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Understanding our changing communities

The Community Wellbeing Indicators report brings together a rich set of quantifiable measures of how Sydney is faring as a society.

It speaks to the core principles of Sustainable Sydney 2030, the City of Sydney Community Strategic Plan: providing for healthy communities; promoting opportunity, cultural participation and diversity; demonstrating integrity and inclusiveness; strengthening Sydney’s competitiveness, productivity and capacity.

This report provides an update to the Community Wellbeing Indicators framework, adopted by council in 2012, and first populated and published in 2016.1

Many of the measures in this report now have time series data going back ten years or more, and clear trends have emerged. These trends are presented here, providing the City with a strong basis for the formulation of evidence-based policy and for ongoing planning.

Future iterations of this broad-ranging package of measures will continue to build on the rich information resource provided here, further extending the time series for all indicators.

How are we tracking overall?

This report addresses 90 indicators and 122 measures, grouped into four domains. Around half of the time series presented reflect favourable social progress when assessed against the targets identified in the framework.

In its efforts to build community wellbeing and resilience, the City has some outstanding assets to work with: 90% of the residents appreciate a diverse society (section B) and levels of trust in the community remain high - 72% agree that “most people can be trusted” (section A).

The ratios of incidence of crime across the major crime categories to population have decreased. Perceived safety in a range of situations has remained stable at very high levels. Life expectancy of our residents is on the rise, and prevalence of some major diseases is decreasing. (Section A)

Our residents enjoy high levels of education and employment and the city’s economic prosperity has been tracking as desired, demonstrated by the growth of Gross City Product and increasing income levels (sections A & D). Tourism numbers are strong and the vast majority of residents have attended the rich and diverse cultural life the city offers, in both commercial and public domains (sections B & D).

The indicators currently not progressing as desired confirm a number of areas the City recognises and advocates in already – these include housing affordability, homelessness, and relative socio-economic inequality.

Some health concerns – such as an increase in the proportion of adults living with diabetes or psychological distress - are not unique to the city population, but are also witnessed regionally or nationally. Similarly, the fluctuations in residents’ subjective personal wellbeing ratings are closely mirroring national patterns.

The proportion of residents feeling part of their community and perceiving neighbourly social support are not meeting the very high aspirational targets set. This could be attributed to the rapid growth in population and a large number of residents moving in and out of the area each year. Building a community and social cohesion takes time.

Likewise, the reality of a largely professional, young and time-poor resident base makes some targets and desired trends particularly challenging. For example, nearly one in five perceive a lack of opportunity to actively participate in recreational pursuits such as arts or culture, and nearly as many in sporting activities. At the same time, people recognise the spaces that the City provides – majority are happy with access to local libraries and recreational facilities.

---

1 City Of Sydney Wellbeing Indicator Framework, Institute For Sustainable Futures, UTS; cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au/learn/research-and-statistics/community-indicators

Note that the CWI framework consists of five domains. This report contains outcomes relating to domains 1-4 of the framework, described on page vii. Targets and data relating to the fifth domain can be found in the City of Sydney’s biannual Green Reports: cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au/council/publications-updates/environmental-plans-reports
“Measuring progress of societies has become fundamental for development and policy-making in general. Improving the quality of our lives should be the ultimate target of public policies.”

Angel Guerra, Secretary-General, OECD

Wellbeing: Assessing social progress in the 21st century

This Community Wellbeing Indicators report contains over 120 measures or outcomes that the City of Sydney uses to assess community need and wellbeing. It covers key areas of health and safety, culture, democracy, community engagement, and the local economy.

These indicators are based on the principle that evaluating a society’s wellbeing is just as important in determining social progress as economic metrics such as gross domestic product (GDP). Social progress is not the inevitable result of economic growth, and for inclusive growth we need complementary community strengthening efforts.

The Community Wellbeing Indicators inform all of our plans and strategies and help ensure our local area and its residents, workers, visitors and businesses continue to thrive.

International governing bodies across the globe, such as the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the United Nations have adopted wellbeing frameworks as a way of measuring and monitoring aspects of our quality of life. In Australia, the Australian Bureau of Statistics has developed the ‘Measures of Australia’s Progress’ framework. Similarly, Stats NZ have developed Indicators Aotearoa New Zealand as a source of measures for New Zealand’s wellbeing. Taking it a step further, New Zealand is also the first western country to design its entire budget around wellbeing priorities (in 2019).

Wellbeing and building resilience

The last decades of research on societal wellbeing intersect with the fields of social sustainability and urban resilience.

Social sustainability and urban resilience initiatives often focus on building a communities’ adaptive capacity to cope with sudden and unforeseen challenges as well as ongoing social and economic upheaval. In cities like Sydney, this may mean natural disasters, financial crashes or terrorist threats. Ongoing challenges include rapid population growth, strained infrastructure, disparities in housing supply and demand, and the longer-term impacts of climate crisis.

The future success of a global city like Sydney will increasingly rely on managing these challenges and finding ways to thrive in the face of them.

Continuously building and consolidating assets such as social cohesion, environmental sustainability, relative political stability, as well as economic prosperity is widely recognised as critical to social sustainability and urban resilience. In short, wellbeing builds resilience.

2 The OECD Better Life Index; oecdbetterlifeindex.org/blog/is-gdp-still-useful.htm
3 The OECD Better Life Index; oecdbetterlifeindex.org
4 The UNDP Human Development Index; hdr.undp.org/en/content/human-development-index-hdi
5 Measures of Australia’s Progress, 2013; www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Lookup/1370.0main+features672013
6 Wellbeing data for New Zealanders, Stats NZ; wellbeingindicators.stats.govt.nz
7 New Zealand Government; treasury.govt.nz/publications/wellbeing-budget/wellbeing-budget-2019
8 100 Resilient Cities, The Rockefeller Foundation; 100resilientcities.org/resilience#/-/
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How the City of Sydney monitors wellbeing

The City of Sydney measures wellbeing through the Community Wellbeing Indicators framework. The framework reflects a broad range of factors that contribute to wellbeing – our quality of life and material living conditions, including our health, housing, work, income, education, social connections, safety, and the quality of our physical and natural environments.

The Community Wellbeing Indicators framework is a suite of over 100 indicators across these five key domains:

A. Healthy, safe and inclusive communities;
B. Culturally rich and vibrant communities;
C. Democratic and engaged communities;
D. Dynamic, resilient local economies;
E. Sustainable environments.

Collectively these are the City of Sydney Community Wellbeing Indicators.

This report is the second full data-population of domains 1-4 of the Community Wellbeing Indicator framework.

Targets and data relating to the fifth domain – Sustainable environments - can be found in the City of Sydney’s biannual Green Reports.

Adoption of the framework

In 2011 the City recognised growing international consensus that the progress of societies cannot be measured in economic terms alone. The Institute for Sustainable Futures (UTS) was commissioned to develop an indicator framework and, after public exhibition and integration of community feedback, the framework was adopted by Council in 2012.

Council identified ongoing tracking as a core element of the project, enabling reporting against the deliverables identified in the Community Strategic Plan (Sustainable Sydney 2030) and the four year Delivery Plan. Other project outcomes identified in the Council adoption document were:

“Providing a comprehensive evaluation of community need to assist in prioritising of infrastructure, services and activities.

Facilitating comparison with other comparable government jurisdictions both locally and internationally.”

Data to populate the framework come from a wide range of sources and are collated, validated and analysed to assess progress in the City of Sydney over time on each of the indicators.

---

10 City of Sydney Green Reports, City Sustainability Unit; cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au/council/publications-updates/environmental-plans-reports
11 The Community Strategic Plan has a minimum 10-year scope and updates are mandated by the Integrated Planning and Reporting framework under the Local Government Act (1993).
The City of Sydney’s spheres of influence

**Control**
- Core business, statutory responsibilities, service provision.
- City of Sydney facilities and services, buildings and other assets.
- Direct decision-making and action is possible (and necessary).

**Influence**
- Areas in which the City has partial or shared responsibility or influence.
- Advocacy, lobbying, education and communication are possible.
- Action may be possible in collaboration with other organisations and/or levels of government.

**Concern**
- Wide range of issues important to the community but outside the City’s control.
- Awareness and understanding are important.
- Incorporated into strategic vision (e.g. SS2030).
- Possible educative, advocacy, lobbying role.

**Indicators and the City’s charter**

The City of Sydney (‘the City’), as a local government organisation, is governed by the requirements of the Local Government Act (1993) and Regulations, and the City of Sydney Act (1988). Under these and other legislative provisions, the City must administer the local government area taking responsibility for matters identified by charter.

As well as the services all councils must provide, councils can also choose to take on roles as leaders, regulators, advocates, facilitators and educators to the communities they serve.

The City recognises its responsibility to deliver key services as well as embracing a role in formulating and pursuing the community’s vision and ideas, expressing their concerns about important issues to other levels of government and providing civic leadership in our journey towards a more sustainable city.

In particular the City advocates on behalf of the community for equitable and effective resource allocation from the state and federal government agencies that provide services such as public transport, health and education.

The Community Wellbeing Indicators framework contains over 100 indicators that the City uses to assess community need and wellbeing. Of the measures relating to the four domains covered in this report, the City has direct control over only three of these outcomes, but can influence approximately 70%. The remainder, roughly quarter of the measures in this report, not within control of the City, are of concern to the community and important in framing the City’s work.

In a complex and ever-changing world, the goal of understanding community wellbeing in quantitative terms is constantly shifting. Council recognised this when they adopted the Community Wellbeing Indicators framework anticipating that…

“…the number of indicators and measures will continue to change over time as new information becomes available, priorities change or data sources are varied or new data emerge…”

The Community Wellbeing Indicators Framework will undergo review to ensure continued relevancy of each indicator. The value of additions, exclusions and modifications to the original set of measures will also be assessed on the basis of their ability to adequately evaluate indicator progress.
Using this report

Context

The chart below shows annual increases in the city’s resident population since 2006 (bars, in thousands) and how this has changed total population (line). At June 2018, the City of Sydney was home to 240,229 residents, an increase of 67,244 (39%) in the last decade.

Based on the ABS 2016 Census the city residents’ median age is 32 years (compared to 36 years in Greater Sydney). Almost half the residents are aged 18-34 years and the largest age group is the 25-29 year-olds (18%).

Majority of residents are born overseas (55%) compared to 45% who are Australian born. A decade ago these proportions were reversed. While the number of Australian born residents has increased by 10%, the number of those born elsewhere has increased by 38%. The largest groups of residents born overseas are from China, the UK and Thailand.

41% of residents speak a language other than English at home.

47% of resident households are family households. 37% are lone person households and 16% are group households. Couple households without children are the largest family group making up 30% of all households.12

Measures in this report should be contextualised in terms of this rapidly growing, young, and transient population, especially when comparing non-indexed figures over time.

---


Time series, update frequency

Time-series for each measure in this report are provided back to 2006 where possible.

The most recent data available are used to update the time series in this report. In some cases, however, substantial time-lags between the collection and the release of data preclude use of more recently collected data. This is especially likely when data collections are very large and time-consuming for the agencies collecting them to process. The most extreme example of this is Census data. Up to 18 months typically pass between Census night and the release of Census data.

Time series with yearly intervals are preferred in this report but exceptions occur when data are collected less frequently and/or irregularly. Where data are collected and/or released several times a year, they are averaged or otherwise annualised as appropriate.

Geographical scales

Where data is available, the results are presented for the City of Sydney Local Government Area (see map on the following pages). For some of the measures (including several health outcomes) local area level data is not publicly available and estimates based on broader geographies are presented instead. Such cases are footnoted accordingly.

Sources and suggested citation

Measures in this report are sourced from a range of research repositories as footnoted.

Primary / City of Sydney sources are the result of research conducted by the City of Sydney itself. These include resident and community surveys, the Floor Space and Employment Survey, and administrative data.

If citing measures found in this report which come from a primary source, either the footnoted reference can be used or use this citation:


Secondary sources are the result of research conducted by Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS), NSW Health, other government agencies and industry peak bodies. If referring to measures found in this report which come from a secondary source, citing this report is not appropriate. First check the footnoted web-link for any updates and then use the suggested citation for the source itself.

Data from secondary sources was validated in February-May 2019. Primary City of Sydney data is up to date as at time of publication. While all care is taken to ensure a high degree of accuracy, the contributors accept no responsibility for any injury, loss or damage arising from the use, error or omissions therein. Users are invited to notify the City’s research team of any discrepancies.

Progress icons

Target progress icons appear throughout this report to signal to the reader how the measures are progressing in relation to their associated targets. The targets and desired trends are described in the text.

In the context of this report, ‘target’ only occasionally refers to a specific numerical value. More often the ‘target’ for a measure is for it to progress over time in a particular way: either trending upwards or downwards or remaining stable in relation to the baseline.

Note that many targets are aspirational: where we’d want to be and are hoping to enable our community to realise in the longer term.
Progress Icons:

A red square flag indicates that…

a) …the desired trend in the time series has not been realised;
   and/or
b) …a specific numerical target has not been met.

An amber round flag indicates that…

a) …progress has been made towards a specific numerical target but it has not been met yet;
   and/or
b) …pending data with which to assess the desired trend of the time series, the progress cannot
   yet be determined.

A green triangle flag indicates that…

a) …the desired trend in the time series has been realised;
   and/or
b) …a specific numerical target has been met.

Sometimes there is no target associated with a measure.
These measures are important information to monitor to fully understand community wellbeing over


time but are neutral in terms of progress over time.
City of Sydney Local Government Area
Key terms and definitions

The Community Wellbeing Indicators is the full set of measures used by the City, divided into five domains. These are also called ‘the Indicators’ (capitalised) or the ‘Community Wellbeing Indicators’.

A ‘domain’ is a high-level conceptual grouping of indicator areas. Within each of the five domains, indicators are also grouped under thematically linked area headings.

An ‘indicator’ is an aspect or component of society, the state of which has broad implications or conceptual interest in terms of understanding, tracking or planning for that society. It is often also a description of a measure or a set of measures.

A ‘measure’ is a specific statistic or data point used to gauge the state of an indicator. There may be multiple measures for an indicator. For example an indicator might be ‘health risk factors’ whilst measures could include (but are not limited to) ‘proportion of population getting adequate physical exercise’ and ‘proportion of population smoking’.

A ‘baseline’ is the first measure in an ongoing time series. It is a data point against which future data can be compared to establish trends over time. Baseline figures in the Community Wellbeing Indicators start from 2006, whenever that data point is available, or the next available data point available thereafter.

A ‘desired trend’ is a specific tendency in the time series data which is identified in the indicator framework as being ideal for a given measure. A ‘desired trend’ is often described in this document as a ‘target’ and is usually simply an ‘increasing’ or ‘decreasing’, ‘trending up’ or ‘trending down’ pattern over time. However, in some cases a specific minimum or maximum target value is also associated with a measure (see below).

A ‘target’ is usually synonymous, in this report, with ‘desired trend’ (see above). However, a ‘target’ occasionally also / instead refers to a specific numerical value, identified in the indicator framework. Unless otherwise stated, once this specific numerical target is reached, the ongoing objective is to sustain the measure at the target level.

Defining Sydney

The City of Sydney is the local authority with overall responsibility for the local government area known as ‘City of Sydney’. Many other stakeholders share an interest in parts, if not all, of this geographic area. The corporate strategic plan, Sustainable Sydney 2030, recognises the broader context of metropolitan Sydney and the unique role that the City of Sydney area plays as the heart of the global city. To ensure there is clarity regarding the relevant geographies and responsibilities, the different terms and areas are defined as described below.

The City of Sydney refers to the council as an organisation, responsible for the administration of the city.

The Council refers to the elected Councillors of the City of Sydney.

The city or the Local Government Area (LGA) refers to the geographical area that is administered by the City of Sydney and its physical elements. This area is bounded by Port Jackson in the north, Woollahra Municipal Council and Randwick City Council in the east, the Bayside in the south and the Inner West Council in the west.

The City Centre or the CBD area encompasses major civic functions, government offices, cultural and entertainment assets and runs between Circular Quay and Central Station, Domain/Hyde Park and Darling Harbour.

Greater Sydney, Sydney Region and Sydney Metro(politan) are all terms that refer to conglomerations of LGAs that make up the larger Sydney area and may include the Central Coast. This usually approximates the area formerly defined by the Australian Bureau of Statistics as the Sydney Statistical Division (the geographic boundary and / or population differences are marginal).
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A: Healthy, safe & inclusive communities

Healthy, safe and inclusive communities

Introduction

Health, safety and inclusion are holistic and multidimensional concepts. They include physical, mental, emotional and social wellbeing. They are impacted by the environments around us: home, work, school, and urban and natural spaces. In this context, good health means a life relatively free not only of illness but also freedom from victimisation, social isolation and financial stress.

This domain focuses especially on health, wellbeing and quality of life as well as collective identity, belonging, and the quality of the relationships that make up our communities. As such, the indicators in this domain can be conceptualised broadly as ‘social’, although this applies to indicators in the other domains too. For example, employment and education (in domain four, section D in this report) underpin a wide array of life outcomes and are fundamental factors in a complete understanding of social outcomes. The allocation of such indicators to other domains is purely pragmatic and not intended to detract from their value as additional social indicators.

Health, safety and inclusion are fundamental aspects of both individual and collective wellbeing and a society shares responsibility for the social outcomes experienced by its individual members. When this responsibility is met, community wellbeing and social cohesion flow on directly and indirectly.

A healthy population is better able to participate in employment, education, social and community activities and reduces costs incurred for health related services and infrastructure. While we cannot expect poor health, disability and crime to ever be eliminated entirely, we can optimise health and improve the subjective experience of wellness and inclusion.

Providing for healthy communities is a core principle in Sustainable Sydney 2030, the City of Sydney Community Strategic Plan14.

### Personal health and wellbeing

#### Subjective wellbeing

The measure for this indicator is the Personal Wellbeing Index (PWI)\(^{16}\). It is based on City of Sydney area residents’ answers to following seven survey questions. PWI is a standardised average score across these questions.

> “Thinking about your personal wellbeing, how satisfied are you with…
> a. Your standard of living?
> b. Your health?
> c. What you are currently achieving in life?
> d. Your personal relationships?
> e. How safe you feel?
> f. Feeling part of your community?
> g. Your future security?”

The target for this measure is for the average Personal Wellbeing Index score to trend upwards over time to reach at least 75.

The baseline (2011) is 69 out of 100.

The latest update (2018) is **68 out of 100**.

The year on year results are relatively stable. However, contrary to the desired trend, there has been a marginal decrease in Personal Wellbeing Index score since 2015. The target score of 75 has not yet been reached.

The chart above shows both the PWI as well as the mean scores on a scale of 1-100 for each of the seven factors that contribute to the overall score. Scores for the individual questions have overall been stable, with some marginal increases between 2011 and 2015, and marginal decreases in scores between 2015 and 2018.

Local area patterns mirror closely results monitored on Australian national level – ‘Standard of living’ and ‘Safety’ are typically rated highest, and ‘Feeling part of community’ and ‘Future security’ lowest among the seven questions. The national trend is also similar to that seen on the local level – the PWI of the Australian population was in 2015 somewhat higher than in 2011 and the Australian 2018 score returned to a level just under the 2011 baseline.\(^{17}\)

Whilst the resident sentiment has not reached the aspirational PWI target, Sydney’s quality of life has been recognised in the Economist Intelligence Unit’s Global Liveability Index: Sydney has moved up to the third place (among the 140 cities compared) in the 2019 ranking.\(^{18}\)

---


\(^{17}\) Australian Unity Wellbeing Index (AUWI), Reports 35.0 and 32.0; Australian Centre on Quality of Life, Deakin University, with Australian Unity: www.australianunity.com.au/media-centre/wellbeing-old

A: Healthy, safe and inclusive communities

Personal health and wellbeing

How residents respond when asked: In general how would you rate your **physical health**?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Poor or Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent or Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How residents respond when asked: In general how would you rate your **mental health**?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Poor or Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent or Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self-reported health

There are two measures for this indicator: the proportion of residents who reply “Excellent” or “Very good” when asked to rate their a) physical health, and b) mental health.

“In general, how would you rate your…:

a. **Physical health**?

b. **Mental health**?”

The target for this indicator is for the proportion of residents rating their health as “excellent” or “very good” to trend upwards over time and to reach at least 60%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Status</th>
<th>Baseline 2015</th>
<th>Latest update 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical health</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contrary to the desired trend, there has been a decrease in the subjective self-reported health ratings between 2015 and 2018. The specific numerical target of 60% has not been met.

The dip in self-reported health results is a concern, however in line with health outcomes reported by other sources (detailed over the next pages of this report) and part of a broader trend/ not just a local issue – for example, data reported by health agencies reveals that the overall proportion of NSW residents reporting to be under high or very high psychological stress has been increasing since 2011; and obesity rates are rising both locally and in the metropolitan region.


20 Note that other sources may report this statistic slightly differently. For example NSW Ministry of Health, Centre for Epidemiology and Evidence, combines the top three ratings (i.e. Excellent, Very good, Good) rather than the top two.

21 HealthStats NSW; Centre for Epidemiology and Evidence, NSW Ministry of Health: www.healthstats.nsw.gov.au/Indicatorgroup/TopicIndicatorGroups

22 Social Health Atlas of Australia (February 2019 and earlier releases); Public Health Information Development Unit (PHIDU), Torrens University Australia: phidu.torrens.edu.au/social-health-atlases/
A: Healthy, safe and inclusive communities

Health outcomes

Life expectancy

There are two measures for this indicator: life expectancy at birth, for females and for males.

The target for this indicator is for life expectancy at birth to remain stable or trend upwards over time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline 2006</th>
<th>Latest update 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Life expectancy - Females</strong></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Life expectancy - Males</strong></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In line with the desired trend, the life expectancy at birth is trending upwards for both females and males.

Newborn and infant care:

Note that the chart above shows two separate indicators together. Both indicators relate to the earliest years of life. No other relationship is known or implied between these indicators.

Immunisation

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of children fully immunised at one year (12-14 months) of age.

The target for this indicator is for immunisation rates to trend upwards over time.

The baseline (2006) is 87%.

The latest update (2017) is 92%.

In line with the desired trend, the immunisation rates are trending upwards over time.

Breastfeeding

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of newborns being fully breastfed upon discharge from hospital.

The target for this indicator is for the proportion of newborn babies being fully breastfed to trend upwards over time.

The baseline (2007) is 83%.

The latest update (2017) is 76%.

Contrary to the desired trend, the time series shows breastfeeding of newborns trending downwards.

Note that this measure captures only babies fully breast-fed and does not include partially breast-fed infants.

---

24 Social Health Atlas of Australia (February 2019 and earlier releases); Public Health Information Development Unit (PHIDU), Torrens University Australia: phidu.torrens.edu.au/social-health-atlases/

25 HealthStats NSW; Centre for Epidemiology and Evidence, NSW Ministry of Health: www.healthstats.nsw.gov.au/Indicatorgroup/TopicIndicatorGroups Note that, in lieu of local government area data (not available for this indicator), data from the two Local Health Districts that include the City of Sydney have been averaged and presented here as estimates.
A: Healthy, safe and inclusive communities

Health outcomes: prevalence of diseases

Prevalence of major diseases:

Note that the chart above shows two separate indicators together. No relationship is implied between these indicators.

Asthma

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of the adult population (aged over 15 years) estimated to be living with asthma.

The target for this indicator is for the proportion of adults living with asthma to trend downwards over time.

The baseline (2006) is 11%.

The latest update (2017) is 8%.

In line with the desired trend, the time series shows the proportion of adults living with asthma trending downwards over the complete time series.

Diabetes

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of adults (aged over 15 years) estimated to be living with diabetes. The measure includes those who have either diabetes or high blood glucose and did not have gestational diabetes.

The target for this indicator is for proportion of adults living with diabetes to trend downwards over time.

The baseline (2006) is 6%.

The latest update (2017) is 8%.

Contrary to the desired trend, the time series charted above shows the proportion of adults living with diabetes trending upwards over time.

---

26 HealthStats NSW: Centre for Epidemiology and Evidence, NSW Ministry of Health: www.healthstats.nsw.gov.au/Indicatorgroup/TopicIndicatorGroups

The data presented are modelled estimates based on self-reported population-weighted health survey data. Note that the survey sampling design was changed in 2012, some of the differences in the results may be explained by the improved design of the survey.

In lieu of local government area data (not available for these two indicators), data from the two Local Health Districts that include the City of Sydney have been averaged and presented here as estimates.
Prevalence of major diseases:

Note that the chart above shows two separate indicators together. No relationship is implied between these indicators.

Cancer

The measure for this indicator is the number of new cases of cancer (all types) diagnosed per 100,000 population, per annum.

The target for this indicator is for the cancer incidence to trend downwards over time.

The baseline (2006) is 382.
The latest update (2015) is 342.

In line with the desired trend, the time series shows the cancer incidence trending downwards over the time series.

Cardiovascular disease

The measure for this indicator is the rate of circulatory disease hospitalisations per 100,000 population, in a year, as a three year rolling average.

The target for this indicator is for the cardiovascular disease hospitalisations to trend downwards over time.

The baseline (2006) is 1,742.
The latest update (2017) is 1,418.

In line with the desired trend, the time series shows the cardiovascular disease hospitalisations trending downwards over the time series.

---


Psychological distress

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of adults (aged over 15 years) who are in psychological distress, based on the Kessler 10 scale. There is a strong association between high Kessler scale scores and incidence of mental health conditions.

The target for this indicator is for the proportion of adults in high or very high psychological distress (responses scored as a Kessler 10 score of 22 or above) to trend downwards over time.

The baseline (2006) is 12%.

The latest update (2017) is 13%.

Contrary to the desired trend, the time series charted above shows the proportion of people in psychological distress has been increasing since the low level recorded in 2011-2013. The measures has now crept back up to the level seen in 2006-2007.

Note that this trend is not unique to the LHD areas used for computing the charted results. Similar trend of increasing psychological distress levels has been recorded on the total NSW level.

---

29 HealthStats NSW: Centre for Epidemiology and Evidence, NSW Ministry of Health: www.healthstats.nsw.gov.au/Indicatorgroup/TopicIndicatorGroups

The data presented are modelled estimates based on self-reported population-weighted health survey data. Note that the survey sampling design was changed in 2012, some of the differences in the results may be explained by the improved design of the survey.

In lieu of local government area data (not available for this indicator), data from the two Local Health Districts that include the City of Sydney have been averaged and presented here as estimates.
### Health risk factors

**Nutrition and exercise**

The three measures for this indicator are the proportions of adults (aged over 15 years) who get adequate exercise and nutrition in the categories tabulated below.

Adequate physical exercise is here defined as doing a sum total of at least 150 minutes taken over five separate occasions, per week. Adequate nutrition is defined as two or more fruit serves and five or more vegetable serves a day. (Note that the guidelines for different adult age groups vary somewhat and may change over time).

The targets for this indicator are for the proportions of adults getting adequate physical exercise, adequate fruit and adequate vegetables to be stable or to trend upwards over time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline 2006</th>
<th>Latest update 2017</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical exercise</strong></td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>In line with the desired trend, the proportion of adults getting adequate physical exercise has been stable over the past four years. Two thirds get adequate physical exercise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fruit in diet</strong></td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>Contrary to the desired trend, the time series charted above shows the proportion of adults getting adequate fruit trending downwards over time. Less than half of adults have enough fruit in their diet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vegetables in diet</strong></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Contrary to the desired trend, the proportion of adults getting vegetables has remained stagnant at a very low level – only one in 20 eats adequate amount of vegetables.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

30 HealthStats NSW; Centre for Epidemiology and Evidence, NSW Ministry of Health: [www.healthstats.nsw.gov.au/IndicatorGroup/TopicIndicatorGroups](http://www.healthstats.nsw.gov.au/IndicatorGroup/TopicIndicatorGroups). The data presented are modelled estimates based on self-reported population-weighted health survey data. Note that the survey sampling design was changed in 2012, some of the differences in the results may be explained by the improved design of the survey.

In lieu of local government area data (not available for this indicator), data from the two Local Health Districts that include the City of Sydney have been averaged and presented here as estimates.

A: Healthy, safe and inclusive communities

Health risk factors

Body Mass Index (BMI)

There are two measures for this indicator: the proportion of adults (aged 18 years and over) who are a) overweight and b) obese.

Overweight is defined as individuals with a BMI between 25 and less than 30. Obese is defined as a BMI of 30 or greater.

The targets for this indicator are for the proportions of both overweight and obese adults to trend downwards over time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline 2008</th>
<th>Latest update 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overweight</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obese</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contrary to the desired trend, the proportion of overweight adults has increased over time. 30% were overweight in 2015.

However, the latest update to the obesity measure (14%) is somewhat lower than in 2008.

Close to half (44%) of the city’s adult residents are either overweight or obese.

32 City of Sydney estimations based on Social Health Atlas of Australia (February 2019 and earlier releases); Public Health Information Development Unit (PHIDU), Torrens University Australia: phidu.torrens.edu.au/social-health-atlases/
### A: Healthy, safe and inclusive communities

#### Health risk factors

**Rates of smoking and risky drinking in adults (LHD estimates)**

**Recreational substances:**

Note that the chart above shows two separate indicators together. Both relate to recreational substance use. No relationship is being implied between these indicators.

**Risky drinking**

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of adults (aged over 15 years) who engage in risky drinking.

Risky drinking is defined as consuming over two standard alcoholic drinks on a day when consuming alcohol.

The target for this indicator is for the proportion of adults engaging in risky drinking to trend downwards over time.

The baseline (2006) is 33%.

The latest updates (2017) is 34%.

1. Contrary to the desired trend, there has been an increase in the proportion of people engaging in risky drinking over the past few reported years, reversing the decrease seen from 2006 til 2015.

**Smoking**

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of adults (aged over 15 years) who smoke.

The target for this indicator is for the proportion of adults who smoke to trend downwards over time.

The baseline (2006) is 17%.

The latest updates (2015) is 14%.

- The proportion of people who smoke reduced in year 2010, but the progress has stalled since.

**Illicit drug use**

(not charted)

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of the population that use illicit drugs.

The target for this indicator is for the proportion of population using illicit drugs to decrease over time.

- The only data point available for this measure is for year 2016 when 34% of 14+ year olds in the statistical area had used illicit drugs.

---


The data presented are modelled estimates based on self-reported population-weighted health survey data.

Note that the survey sampling design was changed in 2012, some of the differences in the results may be explained by the improved design of the survey.

In lieu of local government area data (not available for this indicator), data from the two Local Health Districts that include the City of Sydney have been averaged and presented here as estimates.


Data is for the ABS Statistical Area 4 (roughly covering the City of Sydney, and parts of Botany Bay and Inner West councils).
Sports and recreation

Attendance at sporting events

There are two measures for this indicator: the proportions of residents that have attended sporting matches and competitions in the past 12 months as – a) spectators and b) participants.

The indicator target is for resident engagement in sport to trend upwards over time.

a. Spectators:
   The baseline (2015) is 46%.
   The latest update (2018) is 42%.

b. Participants:
   The baseline (2015) is 18%.
   The latest update (2018) is 17%.

Contrary to the desired trend, the latest updates show slight decreases both in sports spectating and participating.

Satisfaction with opportunities for sporting or recreational activities

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of residents who are “Satisfied” or “Very satisfied” when asked

“How satisfied are you with opportunities to participate in sporting or recreational activities in your local area?”

The target for this indicator is for the proportion of residents who are satisfied with opportunities to participate in sporting or recreation to trend upwards over time.

The baseline (2011) is 57%.
The latest update (2018) is 43%.

Contrary to the desired trend, the latest update shows a decrease in perceived opportunity to participate in recreational activities.

*Note that the question was worded differently in 2011 - “Do you agree or disagree that there are enough opportunities in your local area for you to participate in sporting or recreational activities?”. This difference may explain the notably different response distribution of the 2011 results.

36 Photo credit: Katherine Griffiths (Perry Park Recreation Centre, Alexandria, 2019).
A: Healthy, safe and inclusive communities

Health services

**Post-natal services**

(not charted)

There are three measures for this indicator: annual rates of:

- a) Under 1 year olds visited by community nurses;
- b) Under 4 year olds visiting early childhood health centres;
- c) Under 4 year olds attending early childhood health nurse appointments.

At this time there is no data available to measure the progress of this indicator.

**General Practitioners**

(not charted)

The measure for this indicator is the number of residents per full-time equivalent General Practitioners.

The target for this indicator is for the number of residents per GP to remain stable or trend downwards over time.

The baseline (2007) is 924.

The latest updates (2018) is 883.

In line with the desired trend, the number of residents per GP has been decreasing.

**Aged care places**

The measure for this indicator is the number of aged care places per 1,000 residents aged over 70.

The target for this indicator is for the supply of aged care places to trend upwards over time relative to demand.

The baseline (2008) is 163 places per 1,000.

The latest update (2016) is 159 places per 1,000.

Contrary to the desired trend, the supply of aged care places has not improved over the full time series. Although 2015 – 2016 data suggests some growth, unless growth amplifies and continues, year-on-year going forward, supply is unlikely to keep pace with population growth and ageing.

The chart above also shows the change over time in absolute numbers of government-funded community aged-care places (in light teal) and residential aged-care places (in dark teal). The residential places have been decreasing over the years; any growth is based on the community care places.

---

A: Healthy, safe and inclusive communities

Learning to earning: services

Child care places

The measure for this indicator is the number of child care places per child in need of childcare.

The ‘child in need of childcare’ approach takes into account both the child care demand by city residents as well as the city’s workforce living outside the city boundaries needing child care in the City of Sydney area.

Note that the formula and the target for the measure are currently under review as part of the City of Sydney’s Child Care Needs Analysis 2019.

Until a new formula and target have been finalised, in lieu, the number of childcare places per resident child has been presented.

The baseline (2006) is 0.5 places per resident child.

The latest update (2018) is 0.7 places per resident child.

The chart above also shows the actual count of childcare places over time (6,814 operating child care places in 2018, more than double the number in 2006 (3,226)).

Primary school places (not charted)

The measure for this indicator is local places per primary-school aged child at government and non-government run schools.

The target for this indicator is for there to be a place for every resident primary-aged child at local schools.

The baseline (2010) is 1.0 places per child.

The latest update (2016) is 1.1 places per child.

Class size Kindergarten to Year 6 (not charted)

The measure for this indicator is average class size in NSW government-run primary schools (K to Year 6).

The target for this indicator is for average class size to trend downwards over time or remain stable.

The baseline (2006) is 24.6 children per class.

The latest update (2018) is 24.1 children per class.

In line with the desired trend, average class size decreased between 2006 and 2011 and has been stable since.

38 City of Sydney Early Education and Care Centre Monitoring Report (2018); City of Sydney Strategy and Urban Analytics Unit.
39 City of Sydney collated information from various sources.
40 Average government primary school class sizes by year, NSW Department of Education:
Note that, in lieu of local government area data (not available for this indicator), data for NSW are presented here as estimates.
A: Healthy, safe and inclusive communities

Learning to earning: services

How residents respond when asked: Thinking about your local area, how satisfied are you with access to learning and education opportunities? 41

Satisfaction with access to learning and education

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of residents who reply “Very satisfied” or “Satisfied” when asked:

“Thinking about your local area, how satisfied are you with access to learning and education opportunities?”

The target for this indicator is for the proportion of satisfied residents to trend upwards over time or remain stable.

The baseline (2011) is 53%.

The latest update (2018) is 51%.

Contrary to the desired trend, the latest update shows a decrease in the total proportion of the respondents satisfied with access to learning or education opportunities.

This is primarily caused by increasing proportion of respondents remaining “Neutral” (39% in 2018, up from 36% in 2011), as total dissatisfaction rates are on par with the baseline (10% in 2018 vs 11% in 2011).


Internet access

(not charted)

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of households which have access to the internet.

The target for this indicator is for internet access at home to trend upwards over time.

The baseline (2006) is 73%.

The latest update (2016) is 90%. 42

In line with desired trend, the latest update shows an increase in internet access at home.

## Learning to earning: outcomes

### Early development

The five measures for this indicator are the proportions of Year 1 school children who are recorded as ‘on track’ for each of the Australian Early Development Census (AEDC) developmental domains as tabulated below.

The AEDC is a population measure of young children’s development. Data is collected by teachers, for children in the first year of full-time school. Children are regarded as being ‘on track’ in a domain if they are above the 25th percentile.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Baseline 2009</th>
<th>Latest update 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language and cognitive skills</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social competence</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional maturity</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and general knowledge</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical health and wellbeing</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The target for this indicator is for the proportion of Year 1 children who are developmentally on track in each domain to increase over time or remain stable.

In line with the desired trend, the time series charted above show the proportion of Year 1 children who are developmentally on track trending upwards over time, or stable, in every domain, relative to baseline.

### Early development vulnerability (not charted)

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of Year 1 school children who are developmentally vulnerable in two or more of the Australian Early Development Census developmental domains. Children are regarded as being developmentally vulnerable in a domain if they are below the 10th percentile.

The target for this indicator is for the proportion of Year 1 children who are developmentally vulnerable to decrease over time.

The baseline (2009) is 11%

The latest update (2018) is 9%.

In line with the desired trend, the proportion of Year 1 children who are developmentally vulnerable is trending downwards over time.

---

A: Healthy, safe and inclusive communities

Learning to earning: educational outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studying*</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in the labour force</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Circumstances of 15 to 19 year olds who were no longer attending secondary school on Census night (August) 44
*The studying category includes those employed persons who both study and work.

School retention and completion
(not charted)

There are two measures for this indicator:

a) The proportion of 17 year-olds who are not attending any educational institution; and

b) The proportion of 20-24 year olds who have completed at least a Year 12 or equivalent qualification.

The targets for this indicator are for a) the proportion of 17-year olds not attending any educational institution to decrease over time; and b) for the proportion of 20-24 year olds to have attained at least Year 12 qualification to trend upwards over time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline 2006</th>
<th>Latest update 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 year-olds not attending any educational institution</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24 year olds who have completed Year 12</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In line with the desired trend, both measures have been improving – the proportion of 17 year olds retained in educational system has improved; and an increase in Year 12 qualifications held at 20 to 24 years of age.

Circumstances of school leavers

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of 15-19 year-old school leavers (no longer attending secondary school) who are neither ‘earning nor learning’: that is neither working nor studying.

The target for this indicator is for the proportion of school leavers who are neither earning nor learning to trend downwards over time.

The baseline (2006) is 8%.

The latest update (2016) is 4%.

In line with the desired trend, the latest update shows a decrease in the proportion of 15-19 year olds who are no longer attending secondary school and are neither earning nor further learning. 3% of the 2016 school leavers are not in the labour force (down from 5% in 2011) and 1% are unemployed (down from 3%).

Note whilst the ‘neither earning nor learning’ category has decreased over time, this is partly caused by a) rapid growth in the number of international students increasing the total number of 15-19 year olds living in the City of Sydney area and studying (82% in 2016); b) an unexplained increase in the ‘Other’ category. The absolute number of 15-19 year olds not in the labour force has remained at the 2006 level (170); number of unemployed halved (57 in 2016, down from 104 in 2006).

---

44 City of Sydney estimates based on 2016 Census Community Profiles; Australian Bureau of Statistics:
City of Sydney calculations count persons by place of residence and exclude ‘not stated’ cases.
Photo credit: Katherine Griffiths (Wayfinding, Sydney, 2019).
A: Healthy, safe and inclusive communities

Personal safety

Perceptions of safety

The measures for this indicator are the proportions of residents replying that they feel “Safe” or “Very safe” in the situations tabulated below. Residents who answered “Never in this situation” are excluded from the totals used to calculate proportions.

There are very high specific numerical targets for this indicator as tabulated below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific target</th>
<th>Baseline 2011</th>
<th>Latest update 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking alone, near home, after dark</td>
<td>At least 70%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking alone, near home, in daylight</td>
<td>At least 95%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At home alone after dark</td>
<td>At least 85%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At home alone in daylight</td>
<td>At least 95%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proportion of residents who feel safe in the listed situations has increased over time or remained stable at the relatively high level. However, with the very high specific numerical targets, only one of them was met - feeling safe at home alone after dark.

The chart above shows that the perceptions of safety are very high for feeling safe at home, both in daylight and after dark, and for walking alone near home in daylight. Whilst the rating for feeling safe walking near home after dark is lower, it improved notably between 2011 and 2015. The improved level has been maintained in 2018.

Note that the chart displays only the proportion of respondents answering ‘Safe’ or ‘Very safe’ and ‘Unsafe’ or ‘Very unsafe’. The rating scale also included ‘Neutral/ not concerned’ option. The latter answers have been included in the calculation, but not charted.

The high levels of perceived safety are in line with the safety outcomes discussed over next pages and recent Safe Cities Index 2019 ranking from The Economist Intelligence Unit where Sydney places 5th overall among the 60 cities compared globally.47

---


47 Safe Cities Index 2019; The Economist Intelligence Unit Limited 2019; safecities.economist.com-safe-cities-index-2019/
Crime:

Crimes against person

The measure for this indicator is the total reported incidence of crime against persons. Note that the criteria for including crimes under this indicator is that they occur and are processed in the local government area. Victims and perpetrators are not necessarily residents.

The target for this indicator is for the total count of crime against person offences to trend downwards over time.

The baseline (2006) is 6,098 incidents. The latest update (2018) is 6,746. Contrary to the desired trend, the number of crimes against persons has increased since 2013. However, whilst the absolute number of crimes has increased, in the context of rapid and substantial population growth during the period, the ratio of crimes to population has in fact notably decreased.

Family violence

The measure for this indicator is the total reported incidence of domestic violence assault. Note that it is likely that many of the victims and perpetrators of the crimes recorded under this indicator are residents. However the criteria for including crimes under this indicator is that they occur and are processed in the LGA.

The target for this indicator is for domestic violence assault incidence to trend downwards over time.

The baseline (2006) is 840 incidents. The latest update (2018) is 1,006 incidents, an increase of 20% from the baseline. Contrary to the desired trend the total number of domestic violence assaults has been trending upwards over time. However, whilst the absolute number of domestic assault offences has increased, in the context of rapid and substantial population growth during the period, the ratio of domestic assaults to population has in fact decreased.

Property crime

The measure for this indicator is the total reported incidence of property crime. Note that the criteria for including crimes under this indicator is that they occur and are processed in the local government area. Victims and perpetrators are not necessarily residents.

The target for this indicator is for property crime to trend downwards over time.

The baseline (2006) is 34,766 incidents.

The latest update (2018) for this measure is 19,689 incidents, a drop of 43% from baseline.

In line with the desired trend, the time series charted above shows property crime trending downwards.

Incidents and interventions

(not charted)

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of applications for CCTV footage searches for which relevant footage is found and released to assist police with investigation and prosecution of offences.

The target for this indicator is for the proportion of applications resulting released footage to trend upwards over time.

The baseline (2010) is 58%.

The latest update (2018) is 64%.

In line with the desired trend, the proportion of applications, which result in the release of relevant CCTV footage, is trending upwards over time.

---


## Road safety

The four measures for this indicator are the number of fatalities and serious injuries resulting from traffic incidents by road user group as tabulated below. Note that traffic incidents included occur and are processed in the LGA although the victims are not necessarily residents.

The targets for this indicator are for all four measures to trend downwards over time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline 2013</th>
<th>Latest update 2017</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrian serious injuries</strong></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>In line with the desired trend, the serious injuries to pedestrians and pedal cyclists have decreased between 2013 and 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedal cyclist serious injuries</strong></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>The number of seriously injured ‘other road users’ has remained on the baseline level. Whilst the absolute number of other road user serious injuries has not decreased, as desired, in the context of substantial population growth during the period, the ratio of such injuries to population has in fact decreased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other road user (motor vehicle drivers or passengers) serious injuries</strong></td>
<td>113</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Road user fatalities</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>The number of fatalities is too low to make a conclusion on the direction of the trend.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

A: Healthy, safe and inclusive communities

Housing affordability

Median sales prices

There are two measures for this indicator: median residential property sales price, for the quarter ending in December, for the two property categories tabulated below.

There are no targets for this indicator: these measures are monitored for information only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline 2006</th>
<th>Latest update 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Houses and townhouses</td>
<td>$610,000</td>
<td>$1,470,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(non-strata titles)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flats and units</td>
<td>$470,000</td>
<td>$870,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(strata titles)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The charted time series above shows the change over time in median residential property sales (in 000s). For houses and townhouses (navy line) the increase from baseline is +140%. The increase from baseline for flats and units (green line) is +85%.

---


New procedures were introduced in the production of Rent and Sales tables from 2017. Comparison with data from old procedures may not be valid.
Median residential weekly rents for the December quarter by property type.\(^{53}\)

**Median rental prices**

There are two measures for this indicator: median weekly rents on residential properties, for the quarter ending in December, for the two property categories tabulated below.

There are no targets for this indicator: these measures are monitored for information only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline 2006</th>
<th>Latest update 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Houses</strong></td>
<td>$438</td>
<td>$800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flats and units</strong></td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The charted time series shows the change over time in median weekly rents. For houses (navy line) the increase from baseline is +83%. The increase from baseline for flats and units (dark green line) is +60%.

---


\(^{54}\) Photo credit: Katherine Griffiths (Buckland St heritage precinct terrace houses, Alexandria, 2015).
Housing stress (not charted)

There are three measures for this indicator:

a) Households whose rent or mortgage payments equal to 30% or more of their before-tax household income (non-equivalised) – as a proportion of all local area households.

b) Households that are in ‘housing stress’: local area households on low income (here defined as in the lower 40th percentile on the Greater Sydney income scale) whose rent or mortgage payments equate to 30% or more of their household income – as a proportion of all households.

c) Low income households that rent or mortgage with housing payments equating 30% or more of their household income.

The target for this indicator is for all three measures to trend downwards over time.

Contrary to the desired trend, the proportion of households in housing stress and low-income renters/buyers in housing stress have slightly increased between 2011 and 2016.

Whilst there is a slight decrease in the overall percentage of households with rent/mortgage payments greater than or equal to 30% of household income, due to the increasing housing prices, many low to moderate income households have been squeezed out of the local rental/buying market and have to look for housing elsewhere in the Greater Sydney area. This in turn reduces diversity of the population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline 2011</th>
<th>Latest update 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households with rent/ mortgage payments greater than or equal to 30% of household income</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households in housing stress – households on a low income with housing payments greater than or equal to 30% of household income.</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low income households (that rent or mortgage) in housing stress.</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55 Photo credit: Katherine Griffiths (Rooftop garden at M Central 1 & 2 apartment building, Pyrmont, 2017).
Affordable rental housing

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of all private dwellings that are affordable rental housing.

Affordable rental housing is supplied and managed primarily by City West Housing or Community Housing Providers. It is designated for very low to moderate income earners, who sometimes are key and essential service workers. Note that this definition reflects the City’s current use of this term rather than that contained in the indicator framework.

The target for this indicator is for affordable rental housing to comprise 7.5% of all private housing stock by 2030, as stipulated in Sustainable Sydney 2030. An estimated 9,500 additional affordable dwellings are required to meet this target.

The baseline (2007) is 447 or 0.5% of private dwellings.

The latest update (2019) is 854 or 0.7% of private dwellings.

Contrary to the trend required to meet the 2030 target, the time series shows minimal growth in affordable rental housing supply. In the 12 years between 2007 and 2019, stock increased less than two-fold. To meet the target, an estimated 11-fold increase on current (2019) stock is required.

---

Social housing

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of all private dwellings that are social housing.

Social housing is housing provided for low income earners and those experiencing disadvantage. It is accessed through the state housing application system and supplied and/or run by Housing NSW, Community Housing Providers or the Aboriginal Housing Office. Note that this definition reflects the City’s current use of this term rather than that contained in the indicator framework.

The target for this indicator is for social housing to comprise 7.5% of all private housing stock by 2030, as stipulated in Sustainable Sydney 2030. Although social housing stock currently exceeds this proportion, an estimated 720 additional social housing dwellings will still be required to keep pace with projected growth in total housing stock to 2030.

The baseline (2007) is 9,397 or 10.5% of private dwellings.

The latest update (2019) is 9,630 or 8.2% of private dwellings.

Whilst currently above the defined target of 7.5% of private housing stock, there has been a decline in the social housing supply as a proportion of total housing, putting the 2030 target in jeopardy.

---

57 City of Sydney Annual Housing Audits; City of Sydney Strategy and Urban Analytics Unit: cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au/learn/research-and-statistics/city-monitors

58 The term “private dwellings” as defined by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) applies to all housing except for: boarding houses; student accommodation; and residential care services (such as aged-care facilities). There were 116,868 private dwellings and 14,425 non-private dwellings in the City area in June 2019.
A: Healthy, safe and inclusive communities

Homelessness

Note that the chart above shows measures for two separate indicators together.

**Total homelessness**

(not charted)

The measure for this indicator is the Census homelessness count (in Aug)\(^{60}\). This captures ‘couch-surfing’ type homelessness, boarding houses, overcrowded dwellings, as well as the two categories charted above (see further definition in the footnote).

The target for this indicator is for homelessness to trend downwards over time.

The baseline (2011) is 3,037.

The latest update (2016) is 5,061.

Contrary to the desired trend the latest update shows an increase in homelessness.

**Crisis accommodation**

The measure for this indicator is overnight counts of people sleeping in crisis accommodation, such as hostels and shelters. The count is conducted twice a year - on a winter night (in August) and on a summer night (in February). Higher of the two values is charted.

There are no targets for this indicator; these measures are monitored for information only.

The baseline (2009) is 438.

The latest update (2019) is 5,061.

Note that crisis accommodation figures charted above indicate supply rather than demand as these facilities typically operate at or at close to full capacity.

**Sleeping rough**

The measure for this indicator is overnight counts of people sleeping rough. The count is conducted twice a year - on a winter night (in August) and on a summer night (in February). Higher of the two values is shown on the chart above.

The target for this indicator is for sleeping rough counts to trend downwards over time.

The baseline (2009) is 399.

The latest update (2019) is 373.

Whilst the count of homeless sleeping rough has been trending downwards over the past few years, this is coming from an 8 year high point reached in 2016.

---

59 City of Sydney Biannual Street Count; City of Sydney Social Programs and Services Unit: cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au/community/community-support/homelessness/street-count. Updated twice yearly.

60 Census of Population and Housing: Estimating homelessness, 2016, Australian Bureau of Statistics: www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/Lookup/2049.0Main+Features12016?OpenDocument. Person is considered homeless if their current living arrangement: is in a dwelling that is inadequate; has no tenure, or if their initial tenure is short and not extendable; or does not allow them to have control of, and access to space for social relations.
Income and relative inequality

Household incomes

The measure for this indicator is median weekly household income before tax.

Half of all households earn less and half earn more than the median household income. Consequently, median income represents typical household circumstances better than ‘average income’, which can be inflated by a small number of very high earning households. Median and average income should not be compared or confused.

The target for this indicator is for weekly household income to trend upwards over time.

The baseline (2006) is $1,237.

The latest update (2016) is $1,916.

In line with the desired trend, the latest update shows an increase in the median household income.

The City of Sydney median household income has increased faster than the Greater Sydney median ($1,746 in 2016 vs $1,173 in 2006), or NSW median ($1,482 in 2016 vs $1,035 in 2006).

The chart on the right shows how the income wealth is distributed in the local area (in comparison to the NSW household income quartiles) and how the distribution has changed over time. By definition, NSW households are distributed evenly across the four quartiles. The chart shows that in City of Sydney area there is a higher proportion (35%) of households earning the highest quartile income (in 2016 defined as $2,555 and over weekly), than in the NSW overall. This can partly be explained by a high proportion of the local area jobs in highly skilled occupations.

---


“Societies with smaller income differences between rich and poor are more cohesive: community life is stronger, levels of trust are higher and there is less violence. The vast majority of the population seem to benefit from greater equality.”

P80/20 Distribution of income (not charted)

The measure for this indicator is the ratio of weekly household income at the top of the 80th percentile to the same at the top of the 20th percentile. A lower ratio indicates greater equality - the income at the top of the low income range is closer to the income ranges of those earning higher incomes.

The target for this indicator is for the P80/P20 ratio to trend downwards over time.

The baseline (2006) is 5.3.

The latest update (2016) is 4.9.

In line with the desired trend, the latest update shows a decrease in the P80/P20 ratio, indicating increased equality.

Note that a lower ratio may also apply in a scenario where most low income earners are priced out and only moderate to high income earners afford to live in the area – what appears to be increased equality may simultaneously be reducing opportunity and diversity.

Socio-economic disadvantage (not charted)

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of suburbs that score below the Australian average on the ABS Index of Relative Socioeconomic Disadvantage (IRSD).

The target for this indicator is for the proportion of suburbs scoring below the Australian average on the IRSD to trend downwards over time.

The baseline (2006) is 8 out of 29 suburbs analysed.

The latest update (2016) is 9 out of 31 suburbs.

Contrary to the desired trend, the latest update shows an increase in the number of suburbs with IRSD scores below the Australian average.

---

63 The Equality Trust, a UK non-profit organisation working to improve quality of life: [www.equalitytrust.org.uk](http://www.equalitytrust.org.uk/)

64 City of Sydney estimates based on ABS Census of Population and Housing (2006, 2011 and 2016), Customised Data Report; Australian Bureau of Statistics. Prepared for City of Sydney. Note this measure is calculated based on the equivalised income.

Financial and food insecurity

How residents respond when asked: related to your experience of financial stress…

a) In an emergency, could you raise $2,000 within two days?

b) At any point in the past year, did you run out of food and could not afford to buy more?66

Financial stress

The two measures for this indicator are the proportions of people who self-identify as in a form of financial stress, assessed via the following two questions:

“The next two questions relate to your experience of financial stress:

a. In an emergency, could you raise $2,000 within two days?

b. At any point in the past year, did you run out of food and could not afford to buy more?”

The targets for this indicator are for the proportion of residents in both types of financial stress to trend downwards over time. Specific numerical targets are tabulated below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific target</th>
<th>Baseline 2011</th>
<th>Latest update 2018</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financially insecure</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>![Yellow]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food insecure</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>![Red]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In line with the desired trend, the latest update shows a continued decrease in rates of financial insecurity since 2011. Progress has been made towards the specific numerical target (10%), but it has not yet been met.

Contrary to the desired trend, there has been no progress towards the target of less than 5%.

Community connectedness

Social support

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of residents who reply “Sometimes” or “Yes, definitely” when asked:

“When needed, can you get help from your neighbours?”

The baseline (2011) is 55%.

The latest update (2018) is 50%.

The target for this indicator is for the proportion of residents who can get help from neighbours if needed to trend upwards over time to reach at least 90%.

Contrary to the desired trend there was a decrease in the proportion of residents who believe neighbours help is available when needed between 2011 and 2018.

The 90% target has not been met or progressed towards using this measure.

However, if the measure were instead willingness to help neighbours, then the target would have been exceeded by 5% points in all three survey years (95% said ‘Sometimes’ or ‘Yes, definitely’).

Comparing the two questions shows a disconnect between actual and perceived availability of help from neighbours - although nearly half of residents are not confident about the availability of neighbours help, only 5% are unsure or unwilling to help. Furthermore, the proportion of residents “definitely” willing to help has increased since 2011.

A: Healthy, safe and inclusive communities

Community connectedness

Residents agreeing that most people can be trusted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Yes, most people can be trusted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of residents agreeing that most people can be trusted.

The target for this indicator is for the proportion of residents who agree that most people can be trusted to trend upwards over time and remain at least 65%.

The baseline (2011) is 67%.
The latest update (2018) is 72%.

The specific numerical target of 65% has been met in all three survey years, and the 2018 result is well above the 2011 baseline. However, contrary to the desired trend, there has been a slight decline in the proportion of residents agreeing that most people can be trusted between 2015 and 2018.

How residents respond when asked:
Thinking about your personal wellbeing, how satisfied are you with feeling part of your community? 68

Feeling part of the community

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of residents who reply “Very satisfied” or “Satisfied” when asked:

“Thinking about your personal wellbeing, how satisfied are you with feeling part of your community?” 69

The target for this indicator is for the proportion of residents answering “Very satisfied” or “Satisfied” to trend upwards over time; to reach at least 75%.

The baseline (2011) is 49%.
The latest update (2018) is 44%.

Contrary to the desired trend, the proportion of people satisfied with feeling part of the community has decreased since 2015. The specific numerical target of 75% has not been met or progressed towards.

As building community cohesion takes time, the above results should be seen in the context of the transient nature of the City of Sydney population – around 50,000 - 60,000 residents move in and out of the local area each year. The total population has been undergoing rapid growth during the monitoring period and is expected to further increase by about 42%, to 350,000 by 2041.

69 Note that this measure is one component of a multifactorial assessment of overall personal wellbeing, discussed earlier.
Volunteering

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of residents who reply “Once or twice” or “Yes, often” when asked:

“In the last 12 months have you volunteered for an organisation or group (unpaid)?”

The target for this indicator is for the proportion of residents volunteering to trend upwards over time and remain at least 25%.

The baseline (2011) is 43%.
The latest update (2018) is 44%.

The latest update shows an increase in the proportion of people volunteering since 2011, however this is down 4% points from the result (48%) recorded in 2015.

The 25% target was exceeded in all three survey years.

Note that the question was worded as “Do you help out as a volunteer?” – “Yes, often”, “Sometimes”, “When needed” and “No” in 2011. The two middle options have been merged for the trend comparison.

Parental participation in schools
(not charted)

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of residents with school-aged children who reply “Once or twice” or “Yes, often” when asked:

“In the last 12 months have you helped out with school activities such as P&C or canteen?”

The target for this indicator is for the proportion of parents helping out at school to trend upwards over time and to remain at least 40%.

The baseline (2011) is 57%.
The latest update (2018) is 62%.
In line with the desired trend, the latest update (not charted) shows an increase in parents helping in schools.
The 40% target was exceeded in all three survey years.

Note that the question was worded as “Are you actively involved with activities in their school (e.g. P&C, Canteen)” – “Yes” or “No” in 2011.

---

Summary

The ABS Census, Health NSW data, City of Sydney Wellbeing Survey and other sources aid assessing the health, safety and social cohesion of our community.

Of the 65 measures for which there are targets or desired trends, 26 are on target and 16 more are progressing in the right direction. Our community is progressing as desired in the areas of:

- Life expectancy and decrease in prevalence of major diseases;
- Learning services and outcomes;
- Property crime;
- Road safety;
- Median household income.

There are, however, 23 measures not progressing as desired. These can be thematically grouped as follows:

- Housing affordability and homelessness;
- Health risk factors and health outcomes (note that LGA level data is not available for some of these measures and are reported for a broader geographical scale);
- Subjective personal wellbeing;
- Financial hardship;
- Feeling part of the community and perceived social support from neighbours.

Majority of the measures which are not progressing as desired are categorised as ‘influence’ areas in the ‘control-influence-concern’ model. There are no indicators in the social domain, which the City can directly control.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Healthy, safe and inclusive communities summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target or trend</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Photo credit: Adam Hollingworth/Hired Gun (Pirrama Park and playground, Pyrmont, 2014).
## Results table A1: Wellbeing and health outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Year/Geo*</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Detail</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>CoS Charter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal health and wellbeing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective wellbeing</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>out of 100 (avg of 7 measures)</td>
<td>Increasing ≥ 75.0</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Wellbeing Index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reported health: Physical health</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>of 16+ yo rate their phys. health Very good or Excellent</td>
<td>Increasing ≥ 60%</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reported health: Mental health</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>of 16+ yo rate their mental health Very good or Excellent</td>
<td>Increasing ≥ 60%</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life expectancy at birth: Females</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>years</td>
<td>Stable or increasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life expectancy at birth: Males</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>years</td>
<td>Stable or increasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newborn and infant care: Immunisation</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>at 1 year of age</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newborn and infant care: Breastfeeding newborns</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>fully breast fed at discharge from hospital</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of major diseases: Asthma</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>of 16+ yo population</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of major diseases: Diabetes</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>of 16+ yo population</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of major diseases: All cancers</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>New cases p.a. per 100'000 persons</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of major diseases: Cardiovascular disease</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1,418</td>
<td>Hospitalisations p.a. per 100'000 persons</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of major diseases: Psychological distress</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>of 16+ yo residents are in high or very high psychol. distress</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicated if data presented is based on a different geography than the LGA.

LHD - Local Health District. City of Sydney falls under two LHDs - Sydney and South Eastern Sydney.

Data from the two have been averaged and presented here as estimates.
## Results table A2: Health risk factors and health services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Year/Geo*</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Detail</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>CoS Charter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health risk factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition and exercise: Physical exercise</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>of 16+ yo are getting enough</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LHD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition and exercise: Fruit intake</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>of 16+ yo are getting enough</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LHD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition and exercise: Vegetable intake</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>of 16+ yo are getting enough</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LHD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Mass Index (BMI): Overweight</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>of 18+ yo are overweight</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational substances: Smoking</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>of 16+ yo who consume at risky levels</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LHD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational substances: Illicit drug use</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>of 14+ y.o. used illicit drugs in 2016</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SA4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-natal services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General practitioners</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>Residents per FSE GPs</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SA3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged care places: Residential (high and low-level care)</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>places per 1,000 70+ year olds</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged care places: Community (high and low-level care)</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>places per 1,000 70+ year olds</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sports and recreation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to participate in local area</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>of 16+ y.o. agree or strongly agree</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at sporting events: As participants</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>of 16+ y.o. participated in the past year</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at sporting events: As spectators</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>of 16+ y.o. spectated in the past year</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicated if data presented is based on a different geography than the LGA.

LHD - Local Health District. City of Sydney falls under two LHDs - Sydney and South Eastern Sydney.

Data from the two have been averaged and presented here as estimates.

SA3 - ABS Statistical Area Level 3 - Sydney Inner City. Close to the City of Sydney LGA boundaries.

SA4 - ABS Statistical Area Level 4 - Sydney - City and Inner South.

FSE - Full-Time Service Equivalent - is an estimated measure of medical workforce activity (similar to FTE).
## Results table A3: Learning to earning, services and outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Year/Geo*</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Detail</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>CoS Charter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning to earning: services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare places</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>places per resident child**</td>
<td>N/A**</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school places</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>places per resident child</td>
<td>Increasing ≥ 1.0</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class size</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>children per class</td>
<td>Stable or decreasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten - primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education services: Satisfaction with access</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>of 16+ y.o. are satisfied</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education services: Internet access</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>of households access the internet from dwelling</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Concern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Learning to earning: outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Year/Geo*</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Detail</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>CoS Charter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early development in five domains</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>79%-89%</td>
<td>of Year 1 school children developmentally on track</td>
<td>Stable or increasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early development vulnerability</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>of Year 1 school children are vulnerable in 2+ domains</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School retention</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>of 17 y.o. not attending any educational institution</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School completion</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>of 20-24 y.o. completed at least Year 12 or equivalent</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School leaver circumstances</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>of 15-19 y.o. school leavers are neither earning or learning</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicated if data presented is based on a different geography than the LGA.

**Measure and target will be revised as part of the 2019 Child Care Needs Analysis
## Results table A4: Personal safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Year/Geo</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Detail</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>CoS Charter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception of safety walking alone near home after dark</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>of 16+ yo residents feel safe or very safe</td>
<td>≥ 70%</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of safety walking alone near home in daylight</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>of 16+ yo feel safe or very safe</td>
<td>≥ 95%</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of safety alone at home after dark</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>of 16+ yo feel safe or very safe</td>
<td>≥ 85%</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of safety alone at home in daylight</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>of 16+ yo feel safe or very safe</td>
<td>≥ 95%</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCTV footage searches</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>released to assist police</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property crime</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>19,689</td>
<td>incidents p.a.</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime against person (total)</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>6,746</td>
<td>incidents p.a.</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Domestic violence</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>1,006</td>
<td>incidents p.a.</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road user fatalities</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>incidents p.a.</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian serious injuries</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>incidents p.a.</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedal cyclist serious injuries</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>incidents p.a.</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other road user serious injuries</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>incidents p.a.</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Results table A5: Housing affordability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Detail</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>CoS Charter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing affordability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median sales prices Houses (non-strata)</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$1,470 ($’000s)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Influence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median sales prices Flats and units</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$870 ($’000s)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Influence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median weekly rental prices Houses</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Influence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median weekly rental prices Flats and units</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Influence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing costs ≥ 30% All households</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>of all households rent or mortgage &gt;30% of income</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing stress &amp; low-income All households</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>of all households are in housing stress &amp; on low income</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing stress Low-income households**</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>of low income renters and buyers (rent or mortgage &gt;30% of income)</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social housing</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>of private dwelling stock</td>
<td>Increasing 7.5%</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable housing</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>of private dwelling stock</td>
<td>Increasing 7.5%</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homelessness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness: Census count Homeless persons</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>5,061</td>
<td>incl. sleeping out, ‘couch-surfers’, in boarding houses, overcrowding</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness: City count Crisis accommodation</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>persons</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness: City count Rough sleepers</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>persons</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Low income is here defined as households in the first two income quintiles (non-equivalised) on the Greater Sydney income scale.**
## Results table A6: Income and inequality and community connectedness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Detail</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>CoS Charter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median total household income</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$1,916</td>
<td>per week, before tax</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of household income Equivalised</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>ratio of household income at top of 80th percentile vs 20th</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economic disadvantage</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>out of 31 suburbs</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Connected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial insecurity</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>of 16+ yo residents unable to raise $2000</td>
<td>Decreasing &lt; 10%</td>
<td>Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food insecurity</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>of 16+ yo that in past year ran out, couldn't afford more food</td>
<td>Decreasing &lt; 5%</td>
<td>Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling part of the community</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>of 16+ yo residents Satisfied or Very satisfied</td>
<td>Increasing ≥ 75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>of 16+ yo agree that &quot;most people can be trusted&quot;</td>
<td>Increasing ≥ 65%</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>of 16+ yo residents*</td>
<td>Increasing ≥ 25%</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental participation in schools</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>of parents of school-aged children helped out at school*</td>
<td>Increasing ≥ 40%</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social support</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>of 16+ yo perceiving neighbourly support is available**</td>
<td>≥ 90%</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes those that answered "Yes, often", or "Once or twice" "...in the last 12 months".

**Includes those that answered "Yes", or "Sometimes". Base includes those "Unsure"
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B: Culturally rich and vibrant communities

Introduction

The City recognises that cultural richness and participation enhances people's lives and sense of community. Music, dance, art, poetry, film, writing, performance, craft, design and other creative pursuits are aspects of life that increase wellbeing and give life meaning in sometimes intangible ways.

Sydney's cultural life also has economic outcomes, driving the creative industries and attracting visitors. Linkages exist between this domain and domain four (section D in this report), where creative industries and tourism are examined.

Fostering cultural participation, audience and diversity is a core City objective and Sustainable Sydney 2030 specifically notes that the City of Sydney local area will be diverse and inclusive.

“There are many ways we can support our cultural sector. We have seen how much impact creative industries have on the local economy - how they help our community, create a sense of belonging, and how they also contribute to our tourism economy. Creativity is at the heart of our City’s culture and we need to continue to support our creative talent and organisations. We need to work with the community to identify opportunities to grow our creative industries and support our creative workforce.”

Clover Moore, Lord Mayor, City of Sydney

“While money matters, ideas can be more important. Opportunities can sometimes be created out of little more than a fertile imagination and a determination to achieve. As a city government, we have a responsibility to maximise these opportunities, and create an environment where ideas, imagination and creativity can flourish. We also have an obligation to ensure that we use our resources to effectively encourage and support cultural and creative activity.”

Clover Moore, Lord Mayor, City of Sydney

B: Culturally rich and vibrant communities

Arts and cultural engagement

Opportunities to participate

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of City of Sydney area residents who reply “Agree” or “Strongly agree” in response to the following statement:

“There are enough opportunities in my local area to participate in arts and cultural activities such as art classes, performance and creating music.”

The target for this indicator is for the proportion of residents perceiving sufficient opportunities to trend upwards over time.

The baseline (2011) is 54%.

The latest update (2018) 48%.

Contrary to the desired trend, there has been a slight decrease in perceived opportunity to participate in arts or cultural activities (charted above).

The proportion of residents actively engaged in cultural activities, events, performances and venues has remained stable. (Results are described in the next column)

Active engagement

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of residents replying “As a hobby”, “For payment” or “As an organiser” at least once when asked:

“In the last 12 months, did you engage with each of the following:

a. Acting, dancing or other performance;
b. Live music and/or singing performance;
c. Visual arts and crafts/ galleries;
d. Creative writing;
e. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander performances and arts;
f. Gaming or coding/ programming;
g. Museums and collecting?”

The target for this indicator is for the proportion of residents actively engaged in cultural activities, events, performances and venues to trend upwards over time.

The baseline (2011) is 41%.

The latest update (2018) is 41%.

Note that in 2011 the last three items listed above were not asked. Music and singing were listed separately, as were visual arts and “other art and craft activities”. When comparing between years, these categories were merged to ensure there is no double counting.

### B: Culturally rich and vibrant communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did not attend any activity</th>
<th>Attended 1-3 types</th>
<th>Attended 4+ types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Resident attendance at listed types of cultural activities, events, performances and venues, in the past year?

**Attendance**

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of residents replying “Attended” at least once when asked:

“In the last 12 months, how did you engage with each of the following:

- a. Acting, dancing or other performance;
- b. Live music and/or singing performance;
- c. Visual arts and crafts/ galleries;
- d. Creative writing;
- e. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander performances and arts;
- f. Gaming or coding/ programming;
- g. Museums and collecting?”

The target for this indicator is for the proportion of residents attending cultural activities, events, performances and venues to trend upwards over time.

The baseline (2011) is 87%.

The latest update (2018) is 89%.

Note that in 2015 and 2018 the list had seven activities, in 2011 it had five.

#### Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander arts and cultural activities

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of residents replying “Attended” to option e. “Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander performances and arts” at the same question.

The target for this indicator is for the proportion of residents attending Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultural activities, events, performances and venues to trend upwards over time.

The baseline (2015) is 21%.

The latest update (2018) is 24%.

In line with the desired trend, the latest update shows an increase in attendance at Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultural activities, events, performances and venues.

Arts and culture perceptions

Overall satisfaction – arts and cultural events

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of residents replying “Very satisfied” or “Satisfied” when asked:

“How satisfied are you with the number and quality of arts and cultural events such as festivals, performances and exhibitions in your local area?”

The target for this indicator is for the proportion of residents satisfied with arts and cultural events to trend upwards over time.

The baseline (2011) is 60%.
The latest update (2018) is 56%.

Contrary to the desired trend, the latest update, charted above left, shows a decrease in resident satisfaction with arts and cultural events.

Creative expression in the public domain

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of respondents who reply “Very satisfied” or “Satisfied” when asked:

“How satisfied are you with the range and quality of creative expression in the public domain such as art installations, murals, busking and street art in your local area?”

The target for this indicator is for the proportion of respondents satisfied with the public art to trend upwards over time.

The baseline (2011) is 45%.
The latest update (2018) is 45%.

Contrary to the desired trend, the latest update, shows a decrease in resident satisfaction with creative expression in the public domain in comparison to the 2015 results (charted above right). The satisfaction is now back at the level seen in 2011.

76 Photo credit: Katherine Griffiths (Artist Jason Wing and creative producer Dennis Golding pose in front of their Gadigal Mural, Darlinghurst, 2019).
B: Culturally rich and vibrant communities

**Library services**

**Libraries access**

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of residents who reply “Satisfied” or “Very satisfied” when asked:

“How satisfied are you with access to libraries in your local area?”

The target for this indicator is for the perceived access to library services and facilities to trend upwards over time.

The baseline (2015) is 69%.

The latest update (2018) is 70%.

In line with the desired trend, the latest update shows slight increase in library access perceptions.

**Libraries satisfaction**

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of library users who reply “Very satisfied” or “Quite satisfied” when asked:

"On a scale of 1 – 5, how satisfied are you with the local libraries?"

The target for this indicator is for library ratings to trend upwards over time.

The baseline (2011) is 87%.

The latest update (2016) is 88%.

In line with the desired trend, the latest update shows slight increase in library user satisfaction.

---


78 City of Sydney Customer Satisfaction Survey (2011, 2016); City of Sydney Customer Services Unit. Commissioned research.
B: Culturally rich and vibrant communities

Creative industries

Workforce growth

The measure for this indicator is the growth in the proportion of workers in the creative industries sector in the City of Sydney LGA.

The creative industries consist of areas such as creative manufacturing, art supplies, art or antiques retailing, galleries, libraries, archives, museums, publishing, music, film or video production and distribution, broadcasting, architectural, advertising or design services, performing arts venues, performers and operation.

There is no target for this indicator: it is monitored for information only.

The baseline (2007) is 32,448 workers.

The latest update (2017) is 33,027 workers or growth of 1.8% since baseline. Note that this is in fact a decrease from 2012 when the sector employment had increased to 35,017.

The net increase in the creative industries sector workforce between 2007 and 2017 (579 additional workers) is solely attributable to growth and/or relocation outside of the CBD. The CBD based Creative Industries workforce reduced.

Despite an absolute increase in numbers, creative industries workers made up a smaller proportion of the entire workforce in 2017 (at 6.6%) than they did in 2007 (at 8.4%).

Business growth

The measure for this indicator is the growth in the proportion of businesses in the creative industries sector in the City of Sydney LGA.

There is no target for this indicator: it is monitored for information only.

The baseline (2007) is 1,794 businesses.

The latest update (2017) is 1,855 businesses or growth of 3.4% since baseline.

Similar to the workforce trends described on the left, the net increase in the creative industries sector businesses between 2007 and 2017 (61 additional businesses) is solely attributable to growth and/or relocation outside of the CBD. The number of CBD based creative businesses reduced.

Despite an absolute increase in numbers, creative industries businesses made up a smaller proportion of the total number of businesses in the LGA in 2017 (at 7.9%) than they did in 2007 (at 9.2%). See section D in this report for an overview how the creative sector compares to other industries relative to each other.

B: Culturally rich and vibrant communities

Cultural diversity

Appreciation of diversity

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of residents who “Agree” or “Strongly agree” when asked “Agree or disagree… It is a good thing for a society to be made up of people from different cultures and communities?”

The target for this indicator is for the proportion of respondents who appreciate diversity in society to trend upwards over time.

The baseline (2011) is 83%.

The latest update (2018) is 90%.

In line with the desired trend, the latest update, charted above, shows an increase in the proportion of residents who appreciate diversity in society.


81 Photo credit: Katherine Griffiths (International Student Ambassadors near Town Hall, Sydney, 2017).
Summary

The City of Sydney Wellbeing Survey and Floor and Employment Survey aid in assessment of how well our community is engaged in arts and cultural activities.

Of the 11 measures for which there are targets or desired trends for the cultural domain, five are progressing as desired, one is stable, and two have no particular target.

There are, however, three measures not progressing as desired. They relate to opportunities to actively participate in arts and culture activities, and the perceived satisfaction with events and public art expression in the local area.

The City’s resident wellbeing survey includes questions about barriers limiting residents’ participation in arts, culture and community - including questions about time-scarcity and affordability of activities. The ‘barriers to participation’ results are outside the scope of the Community Wellbeing Indicators report but inform the City’s strategy and ongoing work to foster art creation and culture accessibility in the city.

Note that most of the indicators in this domain are categorised as influence areas in the ‘Control-Influence-Concern’ model. There are only three – Libraries access and satisfaction, and Creative expression in the public domain – which the City can directly control.
Photo credit: Katherine Griffiths (Contemporary dancer Patricia Wood, affordable apartment leasee at William Street Creative Hub, Darlinghurst, 2019)
## Results summary table B1: Culturally rich and vibrant communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Detail</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>CoS Charter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arts and cultural engagement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and cultural activities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enough opportunities to participate</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>of 16+ y.o. agree or strongly agree</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active participation</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>of 16+ y.o. participated as a hobbyist, organiser, or for payment</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>of 16+ y.o. attended cultural activity(ies)</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>of 16+ y.o. attended in the past year</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arts and culture perceptions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall satisfaction with arts and cultural events in local area</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>of 16+ y.o. are satisfied or very satisfied</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative expression in the public domain</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>of 16+ y.o. are satisfied or very satisfied</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creative industries sector growth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce growth</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>since 2007</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business growth</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>since 2007</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural diversity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation of diverse society</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>of 16+ y.o. agree or strongly agree</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Library services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries satisfaction</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>of 15+ y.o. library users are quite or very satisfied</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries access</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>of 16+ y.o. are satisfied or very satisfied</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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C: Democratic and engaged communities

Introduction

The City acts to engage residents, workers, students, and businesses in building community. We recognise a healthy, connected city, large or small, is made up of individuals and groups who are willing and able to take part in shaping society.

Participation can occur in many ways, from volunteering with community organisations, working with political parties or lobby groups, or through the act of making submissions, demonstrating and voting. All are actions of community participation, democracy in action and ways to have a say in decision-making.

Sydney’s citizens desire both transparency from government and involvement in how decisions are made. Holding government to account and maintaining confidence in the integrity of public institutions is critical to social cohesion and promotes a level playing field for business.

The City’s approach to community engagement is framed by the Community Strategic Plan, Sustainable Sydney 2030; and the Community Engagement Strategy 2019\(^8^4\). There are four guiding principles: Integrity, Inclusiveness, Dialogue and Influence. The Social Sustainability Policy & Action Plan 2018-2028 also recognises the importance of engaged communities\(^8^5\).

Community engagement means involving people in the decisions that affect their lives. It enables good governance and informed decision making.

“An inclusive society must have the institutions, structures, and processes that empower local communities, so they can hold their governments accountable. It also requires the participation of all groups in society in decision-making processes.”\(^8^6\)

---

\(^8^4\) Our approach to engaging the community. City of Sydney Community Engagement Strategy 2019; cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au/community/participation/community-consultation#page-element-dload


Community engagement

Opportunity to have a say

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of residents who “Agree” or “Strongly agree” that:

“There are enough opportunities for me to have a say on issues that are important to me?”

The target for this indicator is for the proportion of City of Sydney area residents who feel there are sufficient opportunities to have a say, to trend upwards over time.

The baseline (2015) is 44%. The latest update (2018) is 40%.

Contrary to the desired trend, the proportion of residents who feel there are sufficient opportunities to have a say has decreased (charted above).


88 Photo credit: Katherine Griffiths (Community consultation for the Community Strategic Plan, Erskineville Town Hall, 2019).
C: Democratic and engaged communities

Community engagement

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of residents ticking “Yes, often” or “Once or twice” at least once when asked:

“In the last 12 months, have you …:

a. Attended a community meeting, public hearing or discussion;
b. Met with, phoned, or written to any local politician;
c. Joined a protest or demonstration;
d. Participated in an online discussion about political or local community issues?”

The target for this indicator is for at least 50% of residents to participate in community engagement and for the proportion to trend upwards over time.

The baseline (2011) is 60%.
The latest update (2018) is 58%.

In line with the desired trend, the minimum target has been met in all three comparison years. The proportion of residents engaging in listed activities has remained stable over time.


Decision-making involvement

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of residents ticking “Yes, often” or “Once or twice” at least once when asked:

“In the last 12 months, have you …:

a. Attended a body-corporate meeting;
b. Sat on a decision-making board or committee, such as a corporate board, school council, sports club committee or church committee?”

The target for this indicator is for at least 25% of residents to participate in community decision-making groups and for the proportion to trend upwards over time.

The baseline (2011) is 22%*.
The latest update (2018) is 36%.

The 25% target was met for the first time in 2015 when 37% of residents reported to have participated in listed decision-making activities. This positive level has been maintained in 2018.

*Note that the question was worded as “Are you on a decision making board or committee, such as a corporate board, school council, sports club committee, church committee, body corporate or resident action group?” in 2011 which may explain the lower outcome.
Citizenship

Citizenship uptake rates

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of City of Sydney local area residents born overseas who have become Australian citizens.

The target for this indicator is for the rate of citizenship of overseas-born residents (who arrived in Australia five or more years prior the survey year*) to increase over time.

The baseline (2006) is 69%.

The latest update (2016) is 62%.

Contrary to the desired trend, the proportion of overseas born residents who have become Australian citizens is decreasing.

Note that this may be a reflection of the Federal Government’s requirements for citizenship becoming stricter and processing times longer over the years, rather than residents’ lack of interest in obtaining the citizenship status.

*In general, from 2007, overseas-born residents need to have lawfully lived in Australia for at least four years to be eligible to apply for citizenship by conferral. The official timeframe from date of application to ceremony is currently 20-24 months (2018). Prior 2007, the residence period requirement was for two years (instead of four).

90 City of Sydney calculations based on Australian Bureau of Statistics Census of Population and Housing data; abs.gov.au/websitedbs/D3310114.nsf/Home/Census?OpenDocument&ref=topBar Calculations were done using the ABS Census TableBuilder Pro application, counting persons by their usual place of residence and excluding ‘not stated’ cases. Census is conducted every five years and data released approximately 18 months later.
Elections, representation and democracy

Voter engagement

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of enrolled voters voting in local government elections who cast formal votes.

The target for this measure is for the proportion of formal votes to trend upwards over time.

The baseline (2008) is 93%.

The latest update (2016) is 98%.

In line with the desired trend, the latest update shows an increase in the proportion of voters casting formal votes.

Voter turnout

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of enrolled voters voting in local government elections.

The target for this indicator is for the proportion of voter turnout to trend upwards over time.

The baseline for voter turnout (2008) is 60%.

The latest update (2016) is 60%.

Whilst the 2016 voter participation is at the same level as in 2008, contrary to the desired trend, the latest update shows a decrease in voter turnout in 2016 in comparison to the improved participation rates in 2012 (69%).

Women on local Council

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of female City of Sydney local councillors.

The target for this indicator is that the proportion of female councillors is at least 50%.

The baseline (2008) is 50% (5 out of 10 councillors).

The latest update (2016) is 70% (7 out of 10).

The target has been met in all three election years monitored.

---

C: Democratic and engaged communities

Elections, representation and democracy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No, none</th>
<th>One or two</th>
<th>Yes, all three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How residents respond when asked: If you wanted to, would you know how to contact:
Local councillors? State MPs? Federal MPs?

Contacting political representatives

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of residents ticking “Yes” at least once when asked:

“If you wanted to, would you know how to contact …”

a. Local Councillors?

b. State Members of Parliament (MPs)?

c. Federal Members of Parliament (MPs)?

The target for this indicator is for the proportion of residents with knowledge of how to contact their political representatives should trend upwards over time.

The baseline (2011) is 65%.
The latest update (2018) is 69%.

The proportion of residents who know how to contact at least one of their political representatives increased between 2011 and 2015 but the measure has stalled since.

Of the three levels of government, residents were most likely to know how to contact their local councillor (63%) and least likely to know how to contact federal MPs (57%) in 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagree or Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree or Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How residents respond when asked: Agree or disagree… I am satisfied with the way democracy works in Australia?

Satisfaction with democracy

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of residents who reply “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” when asked:

“Agree or disagree… I am satisfied with the way democracy works in Australia?”

The target for this indicator is for the proportion of residents agreeing with the statement to trend upwards over time.

The baseline (2011) is 44%.
The latest update (2018) is 34%.

Contrary to the desired trend, the latest update shows a decrease in satisfaction with democracy since 2011.

Summary

The City of Sydney resident surveys, Census and NSW Electoral Commission data aid assessing how engaged our community is in decision making activities.

All indicators in this domain are categorised as influence areas in the 'Control-Influence-Concern' model. None are under the City's direct control.

Of the nine measures for which there are targets or desired trends, four are progressing as desired.

Three of the four measures not yet progressing as desired can be seen as relating to disillusionment with political processes: low satisfaction with democracy (generally, not specific any level of government); low perceived opportunity to be heard on important matters; and less than full voter turnout at elections.

Results table C1: Democratic and engaged communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Detail</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>CoS Charter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to have a say</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>of 16+ y.o. residents agree or strongly agree</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community engagement activities</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>of 16+ y.o. participated in community activities</td>
<td>Increasing ≥ 50%</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making bodies, involvement</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>of 16+ y.o. participated in the past year</td>
<td>Increasing ≥ 25%</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship uptake rates among City residents</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>of overseas born residents in AU for at least 4 years are citizens</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elections, representation and democracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voter engagement Local Government elections</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>formal voting</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voter turnout Local Government elections</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>of enrolled voters</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women on Local Council</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>7 out of 10 councillors</td>
<td>≥ 50%</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacting political representatives</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>of 16+ y.o. know how to contact at least one level of political rep.s</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with democracy in Australia</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>of 16+ y.o. are satisfied or very satisfied</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D: Dynamic resilient local economies

Introduction

The City’s Economic Development Strategy (2013) recognizes that the conventional indicators of economic growth, primarily represented by income and production, do not by themselves adequately capture how economic activity relates to community wellbeing. Economic ‘growth’ and ‘development’ encompass a much broader range of goals and activities than increasing the level of economic activity. Knowledge, innovation, education and skills are also key determinants of economic productivity. Local employment and economic participation are linked to environmental and social aspects of community wellbeing. Opportunities to participate in ‘local’ economies have substantial implications for an individual’s sense of community membership and overall community wellbeing. The nature and location of economic activity, who it involves and how it changes over time, underpins all aspects of living, working and visiting the city.

Providing for economically sustainable, innovative and vibrant communities is a core principle in Sustainable Sydney 2030. The City of Sydney’s ‘Economic Development Strategy’ also identifies three priorities:

- Strengthen Sydney’s competitiveness;
- Improve productivity and capacity; and
- Promote opportunity.

“Each city represents an economic ecosystem in its own right, built around mutually supportive economic and social strengths as well as an intertwined fabric of jobs – not just the professionals in bright skyscrapers but all those who turn the lights on every morning, from retailers and teachers to nurses and cooks, from crime fighters to street cleaners. Maintaining healthy balance is a cornerstone of urban resilience.”


**Global competitiveness**

The measure for this indicator is Sydney's overall ranking in the PriceWaterhouseCoopers (PWC) ‘Cities of Opportunity’ index. The baseline (2011) is an overall ranking of 5th out of 26 cities compared, or in top 20th percentile. The latest update (2016) is an overall ranking of 10th out of 30 cities compared, or in top 33th percentile.

Sydney has received several notable rankings in the index categories since 2008. For instance Sydney has been placed first for ‘sustainability and natural environment’ for three consecutive reports - in 2012, 2014 and again in 2016; and placed 3rd for ‘health, safety and security’ in 2016 (2nd in 2014).

However, Sydney has been placed in the bottom half for ‘City gateway’ and half-way for ‘Ease of doing business’, ‘Cost of doing business and living’ and ‘Technology readiness’ in 2016.

---

City economic growth

The measure for this indicator is the rate of growth in the City of Sydney’s Gross City Product (GCP).

The target for this measure is for Gross City Product growth to exceed Australian GDP growth.

The baseline (2005/06), in 2016 real terms, is $86.5 billion.

The latest update (2017/18) is $129.6 billion and an average annual growth rate of 3.2% over the past 10 years.

The chart above shows the change over time in Gross City Product (green line) and GDP (orange line) as well as the net value in billions of GCP (navy bars).

In line with the desired trend, the time series charted above shows that, at 3.2% average annual growth (over the past 10 years), Gross City Product (GCP) growth is greater than GDP (2.6% on average).

Employment growth

(not charted)

The measure for this indicator is the rate of growth in the size of the workforce.

The target for this measure is for workforce numbers to trend upwards over time.

The baseline (2007) is 385,421 workers.

The latest update (2017) is 501,786 workers, a 30.2% increase from baseline.

In line with the desired trend, the latest update (not charted) shows an increase in the size of the workforce between 2007 and 2017.

The growth has been similar in the CBD and outside of the CBD.

Note that jobs growth in the Local Government Area has been slower than the growth of the city’s population, which increased by 37.9% during the same period.

---

96 Economic growth estimates are updated on an ‘as-needed’ basis by City of Sydney Strategy and Urban Analytics Unit based on: Australian Bureau of Statistics Australian System of National Accounts (cat 5204.0); www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/mf/5204.0; and

D: Dynamic resilient local economies

Economic diversity

Businesses by industry and location as proportions of total businesses\(^98\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry Sector</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Financial Services</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Business Services</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Industries</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education and Research</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist, Cultural and Leisure</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Drink</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail and Personal Services</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Business diversity

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of businesses by location (CBD vs outside), as tabulated below.

There are no targets for this indicator: it is monitored for information only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Latest update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business located in the CBD</td>
<td>54% 52%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses outside CBD</td>
<td>46% 48%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 19,579 21,636 23,511

The location diversity of businesses has largely remained stable over the past ten years and is fairly even between the CBD and non-CBD.


99 Australian Bureau of Statistics Australian and New Zealand Standard Industry Classification (ANZSIC) (cat 1292.0); www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/ml/1292.0
Employment diversity

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of the workforce by location, as tabulated below.

There are no targets for this indicator: it is monitored for information only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline 2007</th>
<th>Latest update 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workforce located in the CBD</strong></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workforce outside CBD</strong></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>385,381</td>
<td>435,769</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chart above shows further breakdowns by industry sector. The industry sectors are derived from the Australian and New Zealand Standard Industry Classification and matched against the selected sectors identified in the City of Sydney Economic Development Strategy.

While the number of businesses in the city area is fairly evenly split between the CBD and non-CBD, two thirds of the city’s workforce are based in the CBD. The proportion of those employed in the CBD had decreased somewhat (to 64%) by 2012, but the measure returned to the 2007 level by 2017.

Disparities between CBD employment diversity and businesses diversity (previous page) reflect the presence of relatively small number of very large financial and business services organisations which are often based in the CBD and employ a large proportion of the workforce.

As the above chart suggests, there is much greater employment diversity outside the CBD (teal bars) than inside the CBD (green bars). Jobs outside CBD are fairly evenly distributed across the various industry sectors.

While it appeared in 2012 that some of the Finance sector jobs had moved to other village areas, this has been reversed in the following five years. The proportion of professional services jobs has been increasing both in and outside CBD over the ten years analysed, and is now the biggest industry outside the CBD area in terms of the workforce.

---


Employment in target sectors:

Knowledge industries

There are three measures for this indicator: the proportion of the workforce employed in knowledge sectors identified in the 2010 State of Australian Cities Report:

- a) Information, media and telecommunications
- b) Professional, scientific and technical services
- c) Education and training

There are no targets for this indicator: it is monitored for information only.

The table below shows proportions of workforce by knowledge industries:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge Industry</th>
<th>Baseline 2007</th>
<th>Latest update 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information, media and telecommunications</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, scientific and technical services</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and training</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employment (as proportion of the total workforce) has increased marginally in Information and Education sectors, and notably in the Professional sector since 2007.

Night-time economy

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of the workforce employed in industries which contribute to the night-time economy - those included in the Food, Drink and Entertainments groups of the 2006 ANZSIC Industry Classification.

There are no targets for this indicator: it is monitored for information only.

The baseline (2007) is 7.3%.

The latest update (2017) is 7.4%.

Proportion of workforce in the night-time economy in the city has remained stable in the ten year view. Note the measure increased to 8.6% by 2012, but has since decreased back to the level seen in 2007.
## Resident employment and education

### Employment rate
There are two measures for this indicator:

- a) Labour force participation and
- b) Unemployment rates

for the City of Sydney area residents aged over 15.

There is no target for labour force participation: this measure is monitored for information only.

The target for unemployment measure is to remain stable or trend downwards over time or and to remain consistently below that of the Greater Sydney region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline 2006</th>
<th>Latest update 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labour force participation rate of residents aged over 15</strong></td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unemployment rate of residents aged over 15</strong></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The labour participation rates in the City of Sydney area and in the Greater Sydney region have remained virtually unchanged between 2006 and 2016.

The city resident unemployment rate has been increasing marginally since 2006, now hovering around 6% level. The rate and trend are closely mirroring the Greater Sydney rates for the same.

### Local employment (not charted)

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of employed residents, aged 15 and over, who work locally (in the City of Sydney area) 105.

The target for this measure is for the proportion of residents employed locally to trend upwards over time or remain stable.

The baseline (2006) is 60%.

The latest updates (2016) is 64%.

In line with the desired trend, the latest update shows an increase in the local employment rate.
Educational qualifications

There are three measures for this indicator relating to the highest level of educational qualification held by residents aged 25 years or older, as tabulated below.

The target for this measure is for the proportion of residents holding non-school qualifications to remain stable or trend upwards over time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest education level</th>
<th>Baseline 2006</th>
<th>Latest update 2016</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any types of non-school qualification</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>In line with the desired trend, the latest updates show a notable increase in residents with non-school qualifications since 2006.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree or higher</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>In particular, the proportion of residents with bachelor or higher degrees has increased notably between 2006 and 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate to Advanced Diploma level qualification</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>The proportion of residents holding Certificate to Advanced Diploma level qualifications decreased marginally between 2006 and 2016. This may be explained by the increasing proportion of residents who have obtained higher education degrees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City of Sydney calculations count persons by place of residence and/or employment and exclude ‘not stated’ cases.
Census is conducted every five years and data released approximately 18 months later.

107 Photo credit: Katherine Griffiths (Newtown Library, Newtown, 2017).
Workforce skills & productivity

Skilled and up-skilling workforce

The two measures for this indicator are the proportion of City of Sydney workers a) in highly skilled occupations\(^{109}\) and b) upskilling via attendance at tertiary institutions.

The target for this measure is for the proportion of both highly skilled and upskilling workers to remain stable or trend upwards over time and remain consistently above Sydney metropolitan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline 2006</th>
<th>Latest update 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highly skilled</strong></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upskilling</strong></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In line with the desired trend, the latest updates show an increase in the highly-skilled worker rate since 2006. The rate is also consistently above that of Greater Sydney.

There has been a marginal decrease in the upskilling workforce rate in the local area. Greater Sydney rate was behind the local area in 2006, but it has slightly grown since. The two geographies are now on par.

Travel time to work

(not charted)

The two measures for this indicator are average commute to work time for a) residents commuting to work anywhere in the Sydney Metro area and b) workers commuting from anywhere in the Sydney Metro area to work places located in the City of Sydney LGA\(^{110}\).

The target for this measure is for average commute to work times to decrease over time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline 2007</th>
<th>Latest update 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residents</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workers</strong></td>
<td>44 minutes</td>
<td>41 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no data available to measure progress on the LGA residents to work time.

In line with the desired trend, commute to work time for workers has slightly decreased over the ten years that the data is available for.


City of Sydney calculations count persons by place of residence and/ or employment and exclude ‘not stated’ cases.

Census is conducted every five years and data released approximately 18 months later.

\(^{109}\) ‘Highly skilled’ workers are level of 1-3 in the Australian and New Zealand Standard Classification of Occupations (ANZSCO) – i.e. Managers, Professionals, or Technicians and Trade workers.

\(^{110}\) Household Travel Survey 2007/08 – 2015/16; Transport for NSW custom report for City of Sydney. Updated irregularly.
Tourism

Demand for tourist accommodation

There are three measures for this indicator relating to numbers and local stay lengths of visitors (tourists and other types of travellers):

a) Hotel arrivals in the Sydney Metropolitan area,

b) Hotel arrivals staying overnight locally,

c) Average hotel stay length (not charted).

The targets for these measures is the demand for tourist accommodation to stay stable or trend upwards over time.

Hotel arrivals in the Sydney Metropolitan area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Latest update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>12.3 million</td>
<td>17.4 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In line with the desired trend, the number of Sydney metropolitan visitors has been trending upwards over time (navy line).

Hotel arrivals in the City of Sydney area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Latest update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hotel arrivals staying overnight locally</td>
<td>4.6 million</td>
<td>6.1 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average hotel stay length (not charted)</td>
<td>5.3 nights</td>
<td>4.8 nights</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Likewise, the number of visitors staying overnight locally has been trending upwards over time.

Contrary to the desired trend, the average length of hotel stay has slightly decreased in the recent years.

Note that, in lieu of local government area data (not available for this indicator), data from the 12 ABS Statistical Areas (SA2s) that fall within the City of Sydney boundaries (a close geographic approximation) have been presented here as estimates.
### Supply and value of tourist accommodation

There are three measures for this indicator relating to availability and value of hotel rooms, as tabulated below.

The target for this indicator is for hotel room stock\(^\text{114}\) and nightly takings to trend upwards over time and for the occupancy rate to remain above 80%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline 2016</th>
<th>Latest update 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hotel room stock</strong></td>
<td>32,888</td>
<td>35,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hotel room occupancy rate</strong></td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average takings per room</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In line with the desired trend, the hotel room stock has been trending upwards since 2016.

Hotel room occupancy rate (86% in 2018) remains stable above the desired target (80%).

There is no data available to measure takings per night.

---

112 City of Sydney Development Statistics Database; City of Sydney Strategy and Urban Analytics Unit. Updated continuously and subject to frequent retrospective correction.


114 Includes accommodation at hotels, pubs, serviced apartments and backpacker beds.

115 Photo credit: Katherine Griffiths (City of Sydney Destination Ambassador greets tourists at Circular Quay, Sydney, 2016)
**Property development**

**Residential development, number of dwellings**

There are two measures for this indicator:

a) Annual number of private dwellings completed in the City of Sydney area, and

b) Annual number of private dwellings approved for development.

The term “private dwellings” as defined by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) applies to all housing except for: boarding houses; student accommodation; and residential care services (such as aged-care facilities). Private housing includes social (including public) housing, affordable rental housing and privately owned or rented dwellings. This makes up roughly 89% of the city’s total housing stock (June 2019).117

The target for this indicator is to reach total 138,000 private dwellings by 2030. 2,200 dwellings on average p.a. need to be completed in order to achieve that since in 2007 there were 89,749 dwellings in total in the City area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Baseline 2007</th>
<th>Latest update 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of dwellings completed</td>
<td>1,572</td>
<td>5,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of dwellings approved</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>1,638</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In line with the desired trend, the dwelling completions are on track to reach 138,000 dwellings by 2030.

In line with the desired trend, there has been a sufficient number of approvals to support the required number of completions per year.

---

116 City of Sydney Development Statistics Database; City of Sydney Strategy and Urban Analytics Unit. Updated continuously and subject to frequent retrospective correction.

117 There were 116,868 private dwellings and 14,425 non-private dwellings (primarily consisting of student accommodation rooms) in the City of Sydney area in June 2019.
Commercial development, floor space

There are two measures for this indicator:

a) Annual amount of floor space completed or substantially re-furbished, and
b) Annual amount of floor space approved for development or substantially refurbishment.

Commercial projects included in these measures are office, retail, entertainment/leisure and other employment generating projects that fall into one of the following categories:

- New commercial developments;
- Refurbishments costing over $5 million;
- Additions and conversions where floor space is 1,000 square metres or more and cost is over $1 million;

Floor area presented excludes visitor accommodation.

There are no targets for this indicator: it is monitored for information only.

---

118 City of Sydney Development Statistics Database; City of Sydney Strategy and Urban Analytics Unit. Updated continuously and subject to frequent retrospective correction.
Property development value

There are two measures for this indicator: property development value relating to a) residential and b) non-residential development applications.

There are no targets for this indicator: it is monitored for information only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline 2010</th>
<th>Latest update 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total value of residential applications</td>
<td>$1.0 billions</td>
<td>$1.4 billions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total value of non-residential applications</td>
<td>$0.8 billions</td>
<td>$2.4 billions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over the nine years analysed, the value of residential developments has been either slightly exceeding (2009/10-2010/11), or notably higher than non-residential applications (2011/12 until 2016/17). 2017/18 is the first year where the ratio has been reversed and the value of non-residential development applications well exceeds the value of residential applications.

119 City of Sydney Development Assessments Data; City of Sydney Planning Assessments Unit. Updated continuously and subject to frequent retrospective correction.
Office vacancy rate

The measure for this indicator is the proportion of commercial office space in the CBD that is vacant.

There are no targets for this indicator: it is monitored for information only.

The baseline (2006) is 9.6%.
The latest update (2019) is 3.9%.

The chart above shows the office vacancy rate sank in FY 2007/2008, crept back up by 2009/10, remained stable for about five years, but has been trending downwards since.

121 Photo credit: Tyrone Branigan (Liberty Place, Sydney, 2016).
Summary

The City of Sydney Floor and Employment Survey, Development Statistics data, ABS Census and other sources aid assessing how well our economy and workforce are progressing.

All indicators in this domain are categorised as either ‘influence’ or ‘concern’ areas in the ‘Control-Influence-Concern’ model.

There are 32 measure in total monitored in this section of the report. Of the 20 measures for which there are targets or desired trends, 13 are on target. The city’s economic growth, educational qualifications of residents, highly skilled workforce, hotel arrivals and completion of new dwellings are all tracking as desired.

Progress has somewhat stalled in unemployment rates, upskilling workforce and Sydney’s global competitiveness ratings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target or trend met</th>
<th>Progressing or pending further updates</th>
<th>Not met</th>
<th>Information only, no target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Total               | 13                                     | 6       | 1                           | 12
## Results table D1: Economic prosperity, competitiveness and diversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Year/Geo*</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Detail</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>CoS Charter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic prosperity and competitiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global competitiveness</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Overall ranking out of 30 global cities</td>
<td>Stable or increasing</td>
<td>Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G.SYD.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City economic growth</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$129.6</td>
<td>Gross City Product in $millions, in 2016 real volume</td>
<td>Exceed AU GDP growth**</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City estimates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment growth</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>501,786</td>
<td>people in the workforce</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic diversity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business location diversity</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>of LGA businesses are in the CBD</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment location diversity</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>of the LGA jobs are in the CBD</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment in night-time economy</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>of total LGA workforce</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment in knowledge industries:</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>of total LGA workforce</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information, media and telecommunications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment in knowledge industries:</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>of total LGA workforce</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, scientific &amp; technical services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment in knowledge industries:</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>of total LGA workforce</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicated if data presented is based on a different geography than the LGA.

**Based on 10 year average annual growth
### Results table D2: Education, employment, skills and productivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Detail</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>CoS Charter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resident employment and education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident labour force participation rate</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>of 15+ y.o. are in the labour force</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident unemployment rate</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>of 15+ y.o. are unemployed</td>
<td>Stable or decreasing</td>
<td>Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local employment of residents</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>of 15+ y.o. employed residents work in the LGA</td>
<td>Stable or increasing</td>
<td>Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational qualifications: Non-school qualifications Total</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>of 25+ y.o. residents</td>
<td>Stable or increasing</td>
<td>Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational qualifications: Bachelors degree or higher</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>of 25+ y.o. residents</td>
<td>Stable or increasing</td>
<td>Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational qualifications: Certificate to Advanced Dip.</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>of 25+ y.o. residents</td>
<td>Stable or increasing</td>
<td>Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workforce skills &amp; productivity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly skilled workforce</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>of workers are in highly skilled occupations</td>
<td>Stable or incr. &gt; Metro</td>
<td>Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upskilling workforce</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>of workers are attending tertiary, tech. or further edu. institu</td>
<td>Stable or incr. &gt; Metro</td>
<td>Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commute to work time: Resident workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commute to work time: All workers</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>minutes, to LGA from anywhere in Sydney Metro</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Results table D3: Tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Year/ Geo*</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Detail</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>CoS Charter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demand for tourist accommodation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel arrivals in the Sydney metropolitan area</td>
<td>2018 Metro</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>million</td>
<td>Stable or increasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel arrivals staying overnight in City of Sydney</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>million</td>
<td>Stable or increasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average hotel stay length in City of Sydney</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>nights</td>
<td>Stable or increasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supply for tourist accommodation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room stock</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>35,509</td>
<td>rooms</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel room occupancy rate</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>of stock</td>
<td>≥ 80%</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average takings per room per night</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Influence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicated if data presented is based on a different geography than the LGA.
### Results table D4: Property development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Detail</th>
<th>Target Description</th>
<th>CoS Charter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential development dwelling numbers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings completed</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>5,112</td>
<td>dwellings</td>
<td>Stable or increasing**</td>
<td>Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings approved</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>1,638</td>
<td>dwellings</td>
<td>Stable or increasing**</td>
<td>Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial development floor space</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor space completed</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>186,889</td>
<td>metres²</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor space approved</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>378,030</td>
<td>metres²</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property development value</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of approvals: Residential applications</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$ 1.4</td>
<td>billion</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of approvals: Non-residential applications</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$ 2.4</td>
<td>billion</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office vacancy rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office vacancy rate</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Concern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Numbers shown are for private dwellings (i.e. excludes boarding houses, student accommodation and aged care).

**To reach the target of 138,000 dwellings by 2030.

2,200 dwellings on average p.a. need to be completed in order to achieve that.