service requests are recorded in the database with items to be collected, collection point and day of collection. A letter of confirmation with instructions for presentation is generated by the system and sent to the customers.

This database allows identification and separation of on-call clean-up bookings from illegal dump incidences that require investigations and follow different procedures of collection. Also, it allows quality assurance of service delivery. The database has been in use for two years.

Current Survey

The survey carried out in May 2005 showed that 91.3% of Council's domestic waste customers were satisfied. This satisfaction level is higher than both Council Management Plan target of 87% and actual satisfaction level measured in 2003 of 86.4%.

General Household Garbage Collection

These services are out sourced and are currently provided by Council's contractor Collex. Different aspects of service satisfaction in this area have been improved compared to the satisfaction level in the previous survey. The improvements can be attributed to improved contract management, and development and implementation of new procedures to addressing customer concerns.

Recycling Services

The kerbside collection services are provided by Council's contractor Collex and the drop-off facility is managed in-house. Some aspects of these services have shown increased customer satisfaction in this year's survey compared to the previous survey.

Green Waste Services

These services are provided in-house and the overall satisfaction levels with green waste services remain high at 87.2%. Customers also have expressed their satisfaction with the size of the green waste bin (88.2%).

Clean Up Services

Clean-up services are provided in-house. The overall satisfaction with the two scheduled services has significantly increased from 80.7% in 2003 to 89.4% in 2005 and that for the on-call clean-up services increased from 86.1 in 2003 to 93.2% this year.

New Initiative

To give customers better and easier access to waste service information, a user-friendly service database is currently being developed. This database will allow customers to search through Council website for service information: address specific garbage,

recycling, green waste and scheduled clean-up collection days. The database will be available on Council website soon.

CONCLUSION:

A customer satisfaction survey has been carried out in May 2005 with the objective of measuring the community satisfaction level with the domestic waste services Council provides to the community.

The overall customer satisfaction rating of domestic waste management services has increased from 86.4% in 2003 to 91.3% in 2005. This increased level of customer satisfaction is attributed to the implementation of improved service delivery procedures both for in-house and out-sourced services.

A Waste Management Database has been developed and implemented that allows better data collection for service performance analysis and improved service delivery. This database has been instrumental in improving the quality of waste management services delivered to the community, specifically the delivery of on-call clean-up services. Another user-friendly internet based database is currently being developed that will allow customers to search for their address specific garbage, recycling, green waste and scheduled clean-up collection days through internet.

On-call clean-up services received the highest rating of 93.2% customer satisfaction.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

1. Note the report;
2. Note that the overall customer satisfaction domestic waste management services has increased from 86.4% in 2003 to 91.3% in 2005.; and
3. Note that a new internet based database is currently being developed that will allow customers to search for address specific waste service information.

ATTACHMENT/S:

Attachment 1 Methodology
Attachment 2 Executive Summary
Attachment 3 Key Criteria- Results Summary

.....
JORDE FRANGOPLES
DIRECTOR CITY SERVICES

Attachment 1: Methodology

Background

The Randwick City Council Domestic Waste Services Customer Satisfaction Survey 2005 was a follow up survey to the survey of the same title conducted in September 2003. The Domestic Waste Survey 2003 measured community satisfaction with the residential waste, recyclables, green waste and clean-up services. Baseline data was established for the purpose of assessing Council's performance in later re-administrations of the survey.

The Domestic Waste Services Customer Satisfaction Survey 2005 was intended to provide the first account of changes over time. Findings will be reported to Council with comparisons against the 2003 data on appropriate dimensions. It was envisaged that the results would be used to guide service delivery improvements.

Purpose

Council's corporate objective in 2003 was that *'75 % of customers are satisfied with the range of services and products and the agreed level of service delivery'*. In 2005 this target has been set at 87%.

Council's waste collection included –

<i>Single unit dwelling</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Garbage - 120 litre mobile garbage bin collected weekly ▪ Recycling - 240 litre "split" mobile garbage bin collected fortnightly ▪ Green waste - 240 litre mobile garbage bin collected fortnightly (alternate week to recycling collection) ▪ Four clean-up services per year
<i>Multi unit dwelling</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 240 litre mobile garbage bin collected weekly (1 bin shared between 2 units) ▪ 240 litre "split" mobile garbage bin collected fortnightly (1 bin shared between 2 units) ▪ Green waste - 240 litre mobile garbage bin collected fortnightly (alternate week to recycling collection) (bins provided on request) ▪ Four clean-up services per year
<i>Council Contractor</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 52,500 garbage collection services per week ▪ 52,300 recycling collections per fortnight
<i>City Services</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Approximately 23,000 green waste collections per fortnight
<i>Proposed New Services</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sharps collection for diabetes ▪ e-waste recycling drop off (e.g. televisions, computers) ▪ Mobile phone recycling ▪ Digital medium recycling (e.g. CDs, DVDs) ▪ Polystyrene recycling

Objectives

The overall objective of the Randwick City Council Domestic Waste Services Customer Satisfaction Survey 2005 was to ascertain current levels of satisfaction with the range of domestic waste services delivered by Council (see table above), to gain community opinion regarding the introduction of new domestic waste services and to track changes in satisfaction over time by comparing the 2005 data with the 2003 baseline data.

More specifically the survey aims were to –

- identify the satisfaction levels of customers with the four available services on a range of service delivery dimensions
- gauge community opinion with respect to the introduction of new domestic services including priorities
- explore the factors contributing to overall customer satisfaction with services
- compare 2005 data with 2003 data on key dimensions and as appropriate
- identify gaps in community perception for service improvements
- guide recommendations for contributing to the management of Council's outdoor workforce and external contractor in relation to waste collections.

Methodology

Community Survey

The object of this stage was to determine the matters or issues of concern to the community and the degree of importance of those matters or issues.

The methodology with the data collection process was dictated to by the demographics with large variations from suburb to suburb.

Micromex analysed and reported the results on a 'city wide' basis as well as by postcode. This enabled Council to identify any major variations between the different geographical areas within the LGA.

Data collection

To achieve the desired outcomes a telephone survey was conducted on a sample of 1200 randomly selected residents within the Randwick City Council LGA.

To qualify for interviews a person from the selected household who had the most recent birthday and who was over the age of 18 was interviewed.

Respondents were filtered to ensure that they had lived in the Randwick City Council area for a minimum of 6 months.

To ensure a representative sample was collected, a rigorous system of call back procedures was adopted. A minimum two-hour delay occurred between call backs and calls to unanswered numbers. A maximum of five attempts will be made during the period of the survey.

Interviews were conducted during weekday evenings from 4:30pm to 8:30pm and on Saturdays from 9:30am to 4:00pm between 20th April and 4th May 2005. Where the random sampling process resulted in an under representation a quota sampling system was used to ensure acceptable representation from all areas or categories.

All interviews were conducted by fully trained and supervised interviewers from Micromex Research in the office in North Wyong under IQCA guidelines and the Market Research Society Code of Professional Conduct. Interviewing was conducted using computer-aided telephone interviewing (CATI) and continuous monitoring of surveys was undertaken.

User database & confidentiality

Strict confidentiality conditions were applied to the database with all records being destroyed after completion of the survey.

On making contact with a resident, confidentiality conditions were explained to the respondent prior to commencement of the survey.

Sampling error

A sample size of **1200** residents provided a maximum sampling error of plus or minus 2.9% at 95% confidence.

At the sub-group level i.e. Single/Multi unit dwelling, the maximum sampling error was approximately 4% at 95% confidence.

Survey response

The number of refusals as a proportion of the completed surveys plus refusals was approximately 56%.

Weighting adjustment

On completion of the initial data analysis phase of the project, considerations were given to weighting by area to provide the most accurate outcome of overall resident opinions.

The weighting took into account ABS Census Population (2001) in each respondent's designated age.

Using weighted results meant that all sub-groups contributed to the citywide results in proportion to their characteristics.

Questionnaire

Micromex, together with Randwick City Council, designed the questionnaire.

Piloting

Piloting of the questionnaire ensured a functional questionnaire in terms of phrasing and the placement of questions in judicial order.

Interviewing

All interviews were conducted by fully trained and supervised interviewers of Micromex Research in the office in North Wyong.

Prior to the survey a privacy statement was read to each respondent to ensure that there was an understanding of the complete confidentiality of the interview.

Statistical comparisons

The methodology used in determining the statistical significance when comparing 2003 with 2005 was as follows:

The *t*-test for independent samples was used to evaluate the differences in means between the two groups, 2003 and 2005.

In the 'Key criteria' on page 19, values where the confidence intervals did not overlap, indicate a statistically significant difference between the values at 95% confidence level.

Attachment 2: Executive Summary

Executive Summary

During the course of conducting this survey we were pleased with cooperation of residents and their general willingness to participate in this survey.

The key results are reported under the following sections:

- General household garbage bin
- Yellow recycling bin
- Green waste bin (SUDS)
- Scheduled clean-up services
- Problems with the general household waste service
- Problems with the recycling bin service
- Problems with the green waste service (SUDs)
- Problems with the clean up services
- General

NOTE: Percentages in brackets represent the 2003 survey results for comparative purposes.

General household garbage bin

Satisfaction rating with the return of the general household garbage bin

Respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction with how the general household garbage bin was returned after it had been emptied.

Key findings

- 75.8% (2003 - 74.5%) of the respondents were 'satisfied' to 'very satisfied'
- The statistical difference between SUDS and MUDS was insignificant
- The statistical difference between the total means in 2003 and 2005 was insignificant
- The most satisfied were those in postcode 2036 and the least satisfied were those in postcode 2034
- Although those respondents in postcode 2034 were the least satisfied, more than 70% were still 'satisfied' to 'very satisfied'
- The 2003 survey results show that postcode 2036 and 2034 were also the most satisfied and least satisfied respectively

In a follow up question those who were dissatisfied were then asked why. The majority of responses related to the bin 'being left in the wrong place'.

How often the general household garbage bin was not big enough

In this question we attempted to establish how frequently the respondents found that their garbage bins were not big enough for their household waste.

Note: MUDs with communal bins were not asked this question.

Key findings

- 46.4% (2003 - 45.5%) of the respondents 'never' had a problem and approximately 23% (2003 - 25%) had infrequent problems
- Respondents from postcode 2034 reported the most instances where the bin was not large enough and this occurred fairly equally during festive occasions, monthly and weekly
- There were only marginal differences in the frequency of respondents not finding their bin big enough compared to 2003

Four or more people living permanently in the household

Note: MUDs with communal bins were not asked this question.

Key findings

- Overall, 29.7% (2003 - 27.8%) of households had four or more people living in them
- 40% (2003 - 41.6%) of SUDs and 14.5% (2003 - 14.7%) of MUDs had four or more people living in their household
- We found there to be a considerable difference between postcodes. Households with four or more people varied from a low of 23.4% for households in postcode 2031 to a high of 46.6% in postcode 2036

Yellow recycling bin

If they knew what items went into each side of the recycling bin

In this prompted question respondents were asked to rate the extent to which they agreed with the statement 'I know what items go into each side of the recycling bin'.

Key findings

- 97% of SUDs and 87.8% of MUDs agreed with this statement
- The extent to which the respondents agreed with this statement was similar for all postcodes

Awareness of the correct usage of the recycling bin

There was a wide range in awareness in response to the question as to whether a bin would be emptied if it contained non-recyclable material.

Key findings

- Overall 68.3% (2003 - 63.6%) were aware that the bin might not be emptied, showing a marginal increase from 2003
- The awareness was marginally higher for SUDs residents with 74.9% (2003 - 67.5%) compared to MUDs residents with 61.1% (2003 - 59.9%)
- The awareness by postcode varied from a low of 65.5% in 2031 to a high of 73.2% in 2032
- Compared to 2003 there was an increase in awareness for all postcodes with the exception of postcode 2036 where there was a decrease in awareness of approximately 4%

Awareness of the recycling drop off centre in Perry St, if it had been utilised and its convenience

Key findings – awareness of drop off centre

- Overall, 39.4% of respondents were aware that there was a recycling drop off centre in Perry Street in Matraville
- The overall awareness remained unchanged from 2003
- The SUDs awareness with 49.1% (2003 - 55.0%) was greater than MUDs with 28.7% (2003 - 23.7%)
- By postcode this varied from a low of 26.7% in postcode 2031 to a high of 56.8% in postcode 2036

Key findings – utilisation of the drop off centre

- Of those who were aware of the drop off centre 18.7% (2003 - 15.8%) had used it in the last 12 months. This represented 7.3% (2003 - 6.2%) of the total sample
- 68% of the users were SUDs
- Of those who were aware of the drop off centre the usage ranged from a low of 11.8% in postcode 2031 to a high of 27.3% in postcode 2036

Key findings – convenience of the drop off centre

This question was only asked if the respondents were aware of, and had used, the recycling drop off centre.

- Overall, 90.2% (2003 - 83.8%) of those who had used the centre rated the convenience of the drop off centre as ‘convenient’ to ‘very convenient’
- The statistical difference between 2003 and 2005 was insignificant

Overall satisfaction with Council’s recycling services

Key findings

- The overall rating of Council’s recycling service was high with 82.3% (2003 - 83.1%) in the range ‘satisfied’ to ‘very satisfied’
- 86.7% (2003 - 87.4%) of SUDs and 77.3% (2003 - 78.9%) of MUDs rated Council’s recycling services in the range ‘satisfied’ to ‘very satisfied’
- The statistical difference between 2003 and 2005 was insignificant

- The satisfaction levels were high for all postcodes with the highest being postcode 2035 where 88.0% were 'satisfied' to 'very satisfied' and the lowest was postcode 2033 with 75.3% in that satisfaction range

Green waste bin (SUDS)

Overall satisfaction with the frequency of the green waste service

Key findings

- The overall satisfaction with the fortnightly green waste service was high with 87.2% (2003 - 87.6%) of the respondents rating the service in the range 'satisfied' to 'very satisfied'
- The statistical difference between 2003 and 2005 was insignificant
- The satisfaction levels were also high for all postcodes although for postcode 2033 the mean satisfaction rating was marginally lower than the average

Satisfaction with the size of the green waste bin

Key findings

- The overall satisfaction with the size of the green waste bin was high with 88.2% (2003 - 88.5%) of the respondents rating the bin size in the range 'satisfied' to 'very satisfied'
- The statistical difference between 2003 and 2005 was insignificant
- The satisfaction levels were high for all postcodes
- Compared to 2003, the dissatisfaction in postcode 2033 increased from 8.2% to 16.4%

How often they used the green waste collection

Key findings

- More than 86% of the respondents used the green waste collection at least monthly
- The greatest fortnightly use was in postcode 2033 with 66% while the least fortnightly use was in postcode 2032 with 43.4%

Awareness of the green waste drop off service at Council's depot

Key findings

- Approximately half of the respondents were not aware of the green waste drop off service at Council's depot
- The 52% in 2005 who were unaware compares with 49% in 2003
- The range of those not aware was from 63.1% in postcode 2032 to 44.0% in postcode 2035

Had they used the drop off service if they were aware of the service

Key findings

- Of the 301 SUDs who were aware of the green waste drop off service at Council's depot 19.0% (2003 - 19.6%) had used the service in the last 12 months
- This represents 9% (2003 - 10.0%) of all SUDs
- The usage by postcode varied from a low of 8% in postcode 2031 to a high of 30.0% in postcode 2034

How convenient they found the green waste drop off service

Key findings

- Of the 56 respondents who had used the green waste drop off service in the last 12 months 88.0% (2003 - 83.1%) rated the service as 'convenient' to 'very convenient'
- The statistical difference between 2003 and 2005 was insignificant

Overall satisfaction with Council's green waste service

The concluding question for all SUDs on the green waste service was to determine their overall satisfaction with these services.

Key findings

- 85.6% (2003 - 85.5%) rated their overall satisfaction with Council's green waste service as 'satisfied' to 'very satisfied'
- The statistical difference between 2003 and 2005 was insignificant
- The mean ratings by postcode showed that the degree of satisfaction was similar for all postcodes

Scheduled clean-up services

Awareness that Council offers two scheduled clean-up services per year

Key findings

- 87.8% (2003 - 92.1%) of the respondents were aware Council offered two scheduled clean-up services per year
- Compared to the previous research there was a marginal increase in awareness for SUDs, from 94.7% in 2003 up to 96.3% in 2005, but a significant decrease in awareness for MUDs, from 89.6% in 2003 down to 78.5% in 2005
- By postcode, the percentage of respondents who were unaware ranged from 7.1% in postcode 2035 to 18.9% in postcode 2032

If they had used the service in the past 12 months

This question was only asked of those who were aware that Council offered two scheduled clean up services per year.

Key findings

- Of those who were aware of the scheduled clean-up service 69.5% (2003 - 69.8%) had used the service in the last 12 months
- This represents 61.0% (2003 - 64.3%) of the total sample
- Those who were aware and had used the service were primarily SUDs with 76.9% (2003 - 83.6%) compared to MUDs with 59.6% (2003 - 55.7%)
- The usage by postcode varied from a low of 63.2% in postcode 2032 to a high of 74.6% in postcode 2035

Satisfaction with the scheduled clean-up service

This question was only asked of those who were aware that Council offered two scheduled clean up services per year and had used the service in the previous 12 months.

Those respondents from both SUDs and MUDs who had used the clean-up service in the past 12 months were then asked to rate their satisfaction with the clean-up service.

Key findings

- Overall, 89.4% (2003 - 80.7%) of the respondents were 'satisfied' to 'very satisfied'
- The results show a statistically significant improvement compared to 2003
- The most significant improvement was with SUDs where those who were 'satisfied' to 'very satisfied' increased from 79.4% in 2003 to 90.9% in 2005
- Overall, those who were dissatisfied decreased from 12.7% in 2003 to 5.9% in 2005
- There was a significant improvement in satisfaction in postcodes 2031, 2034, 2035 and 2036 compared to 2003

Awareness when a scheduled clean-up service occurs

This question was only asked of those who were aware that Council offered two scheduled clean up services per year and had used the service in the previous 12 months.

Those respondents who were aware that there was a scheduled clean-up service were then asked how they knew when it was due in their area.

Key findings

- The most significant means of establishing when there was a clean-up scheduled was by 'referring to the waste calendar'
- Overall, those who referred to the waste calendar increased from 74.6% in 2003 to 77.7% in 2005

Disposal of bulky items without using the scheduled clean-up service

This question was asked of those who were not aware that Council offered two scheduled clean-up services per year or those that knew but had not used the scheduled clean-up service in the last twelve months.

Key findings

- The majority never required the service, however, 17.4% phoned a collection service if needed and 8.8% took the waste to the tip themselves

Awareness that Council offered two on-call clean-up services a year that required booking***Key findings***

- Overall, 62.4% (2003 - 46.8%) of the total sample were aware that Council offered two on-call clean-up services per year that required booking. This was a significant increase from 2003
- This awareness was considerably higher with SUDs with 76.4% (2003 - 57.2%) compared to MUDs with 47.0% (2003 - 36.7%)
- The awareness of the on-call clean-up services ranged from a low of 46.1% in postcode 2032 to a high of 68.5% in postcode 2035

Had they used the service in the past 12 months

Those respondents who were aware that Council offered two on-call clean-up services per year were then asked if they had used the service in the last 12 months.

Key findings

- Overall, 32.7% (2003 - 13.4%) had used the service in the last 12 months
- This was a significant increase compared to 2003 and represents 20.3% (2003 - 6.2%) of the total sample
- Usage by postcode varied from a low of 24.7% in postcode 2032 to a high of 39.5% in postcode 2033

Satisfaction with the on-call clean-up service

Those respondents who had used the on-call clean-up service were asked to rate their satisfaction with the service.

Key findings

- Evaluating the difference in means between the 2003 and 2005 we found a statistically significant improvement in the rating of the on-call clean-up service in 2005
- There was a very high degree of satisfaction with this service with 93.2% (2003 - 86.1%) overall rating in the range 'satisfied' to 'very satisfied'
- 92.6% (2003 - 89.2%) of SUDs and 94.2% (2003 - 82.8%) of MUDs rated the booked clean-up service in this range 'satisfied' to 'very satisfied'
- The most significant improvements were in postcodes 2032, 2034 and 2035

Preference for a scheduled or on-call clean-up service

All respondents to this survey were asked whether they preferred a scheduled service or an on-call clean-up service.

Key findings

- Overall, 63.6% (2003 - 71.5%) of respondents preferred a scheduled service and 21.6% (2003 - 19.3%) preferred an on-call service
- Compared to 2003 we found that the preference for an on-call service remained approximately the same while those who preferred a scheduled service decreased from 71.5% to 63.6% and those in the 'don't know' category increased from 9.9% to 14.8%
- The scheduled clean-up service was preferred by 67.5% (2003 - 75.6%) of SUDs and by 59.2% (2003 - 67.5%) of MUDs
- The preference for a scheduled service by postcode ranged from a low of 44.1% in postcode 2032 to a high of 71.4% in postcode 2035

Problems with general household waste service

If they had a problem with general household waste service

Key findings

- Overall, 9.5% (2003 - 16.2%) of residents had a problem with their household waste service. This indicates a significant improvement compared to 2003
- A greater proportion of SUDs had a problem with 12.8% (2003 - 21.0%) compared to MUDs with 5.9% (2003 - 11.6%)
- The problems by postcode ranged from a low of 4.2% in 2036 to a high of 13.4% in 2034

Specific problems

Key findings

- When those who had experienced a problem were asked what their specific problem was the major issue for 42.6% (2003 - 47.4%) of the respondents was that their service had been missed
- This represents 4.1% (2003 - 7.7%) of the total sample

Action taken to solve the problem

Those respondents who had a problem with their general household waste service were asked what action they took to resolve the problem.

Note: In 2003 the most significant response was 'rang Council to lodge a complaint' whereas in 2005 the most significant response was 'rang Council's Call Centre to lodge a complaint'.

Key findings

- The majority of those who had experienced a problem with their household waste collection, 61.0% (2003 - 49.5%) contacted Council's Call Centre to lodge a complaint
- A significant proportion of MUDs simply ignored the problem

Satisfaction with the response by Council or Collex

Those respondents who had a problem with their general waste collection and had rung Council or Collex to lodge a complaint were asked to rate their satisfaction with the response they received from Council or Collex where action was required.

Key findings

- Overall, 77.6% were 'satisfied' to 'very satisfied' with the response they had received from Council or Collex
- There was a high degree of satisfaction from both SUDs and MUDs

Note: Comparing 2003 and 2005 we found the overall satisfaction to be marginally higher in 2005, however the difference was statistically insignificant. It is also important to note that in 2003 the question related to the response by Council only, whereas in 2005 the question related to both Council and Collex.

Problems with recycling bin service

If they had a problem with their recycling bin service

Key findings

- Overall, 7.8% (2003 - 14.3%) of residents had a problem with their recycling bin service which indicates a significant improvement compared to 2003
- Those SUDs who had a problem 7.7% (2003 - 12.3%) were approximately equal to the percentage of MUDs 8.0% (2003 - 16.2%) who had a problem
- The problems by postcode ranged from a low of 3.9% in postcode 2036 to a high of 12.2% in postcode 2033

Specific problems

Key findings

- When those who had experienced a problem were asked what their specific problem was, the major issue for 20.7% (2003 – 17.5%) was that their bin was too small, followed by their service being missed 19.5% (2003 - 19.9%)
- ‘Bin is too small’ represents 1.6% of the total sample

Action taken to solve the problem

Those respondents who had a problem with their recycling bin service were asked what action they took to resolve the problem.

Note: In 2003 the most significant response was ‘rang Council to lodge a complaint’ whereas in 2005 the most significant response was ‘rang Council’s Call Centre to lodge a complaint’.

Key findings

- The majority of those who had experienced a problem with their recycling bin service, 58.0% (2003 - 73.1%), ignored the problem, while 24.2% (2003 - 24.6%) rang Council’s Call Centre to lodge a complaint
- A significant proportion of MUDs simply ignored the problem

Satisfaction with the response by Council or Collex

Those respondents who had a problem with their recycling bin service and had rung Council or Collex to lodge a complaint were asked to rate their satisfaction with the response they received from Council or Collex where action was required.

Key findings

- Overall, 47.8% were ‘satisfied’ to ‘very satisfied’ with the response they had received from Council or Collex and 21.2% were ‘dissatisfied’ to ‘very dissatisfied’

Note: Comparing 2003 and 2005 we found the overall satisfaction to be marginally lower in 2005 however the difference was statistically insignificant. It is also important to note that in 2003 the question related to the response by Council only whereas in 2005 the question related to both Council and Collex.

Problems with green waste service (SUDs)

If they had a problem with their green waste service

Key findings

- Overall, 7.6% (2003 - 9.9%) of residents had a problem with their recycling bin service which indicates an improvement compared to 2003
- The problems by postcode ranged from a low of 5.6% in postcode 2036 to a high of 12.4% in postcode 2033

Specific problems

Key findings

- When those who had experienced a problem were asked what their specific problem was, the major issue for 23.1% (2003 - 24.1%) of the respondents was that their service had been missed, followed by 'bin damaged' 16.0% (2003 - 3.4%)
- 'Missed service' represents 0.9% of the total sample

Action taken to solve the problem

Those respondents who had a problem with their general household waste service were asked what action they took to resolve the problem.

Key findings

- The majority of those who had experienced a problem with their green waste service, 54.1% (2003 - 31.6%) contacted Council's Call Centre to lodge a complaint

Satisfaction with the response by Council

Those respondents who had a problem with their green waste service and had rung Council's Call Centre to lodge a complaint were asked to rate their satisfaction with the response they received from Council where action was required.

Key findings

- Overall, 50.1% (2003 - 58.4%) were 'satisfied' to 'very satisfied' with the response they had received from Council whilst 33.8% (2003 - 29.1%) were 'dissatisfied' to 'very dissatisfied'

Note: Comparing 2003 and 2005 we found the overall satisfaction to be marginally higher in 2003, however the difference was statistically insignificant.

Problems with the clean up services

If they had a problem with the clean up service

Key findings

- Overall, 5.1% (2003 - 15.1%) of residents had a problem with their clean up service which indicates a considerable improvement compared to 2003
- The problems by postcode ranged from a low of 3.5% in postcode 2036 to a high of 8.3% in postcode 2032

Specific problems

Key findings

- When those who had experienced a problem were asked what their specific problem was the major issue for 42.6% (2003 - 56.9%) of the respondents was the 'late collection'
- 'Late collection' represented 2.2% of the total sample

Action taken to solve the problem

Those respondents who had a problem with their clean up services were asked what action they took to resolve the problem.

Key findings

- The majority of those who had experienced a problem with their clean up services, 54.9% (2003 - 67.4%), simply ignored it
- 39.3% (2003 - 26%) contacted Council's Call Centre to lodge a complaint

Satisfaction with the response by Council

Those respondents who had a problem with their clean up services and had rung Council to lodge a complaint were asked to rate their satisfaction with the response they received from Council where action was required.

Key findings

- Overall, 55.8% (2003 - 42.3%) were 'satisfied' to 'very satisfied' with the response they had received from Council, which shows an improvement on 2003
- The overall improvement was statistically insignificant

General

Awareness that Council distributes a waste calendar to households annually

Key findings

- 78.8% (2003 - 79.7%) of respondents were aware that Council distributes a waste calendar to households annually
- A greater proportion of SUDs, 92.3% (2003 - 90.8%), than MUDs, 64.0% (2003 - 69.0%), were aware
- The awareness varied by postcode from a low of 58.8% in postcode 2032 to a high of 86.0% in postcode 2034

If they referred to the waste calendar

Those respondents who indicated that they were aware of the calendar being distributed annually were then asked if they referred to the calendar to check what items go into each of the bins.

Key findings

- 79.2% (2003 - 72.3%) of respondents referred to the calendar to check what items go into each of the bins
- A greater proportion of SUDs, 81.0%, than MUDs, 76.3%, referred to their waste calendar
- By postcode those who referred to the calendar ranged from 66.4% in postcode 2033 to 84.9% in postcode 2036

Rating on information provided by Council on waste services

Key findings

- There was a high degree of satisfaction with the information Council provides on waste services
- Overall, 78.0% (2003 - 76.0%) of the respondents were 'satisfied' to 'very satisfied', which shows a marginal, however statistically insignificant, improvement on 2003
- A higher proportion of SUDs with 84.7% (2003 - 86.3%) compared to MUDs with 70.4% (2003 - 66.1%) were satisfied
- By postcode, the satisfaction in the range 'satisfied' to 'very satisfied' varied from 65.8% for postcode 2033 to 87.0% for postcode 2036

Those who were dissatisfied were then asked how this could be improved.

The majority indicated that they had not received a calendar followed by the need for more and better information.

Overall satisfaction with all four domestic waste services

Key findings

- Evaluating the difference in means between 2003 and 2005 we found a statistically significant improvement in the satisfaction rating with the delivery of domestic waste services in 2005
- There was a very high degree of overall satisfaction with the delivery of domestic waste services
- 91.3% (2003 - 86.4%) of respondents rated the delivery of domestic waste services in the range 'satisfied' to 'very satisfied'
- This satisfaction rating represented 94.8% (2003 - 89.9%) of SUDs and 87.4% (2003 - 82.9%) of MUDs
- By postcode, the lowest rating in the range 'satisfied' to 'very satisfied' was in postcode 2033 with 87.7% and the highest was in postcode 2035 with 93.8%

How to improve delivery of domestic waste services

There were 1200 unprompted responses to this question the most significant of which related to the bin size.

Other issues related to recycling, increased frequency of service and increased efficiency.

Attachment 3 : Key Criteria - Result Summary**Table 1: Key Criteria – Results Summary**

Key criteria results summary	2003 research results	2005 research results	Has this result improved?	*Is the change statistically significant ?
Overall satisfaction				
Overall satisfaction with the delivery of waste services	86.4% (satisfied to very satisfied)	91.3% (satisfied to very satisfied)	Yes	No
General household garbage				
Satisfaction with how the bin is returned	74.5%	75.8%	Yes	No
Frequency of which the bin is not big enough	70.9% (never or infrequently)	69.0% (never or infrequently)	No	No
If they ever had a problem with the general household waste service	16.2% had	9.5% had	Yes	Yes
Recycling services				
Overall satisfaction with Council's recycling services	83.1% (satisfied to very satisfied)	82.3% (satisfied to very satisfied)	No	No
Awareness of the recycling drop off centre at Perry St, Matraville	39.4% aware	39.0% aware	No	No
Usage of the drop off centre	6.2%	7.3%	Yes	No
Rating of the convenience of the drop off centre	83.8% (convenient to very convenient)	90.2% (convenient to very convenient)	Yes	Yes
If they ever had a problem with the recycling bin service	14.3% had	7.8% had	Yes	Yes
Green waste services				
Satisfaction with the frequency of the green waste service	87.6% (satisfied to very satisfied)	87.2% (satisfied to very satisfied)	No	No
Satisfaction with the size of the green waste bin	88.5% (satisfied to very satisfied)	88.2% (satisfied to very satisfied)	No	No
Awareness of the green waste drop off centre at Council's depot	50.1% aware	48.0% aware	No	No
Usage of the green waste drop off service	10.0%	9.0%	No	No
Rating of the convenience of the drop off centre	83.1% (convenient to very convenient)	88.0% (convenient to very convenient)	Yes	No
Overall satisfaction with Council's green waste services	85.5% (satisfied to very satisfied)	85.6% (satisfied to very satisfied)	Yes	No
If they ever had a problem with the green waste service	9.9% had	7.6% had	Yes	No
Scheduled clean-up services				
Awareness of the two scheduled clean-up services	92.1% aware	87.8% aware	No	No
Usage of the two scheduled clean-up services	64.0%	61.0%	No	No
Overall satisfaction with the two scheduled clean-up services	80.7% (satisfied to very satisfied)	89.4% (satisfied to very satisfied)	Yes	Yes
If they ever had a problem with the clean up service	15.1% had	5.1% had	Yes	Yes
On-call clean-up services				
Awareness of the on-call clean-up services	46.8% aware	62.4% aware	Yes	Yes
Usage of the two on-call clean-up services	6.0%	20.0%	Yes	Yes
Overall satisfaction with the two on-call clean-up services	86.1% (satisfied to very satisfied)	93.2% (satisfied to very satisfied)	Yes	Yes
Preference for a scheduled or on-call service	71.5% prefer scheduled	63.6% prefer scheduled	n/a	n/a
Waste Calendar/Council information				
Awareness of the waste calendar	79.7% aware	78.8% aware	No	No
Whether they refer to the waste calendar	72.3% do	79.2% do	Yes	No

Satisfaction with the information Council provides on waste services	76.0% (satisfied to very satisfied)	78.0% (satisfied to very satisfied)	Yes	No
--	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----	----

***Note:** 'Yes' indicates that the change is noteworthy in terms of the statistical tests performed. It should be noted that some changes may not have statistical significance but they may have practical significance in terms of service delivery.