

# Deputation List

## Agenda Briefing Forum – 22 April 2025

Deputations will be heard at the Agenda Briefing Forum at **7pm, Tuesday 22 April 2025**.

The items will then be considered by Council at its Ordinary Council Meeting, scheduled for **7pm, Tuesday 29 April 2025**.

The procedure for making a deputation is available on the City's website:

[Petitions and Deputations - City of Bayswater](#)

Deputations may be made in person or in writing.

### In-person deputations

The following people have registered to make in-person deputations:

Deputee Name(s)	In Support / Not in Support of the Officer's Recommendation or Councillor Motion
<b>10.1.2 Annual General Meeting – 12 March 2025 – Response to Motions</b>	
Kate Bowker	Not in support (Motion 11)
<b>10.3.1 Frank Drago Soccer Precinct Redevelopment – Feasibility and Advocacy Findings Report</b>	
Mia Njirich	In support
Megan	In support
<b>10.3.2 Maylands Lakes - Environmental Masterplan Update</b>	
Steve Cloughley	In support
Kevin Hamersley	In support
<b>10.4.2 Deschamp Reserve Footpath Designated On Lead Area</b>	
Harvey Tonkin	Not in support <i>Has provided deputation in writing which is attached below.</i>

### Written deputations

The following deputations have been received in writing and are attached:

Deputee Name(s)	In Support / Not in Support of the Officer's Recommendation or Councillor Motion
<b>10.1.2 Annual General Meeting – 12 March 2025 – Response to Motions</b>	
Nana Maeshinjo	In support (Motion 19 and 20)

Eden Winnacott	In support (Motion 19)
Kelsie Jenkins	In support (Motion 19)
Megan Parker	In support (Motion 13 and 19)
Sinead Kelly	In support (Motion 19)
<b>10.3.2 Maylands Lakes - Environmental Masterplan Update</b>	
Debra Rosser	In support
Dianne Akhtar	Neither in support nor opposed.

**10.1.2 Annual General Meeting – 12 March 2025 – Response to Motions**

**Nana Maeshinjo**

I support Motion 19 and 20.

Motion 19: *For Council to consider the installation of traffic calming devices along Mephan Street, Darby Street, Rocher Place, Goldmead Street and Traylen Road, designed for the current school zone speed limit environment, surrounding Maylands Peninsula Primary School.*

Motion 20: *That Council incorporate options to convert Traylen Road to a cul-de-sac at the Guildford Road end, in conjunction with other planned road layout changes in the area.*

---

**10.1.2 Annual General Meeting – 12 March 2025 – Response to Motions**

**Eden Winnacott**

I support Motion 19, Item 10.1.2 - regarding improving Mephan and Darby Street. I am a parent at Maylands Peninsula Primary School.

Motion 19: *For Council to consider the installation of traffic calming devices along Mephan Street, Darby Street, Rocher Place, Goldmead Street and Traylen Road, designed for the current school zone speed limit environment, surrounding Maylands Peninsula Primary School.*

---

**10.1.2 Annual General Meeting – 12 March 2025 – Response to Motions**

**Kelsie Jenkins**

As P&C, and concerned parent of MPPS students, I support motion 19. I really hope more can be done in the surrounding streets to keep our children safe, similar to other schools in our area.

Motion 19: *For Council to consider the installation of traffic calming devices along Mephan Street, Darby Street, Rocher Place, Goldmead Street and Traylen Road, designed for the current school zone speed limit environment, surrounding Maylands Peninsula Primary School.*

---

**10.1.2 Annual General Meeting – 12 March 2025 – Response to Motions**

**Megan Parker**

I support installation of Cockitroughs in locations identified by researchers. I support this motion being prioritised and enacted with urgency due to the recent loss of habitat forcing cockatoos into urban areas.

Motion 13: *That Council, in alignment with the City's Strategic Community Plan and the Environment and Liveability goals, installs cockitroughs at key locations throughout the City.*

I support the installation of traffic calming devices surrounding Maryland's Peninsula Primary school, motion 19.

Motion 19: *For Council to consider the installation of traffic calming devices along Mephan Street, Darby Street, Rocher Place, Goldmead Street and Traylen Road, designed for the current school zone speed limit environment, surrounding Maylands Peninsula Primary School.*

---

**10.1.2 Annual General Meeting – 12 March 2025 – Response to Motions**  
**Sinead Kelly**

Keen to see pedestrian safety be prioritised on these roads, we need safe routes across these roads for small kids, prams and bikes.

Motion 19: *For Council to consider the installation of traffic calming devices along Mephan Street, Darby Street, Rocher Place, Goldmead Street and Traylen Road, designed for the current school zone speed limit environment, surrounding Maylands Peninsula Primary School.*

**10.3.2 Maylands Lakes – Environmental Masterplan Update**

**Debra Rosser**

I have read all the relevant reports associated with the Maylands Lakes Masterplan and have contributed to the online survey. We have lived at our present address since 2002 and have witnessed the decline in the health of the lakes. We must grasp the opportunity to take actions that will, in time, reduce the ongoing maintenance cost to the City as well as improving the amenity of the lakes. I therefore strongly support the Masterplan and hope see it adopted by Council.

### **10.3.2 Maylands Lakes – Environmental Masterplan Update**

**Dianne Akhtar**

It has come to my attention that the city has recently sold an asset that offers Council an opportunity to pay for the Maylands Lakes Masterplan. The money's received from the sale of this asset should be focused on the most expensive parts of the Masterplan. This means we could bring forward the pumping and filtration portion of the planned work for option three- which is the only viable solution. It is council responsibility to resolve this issue if they have the funding to do so.

The residents of Maylands Lakes have been exposed to serious health risks and loss of amenity due to both health risks of toxic cyanobacteria and midge inundation for more than 10 years. There is no other project that has hundreds of residents exposed to such health risks. As such the money from the sale of assets should be focused on this resolution.

Additionally, at no point in the information leading up to the production of the Masterplan concept were the removal of facilities around the lake ever a priority, raised by the City as being part of the plan, or a point of contention with the community. The boardwalks and gazebos are a part of our valuable amenity that have no effect on the water quality nor the planned work. There has also been discussion at the Masterplan workshop about removing hard walls.

The City should have been including the maintenance of these facilities as part of their ongoing operational budget and operational work. Which hard walls are the city considering for removal, if any, and why? It has been suggested at the Masterplan Concept community meeting that the Gazebo's and board walks are not used. This is incorrect! The Gazebo's are often chosen as a site for many wedding photos and is still where residents stop to view the lakes or picnic. The wedding photos are no longer an option because of the state of the water and the inundation of midges. In photographs now, the water appears a stagnant green because of the poor water quality. The extreme inundation of midge throughout most of the year makes enjoying the exterior of our homes and the surrounds including boardwalks and gazebos impossible. Despite this, police precinct staff, visitors and residents still often picnic and view the birdlife from the boardwalks and the gazebos on Bungana and Brearley during the day.

Many couples and families still visit the parks and gazebo on Hinkler Loop to picnic and share time together. The mosquito plague has perhaps reduced their stay. Over the hottest months, while the midge numbers have been lower, the high number of mosquitos have prevented people from using any outdoor facilities on the lakes and the river – as confirmed by Council.

Again, these structures do not affect the water quality and are part of the amenities that residents paid for when they bought their homes. It is our hope that once the lake environment is safe, healthy and free from plagues of midge and mosquito, we can enjoy the amenities have picnics and BBQs in the parks and gazebos. It is our hope to view fish, turtles and birds from the boardwalks too, as we did before the lakes began to deteriorate.

The boardwalk on Lake Brearley has not been maintained by The City of Bayswater for years and has fallen into disrepair to a point that The City of Bayswater states it is unsafe. Why has The City of Bayswater failed to maintain these assets? It has been suggested by a few residents at the Masterplan meeting that the boardwalks have been removed from the assets list. When did the City of Bayswater remove these from the asset list and why? What community engagement regarding the

removal of these assets have occurred? None of the residents I have spoken to knew they were planning to remove assets.

There is also evidence that hard walls help to reduce midge problems due to wave action and wind. In this in-depth analysis by the Health Department and Water Corporation, hard walls are an essential aspect of controlling midge and mosquitos.

(<https://www.health.wa.gov.au/~media/Files/Corporate/general-documents/Mosquitoes/PDF/Chironomid-midge.pdf>)

This effect has already been significantly reduced by infill around the wall edges over the last few years and could explain rising midge numbers.

Our amenities add to the value of our homes, and we do not want to lose the value or amenities we paid for when buying our homes. We do not want to have continued midge issues. Midge inundations into properties and the lake surrounds are one of the key issues facing residents around the lakes. When considering the budget, which is significant, what proportion of the budget is related to actual water quality improvement, and what proportion of the budget is allocated to safety and amenity? What exactly is the City of Bayswater planning to remove - where and why? On the Engage Baywater site, there are plans to add gazebos and water viewing platforms around Bardon Park. Why is the city considering adding these features to another park when they suggesting they are unable or unwilling to maintain the existing assets? This decision is not consistent with the responsibilities Council have to maintain our lakes and return them to assets we can enjoy without the fear of midge inundation and health risks. The community want a Masterplan and budget that is focused on water quality without the distraction of facilities and amenities that are part of a separate discussion that none of the community want to lose.



#### 10.4.2 Deschamp Reserve Footpath Designated On Lead Area Harvey Tonkin

##### **Deposition in Opposition to Proposed On-Lead Designation of Footpath Area**

Thank you for the opportunity to present this deposition.

To begin, may I ask that the maps referenced in the motion be opened for review?

Our request is simple: we are asking that the status quo be maintained — that dogs continue to be allowed off-lead in the designated area.

When the original motion was introduced, no clear justification was given for changing the final 35 metres of footpath (from the middle of the Public Access Way to the school boundary) to an on-lead zone, aside from a general request from the local primary school. It's important to note that the first 70 metres of this path was already designated as on-lead, so the proposal merely extends the on-lead area by an additional 35 metres.

My wife and I have walked our dogs in this park every morning between 6am and 8am for over 40 years — always off-lead. In all that time, we have never had an incident where our dogs have approached or disturbed schoolchildren, nor have we heard of any such complaints from others.

When the motion was brought forward in November 2024, a council officer unexpectedly included the northern footpath as part of the proposed on-lead area — allegedly to protect children walking to school via that route. However, the school in question has been in existence since 1980. This raises a crucial question: Why, after 45 years without incident or concern, are off-lead dogs suddenly seen as a threat?

We also wish to raise concerns about misleading documentation. The second map presented by council is incorrect and potentially deceptive. I raised this with Councillor Sally Palmer, who was to forward the matter to the relevant officer. However, the map was never amended. The footpath under discussion should be clearly marked with red lines on both sides. The actual council boundary lies approximately 4–6 metres north of the path, yet Map 2 fails to show hachuring in this area. This has misled many residents into believing that the land north of the footpath is part of the proposed on-lead zone, when it is not.

There are several practical concerns if this change is enacted:

1. **Impractical Lead Transition:** Expecting owners to leash their dogs at the edge of the footpath, walk just 1.3 metres, and then unleash again is unrealistic and unnecessary.
2. **Access to the Water Fountain:** Many dogs get thirsty and need to go to the water fountain. Forcing owners — including some with mobility issues — to leash their dogs just for a drink.
3. **Parents with Prams:** A parent walking with a pram and a dog would need to tether their dog just to walk along this short stretch of footpath, even though it is surrounded by off-lead zones. This creates confusion and unnecessary burden.

In conclusion, this proposed change introduces confusion, inconvenience, and attempts to solve a problem that has not existed in over four decades. We respectfully urge the council to maintain the current off-lead arrangement in this area.

Thank you for your consideration.