

## **SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA**

---

### **Council Meeting**

**Monday, 25 May 2026**

**7:00 PM**

**Dragon Room**

**Civic Centre**

**Hurstville**



**LATE ITEMS**

**MAYORAL MINUTE**

<b>MM005-26</b>	<b>Expansion of Lime Bikes in Georges River</b> (Report by The Mayor, Councillor Borg) .....	3
<b>MM006-26</b>	<b>Emergency Services Funding Reform – Response to NSW Treasury Options Paper</b> (Report by The Mayor, Councillor Borg) .....	6

## MAYORAL MINUTE

**Item: MM005-26 Expansion of Lime Bikes in Georges River**

**Mayor:** The Mayor, Councillor Borg

### BACKGROUND

Many in our community will have recently noticed the increasing presence of shared e-bikes across Georges River.

I wish to provide an update to Council and our community regarding the expansion and operation of shared e-bikes within our Local Government Area, as well as the evolving legislative framework introduced by the NSW Government.

#### Recent Changes to Legislation

The expansion of shared e-bikes in Georges River follows recent legislative reforms by the NSW Government, including the *Road Transport and Other Legislation Amendment (Micromobility Vehicles and Smartcards) Bill 2025*, passed in November last year.

This legislation establishes a new framework for shared micromobility services, under which the State Government have the power to approve and regulate which operators, such as Lime, may operate within local government areas. Approved operators must comply with minimum standards set at the state level, with supporting regulations and guidelines currently being finalised.

This new framework limits the ability of local councils to refuse entry to approved operators. As a result, councils are responsible for managing the local impacts of these services, despite having limited authority over whether operators enter the market, or the number of bikes introduced into our LGA.

#### Role and Powers of Local Councils

While councils do not control market entry, we retain powers to manage how shared e-bikes operate within our local government area.

This includes the ability to:

- Determine where operators may deploy and park e-bikes;
- Establish dedicated parking zones on public land;
- Implement “no ride” or “no parking” areas; and
- Introduce “go slow” zones in high pedestrian environments.

Council is currently working to identify suitable locations for potential designated parking zones. These would be located on public land, noting that there is currently no legislative framework enabling councils to charge fees for this type of commercial use.

#### Funding Model

At present, the NSW Government is still finalising the detailed regulatory and funding framework for shared micromobility services.

Early proposals have suggested the introduction of a levy of approximately 80c per trip to fund regulation, compliance and supporting infrastructure, with only 20c of that flowing through to Council and the remainder being retained by the State.

Council is supportive of micromobility initiatives but would seek to ensure that any funding model must fairly reflect the responsibilities borne by local government. While the State determines operator approvals, councils are responsible for managing community impacts,

infrastructure, and compliance at the local level. It is therefore essential that funding arrangements appropriately support councils in this role.

### Managing Impacts in Georges River

Council was formally notified by Lime of its expansion into Georges River on 11 March this year, with full rollout across the LGA commencing on 4 May 2026.

Lime has indicated that its expansion across Sydney is driven by user demand and has committed to working collaboratively with councils when entering new areas. Council has established direct contact with Lime representatives, including their warehouse manager, to ensure timely responses when issues are reported. In our experience, Lime has generally responded within two hours of notification.

The operator has implemented several measures to promote responsible use, including:

- Mandatory parking zones at key locations such as train stations, enforced through the Lime app;
- End-of-trip photo verification, using machine learning to assess appropriate parking;
- Geofenced no parking and no ride zones, which automatically slow or stop bikes in restricted areas;
- A progressive disciplinary system, where repeated misuse can result in account restrictions or bans; and
- Rider eligibility requirements, including a minimum age of 18 and acceptance of terms and conditions.

Since the introduction of shared e-bikes into Georges River, approximately 7,500 trips have been undertaken by around 2,400 individual riders, with approximately 70% of trips remaining within the LGA. This highlights strong demand and demonstrates that the service is primarily supporting local connectivity, particularly around key transport hubs such as Kogarah and Hurstville.

Since late March, Council has received 10 service requests relating to Lime e-bikes. While no formal written complaints have been lodged, additional concerns have been raised via phone enquiries, indicating increasing community awareness.

The most common issues relate to:

- Bikes being left on footpaths and in pedestrian areas, creating obstructions; and
- Parking near transport hubs, including taxi ranks, impacting accessibility and safety.

These concerns have been observed across a range of locations, particularly along arterial roads and in suburbs including Mortdale, Kingsgrove and Carlton.

Council continues to meet regularly with Lime and work collaboratively to improve service outcomes.

### Enforcement Challenges

It is important to acknowledge that current legislation has not fully kept pace with the rapid introduction of shared micromobility services.

Under the *Public Spaces (Unattended Property) Act*, Council is required to provide a minimum of three hours' notice before removing unattended items, and in some cases up to seven days. This significantly limits our ability to act quickly where e-bikes present an obstruction or safety issue, placing greater reliance on operator responsiveness.

Additionally, enforcement challenges remain in relation to behaviours such as riding on footpaths and improper parking.

Encouragingly, Council is not aware of any reported injuries or accidents involving shared e-bikes within our LGA at this time.

Members of the community are encouraged to report issues directly to Lime via their app or customer service channels for the most timely response. Council will continue to escalate concerns and advocate on behalf of our residents.

### Conclusion

Shared e-bikes present a valuable opportunity to improve connectivity and support more sustainable transport choices, building on the success of our shared e-scooter trial in Kogarah.

However, their success depends on responsible use, appropriate infrastructure, and strong collaboration between operators, Council and our community.

### **MOTION:**

That Council:

- (a) Notes the update on the expansion of Lime shared e-bike operations, including usage data and community feedback;
- (b) Continues to work collaboratively with Lime to monitor service levels, including parking compliance and operator responsiveness, and improve outcomes for the Georges River community;
- (c) Commences a community awareness campaign outlining the responsibilities of the operator and riders and promoting safe riding and proper parking;
- (d) Advocates for clear, enforceable and contemporary regulations, as well as appropriate and equitable funding arrangements to support the management of micromobility services; and
- (e) Provides a Councillor briefing/workshop on the expansion and management of shared micromobility services to ensure the best outcomes for the community.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

Nil

**Item: MM006-26 Emergency Services Funding Reform – Response to NSW Treasury Options Paper**

**Mayor:** The Mayor, Councillor Borg

**Background**

In April 2026, the NSW Government released an Options Paper regarding proposed reform of the Emergency Services Levy (ESL) funding model. The reform proposes replacing the current funding model with a new property-based funding mechanism to support the ongoing operations of Fire and Rescue NSW, the NSW Rural Fire Service and the NSW State Emergency Service.

Under the current system, emergency services are funded from insurance premiums (73.7%), local councils (11.7%) and the NSW Government (14.6%).

For Georges River Council this cost was \$3.1 million in 2025/26, which is absorbed through general rates. As it is absorbed in general rates councils cannot clearly identify or directly recover these expenses, meaning the current arrangement is considered a form of cost shifting. Cost shifting occurs when one level of government, typically the State or Federal Government, transfers responsibilities to another level, such as local councils, without providing sufficient funding to meet those obligations. Consequently, councils are required to fund these services from their own budgets, which are primarily supported by ratepayers through local rates.

The proposed reform seeks to address a number of broader policy issues affecting communities across NSW. The current ESL contributes to higher insurance premiums, which may impact insurance affordability and contribute to underinsurance or non-insurance for some households and businesses. In addition, emergency services funding requirements are projected to continue increasing over coming decades, creating pressure for a funding framework that is sustainable, equitable and transparent.

The Government's proposed replacement model is a tiered fixed-charge levy based on land values and applied to property owners. The Options Paper outlines a range of indicative models that vary in their approach to land value thresholds, regional considerations and property types. While the models differ in design and complexity, they generally seek to balance equity, simplicity, transparency and capacity to pay.

However, there remains insufficient detail regarding how any replacement model would operate in practice and what the implications would be for local government. Council's submission should therefore emphasise the need for clarity around the proposed administration and collection arrangements, particularly to ensure that councils are not required to assume additional responsibilities that properly sit with the State Government.

Of particular concern is the possibility that councils may be required to collect and administer the levy through council rate notices. Council does not support this approach, as it would effectively transfer a State Government function onto local government without certainty around funding, resourcing, or administrative support. Such an arrangement would create additional operational burdens for councils, including system changes, increased customer enquiries, debt management responsibilities, and ongoing administrative costs.

Council's position is that Revenue NSW should retain sole responsibility for the administration, billing, collection, and debt recovery of any future broad-based property levy. This would provide greater transparency and accountability for the community, ensure consistency across the State, and avoid further cost shifting onto local government.

The current ESL framework already places financial pressure on councils, with contributions generally absorbed within ordinary rate revenue rather than separately identified or recovered.

This reduces transparency for ratepayers and limits council's ability to direct funding towards local infrastructure, services, and community priorities. Any replacement model should avoid compounding these existing cost-shifting pressures by imposing additional collection or administrative functions on councils.

Treasury modelling indicates that the financial impact of the proposed levy may vary significantly across local government areas depending on factors such as land values, insurance profiles, and regional classifications. The Options Paper identifies that some lower-value and regional residential properties may experience reduced contributions under certain models, while some commercial and industrial property owners could face increased costs compared with the current ESL arrangements.

Given the potential financial, administrative, and community impacts of the proposed reforms, it is important that residents, businesses, and community stakeholders are made aware of the Parliamentary Select Committee inquiry and are encouraged to participate in the consultation process. Raising community awareness will help ensure that those potentially affected by the reforms have an opportunity to understand the proposed changes, consider how they may impact them locally, and provide informed feedback to the inquiry.

It is also appropriate for Council to make a formal submission to the Parliamentary Select Committee to help ensure that any future funding model delivers fair and equitable outcomes for the community, provides clarity and certainty for councils, and supports the long-term sustainability of local government services and operations.

**MOTION:**

- (a) That Council promote community awareness of the Parliamentary Select Committee inquiry by sharing relevant information and submission links through Council's communication channels, including social media, to encourage residents and businesses to understand the proposed reforms and participate in the consultation process.
- (b) That Council submit a formal response to the Parliamentary Select Committee inquiry prior to the 19 June 2026 deadline, and provide a copy to the local Members representing the Local Government Area (LGA), which:
  - (i) Supports reform of the Emergency Services Levy (ESL) to ensure the funding model is fairer, more transparent, and more equitable across the community.
  - (ii) Supports Revenue NSW assuming sole responsibility for the administration, billing, collection, and debt management of any new broad-based property levy.
  - (iii) Opposes any funding model that requires local councils to act as the primary collection agency through the inclusion of the levy on council rate notices, particularly where such arrangements would impose additional administrative costs, resource burdens, and cost-shifting pressures on local government.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Nil