



Public Questions In Writing

Ordinary Council Meeting – 26 May 2026

Name: Matthew Morgan, Bayswater

Subject: Item 10.3.2 Petition – Prevention of Non-Local Traffic through Bayswater Roads

Question 1

The City of Bayswater publicly suppressed consultant reports regarding increased rat-running through Stone st, Percy st, Queen st and Traylen rd. Until a Freedom of Information request forced its release. The letter distribution also did not reach the intended participants. Accordingly, community misconceptions have been festering. Can the City of Bayswater confirm it has no intention re-naming the streets of Stone Street, Percy Street, Queen Street and Traylen Road to the “Guildford-Garratt Road Bypass Hwy”?

Response 1

The City has not withheld any consultant reports relating to increased traffic volumes on Stone Street, Percy Street, Queen Street and Traylen Road. A technical report prepared by an external consultant was released following the necessary permissions being obtained from the authoring party. The City rejects any suggestion that information has been intentionally withheld.

The City engaged Australia Post to distribute more than 3,000 copies of a second letter to residents and extended the community engagement period to support participation. The City is not aware of any widespread issues with the distribution of this correspondence.

The City confirms that there is no proposal or intention to rename Stone Street, Percy Street, Queen Street or Traylen Road.

Question 2

At the 28 April 2026 meeting, City of Bayswater conceded that they are not complying with motion 1 of the 2025 AGM to include restricted movement traffic calming as an option for Traylen road in the community engagement survey. Why does the City of Bayswater brazenly not comply with its own motions that it passes at their AGM meetings?

Response 2

The City is complying with the motions adopted by Council following the 2025 Annual General Meeting of Electors.

Motion 1 states that Council:

1. Does not install a treatment at Traylen Road like those proposed for Williamson Street and Milne Street at this time; and
2. Includes the suggested treatment as a comment in the community engagement process for the signalling of the Garratt Road and Stone Street intersection.

The City has implemented this motion as resolved by Council.

Question 3

Some drivers have been illegally driving from Stone street and driving straight through to Frinton Street. These car drivers are rat-running through Stone street and should be using Guilford and Garratt road to access this street. Why is the council condoning this rat-running behaviour by recommending opening up this street in all directions instead of closing off the street by installing a cul-de-sac?

Response 3

The City does not condone illegal driving behaviour and expects all road users to comply with applicable traffic laws.

Based on traffic counts conducted along Stone Street and Traylen Road, traffic volumes on both roads are consistent with their current road hierarchy classification.

The proposed intersection modification is intended to improve access and safety for local traffic entering and exiting Garratt Road from the Maylands Peninsula precinct.

A full or partial road closure, such as a cul-de-sac, would redirect traffic onto other residential streets within the precinct, potentially resulting in unintended impacts on the broader local road network.

Name: Nana Maeshinjo, Bayswater

Subject: Item 10.3.2 Petition – Prevention of Non-Local Traffic through Bayswater Roads

Question 1

Guildford rd is in desperate need of a pedestrian crossing. Darby st provides access to MPPS, Meltham train station and cafes; it statically it has vehicle crash clusters but has line of sight for a traffic signal, with a slip road for residential traffic and available verge space that will not impact residents for a traffic signal. If Stone st/Garratt rd becomes a left-right-in and left-out only to allow for bus route 41, why has council not considered a traffic signal for Darby Street?

Response 1

Darby Street does not meet the warrants for the installation of traffic signals and is unlikely to be approved by Main Roads WA, which is the responsible authority for Guildford Road.

The City has, however, identified the need to improve pedestrian connectivity in the area and is progressing a signalised pedestrian crossing on Guildford Road between Traylen Road and Ferguson Street. This project has been under development for several years, and funding has been secured.

Question 2

The City of Bayswater were suppressing the GHD report that required a Freedom of Information request to access. This information was extremely valuable for the residents to properly conduct the community engagement survey. Can the City of Bayswater confirm whether they are suppressing any other documents that could significantly influence a resident's decision to properly conduct the community engagement survey?

Response 2

The report referenced was prepared by a third party, and permission from that party was required prior to its release. Once this permission was obtained, the report was made available. The City rejects any suggestion that information has been intentionally withheld.

No other reports have been prepared for this project.

Question 3

To avoid unnecessary planning costs during planning and development, government guidelines advise that community consultation should start at beginning of any project. Why has the Local Roads and Infrastructure department already sought council approval, engaged an external consultant paid by rate payers and omitted recommendations before any community consultation has commenced?

Response 3

The City engages external consultants at an early stage of a project to provide technical advice and identify appropriate options for consideration. This helps inform Council decision-making and ensures that any potential proposals presented to the community are supported by evidence-based analysis.

At this stage, the engagement of a consultant was limited to preliminary investigations to determine suitable intersection treatments. No detailed design or construction funding has been sought or approved.

Community consultation forms a key part of the project and will inform whether the proposal progresses beyond this preliminary stage. Any further design development will only occur if there is demonstrated community support to proceed.

Name: Dani De Sousa Fra

Subject: Item 10.3.2 Petition – Prevention of Non-Local Traffic through Bayswater Roads

Question 1

With the proposed signalisation at the Frinton / Stone / Garrett intersection, and the subsequent increase of non-local traffic through our residential roads, how does the City plan to ensure the safety of our children attending Alf Brooks Park and using the footpaths?

Response 1

No detailed design of the Stone Street and Garratt Road intersection upgrade has been undertaken at this stage.

If the proposal progresses, the detailed design will consider pedestrian safety, including appropriate crossing treatments, sightlines, traffic control measures and the maintenance of footpath widths in accordance with the City's Footpath Policy and relevant standards.

The design process will also assess potential impacts to surrounding streets and public spaces, including access to Alf Brooks Park, to ensure safety and accessibility for all users.

Question 2

How would traffic calming measures be implemented in Frinton Street to try to minimise rat running at high speeds?

Response 2

Subject to the outcome of the community engagement process, traffic calming measures along Frinton Street may be considered as part of the project to discourage non-local traffic and reduce vehicle speeds.

Any such measures would be assessed during the detailed design phase to ensure they are appropriate for the local road environment and align with relevant standards.

Question 3

How does the City plan to compensate homeowners directly affected by the changes for the decrease in property value as a result of increased traffic and re-routed bus routes?

Response 3

There is no intention to acquire any private land as part of the project, and any required works, including potential pavement widening, would be undertaken within the existing road reserve.

The City does not provide compensation for changes in property values that may result from traffic or infrastructure projects of this nature.

Should the project proceed, it will be subject to detailed design and community consultation, with consideration given to minimising impacts on surrounding residents where practicable.

Name: Steve Hall

Subject: Item 10.3.2 Petition – Prevention of Non-Local Traffic through Bayswater Roads

Question 1

LCURS treatments have been approved for 19 locations in the Maylands Peninsula (see 'Maylands Pen - FINAL E2' on the Maylands Peninsula traffic measurement page at Engage Bayswater). No treatments were proposed and approved under that plan for Stone Street between Garrat and Percy Roads. Are there any street in the Peninsula which have had an 85th% speed recorded in the last 2 years higher than that for Stone Street (i.e. higher than 56kmhr) which have not either had new treatments constructed or had new treatments proposed AND approved to be constructed under LCURS. Please identify the street/s and the 85th percentile speed for each?

Response 1

In March 2024, Council endorsed 18 traffic management treatment locations within the Maylands Peninsula Precinct following two rounds of community engagement. In October 2025, Council approved a further 10 locations, subject to consultation with directly affected properties. As this consultation process is still underway, the updated plan has not yet been published on Engage Bayswater. These additional locations include a raised platform on Stone Street.

The City also has a further eight locations currently under investigation following additional community requests and petitions.

The prioritisation of traffic management treatments is not based solely on 85th percentile speed data. Assessments also consider factors such as crash history, traffic volumes, road function and classification, rat-running behaviour, pedestrian activity, network connectivity, community feedback and overall precinct balance.

Accordingly, officers have not undertaken a comparative assessment based solely on identifying streets with 85th percentile speeds greater than 56 km/h that have not yet received or been approved for treatment. Such an assessment could be undertaken if requested by Council.

Question 2

The City has referred to at 10.3.2 (as it has multiple times elsewhere) to the blister island treatment at 104 Stone Street as a reason why no action needs to be taken in relation to traffic speed on Stone Street. Has the City assessed the effectiveness of the blister island treatment in mitigating traffic speed on Stone Street? If not, is it reasonable for the City to be relying on this sole treatment to mitigate traffic speeds on Stone Street, particularly in the circumstances where traffic speeds significantly exceed the speed limit?

Response 2

Blister islands are a recognised traffic calming treatment commonly used to reduce vehicle speeds, narrow the perceived carriageway width and improve driver awareness within residential streets.

The City has not relied solely on the existing blister island treatment at 104 Stone Street in assessing traffic conditions within the area. Traffic management investigations undertaken as part of the broader Maylands Peninsula traffic and Low-Cost Urban Road Safety (LCURS) program have considered a range of matters, including vehicle speeds, traffic volumes, road function, network connectivity, crash history, rat-running behaviour and community feedback.

While the existing blister island contributes to traffic calming outcomes on Stone Street, the City acknowledges that no single treatment is expected to independently address all driver behaviour or speed compliance issues across an entire road segment. For this reason, traffic management within the Peninsula has been considered as part of a broader precinct approach involving multiple existing and proposed treatments across the network.

Question 3

Can the City advise whether the City still constructs similar blister island treatments to mitigate traffic speeds and if not, why not?

Response 3

The City may still consider blister islands as part of traffic management investigations where site conditions are suitable, as they are a recognised traffic-calming treatment that can assist in reducing vehicle speeds and narrowing the perceived carriageway width.

However, the installation of blister islands has become increasingly constrained in many established residential areas due to changes in development patterns and the increased number of driveway crossovers associated with infill development. To ensure that access to properties is maintained and vehicle movements are not unduly restricted, adequate separation is required between opposing crossovers when designing centre island treatments.

In many cases, a minimum spacing of approximately 12 to 15 metres between crossovers on opposite sides of the road is required to safely accommodate a blister island treatment. This level of spacing is becoming increasingly difficult to achieve within parts of the existing urban environment.

Accordingly, the City considers a range of alternative traffic management treatments where blister islands are not feasible or appropriate for the location.

Mark Gardiner, Bedford

Subject: Item 10.4.1 Development Application Proposed Padel Courts Additions to Bedford Bowling Club

Question 1

We have concerns with our right to quiet enjoyment will be compromised by excessive Noise and Traffic/People movement over long opening times, evenings, and weekends. We have reviewed the Reverberate Consulting environmental noise assessment provided by the City. Our concerns and requests for clarification are set out below.

Independent verification - Has the Reverberate report been vetted or peer-reviewed by an independent third party? If so, please provide the reviewer's name, credentials and the review report or confirmation.

Response 1

The acoustic report has been reviewed by the City's qualified Environmental Health Officers, who are authorised under the *Environmental Protection Act 1986* to administer the provisions of the *Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997*.

Question 2

Evidence for recommended treatments what are they? The report concludes that noise from the proposed padel courts "can be controlled to meet the Assigned Levels" and refers to treatments recommended in Appendix A. We require clear evidence that the recommended treatments will achieve the stated noise limits.

Please provide:

- **Specific, measurable treatment specifications (materials, dimensions, construction details).**
- **Predicted attenuation values and the modelling assumptions used.**
- **Any validation testing or precedent examples showing the treatments achieved comparable results in practice.**

Response 2

Noise modelling contained within the acoustic report indicates that noise from Padel Court activity will be within the assigned levels, provided that no music is audible at nearby neighbours. Given that noise emissions are forecast to comply with the assigned levels, there is no requirement for further attenuation measures to be implemented.

Question 3

Ambiguous wording - The conclusion uses "can" rather than stating that compliance will be achieved. Please clarify whether compliance with the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997 is guaranteed if the recommended treatments are implemented exactly as specified, or whether there is residual risk that assigned levels will still be exceeded. If there is residual risk, describe mitigation or enforcement measures proposed.

Response 3

The modelling provided within the acoustic report demonstrates that noise emissions "can" comply with the *Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997*, if no music is audible at nearby neighbours.

Nevertheless, the applicant is responsible for ensuring ongoing compliance with the assigned noise levels. Where complaints are received, the City may investigate and undertake noise measurements at affected properties. If exceedances are identified, the matter will be raised with the applicant for rectification. Continued non-compliance may result in enforcement action, including infringement notices, environmental protection notices, noise abatement directions, or prosecution.
