



Deputation List

Agenda Briefing Forum – 15 September 2026

Deputations will be heard at the Agenda Briefing Forum at **7:00 pm, Tuesday 15 September 2026**. The items will then be considered by Council at its Ordinary Council Meeting, scheduled for **7:00 pm, Tuesday 22 September 2026**.

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
10.1.2 Market Engagement Development Opportunity - 92 Railway Parade, Bayswater	
Glenn Morley	Neutral
Wendy Garstone	Neutral
10.1.3 Partial Disposal of Lot 2, No. 60 Embleton Avenue (Wotton Reserve)	
Cynthia Huet de Froberville (Spokesperson) Gilbert Tourneur Jocelyn Brunet	Neutral
Ben Leaver (Spokesperson) Stephen Peters Susan Phonsongkham Isobel Dalton	In support
Garth Hokinson (Spokesperson)	Neutral
John Dols	Neutral
Wendy Garstone	Neutral
10.5.2.2.1 Policy Review: Street Verges	
Wendy Garstone	Not in support
Aileen O'Rourke	Not in support

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
10.1.3 Partial Disposal of Lot 2, No. 60 Embleton Avenue (Wotton Reserve)	
Leon McGrath	Not in support
10.5.2.2.1 Policy Review: Street Verges	
Maria Kostecki	In support
Lauren Pratt	Not in support
Annette Pratt	Not in support
Nich Stalker	Not in support
Margaret Lockyer	Not in support
Kathryn Lance	Not in support
Yvette Coyne	Not in support
Matthew Morgan	Not in support
Abigail Perrotte	Not in support
Georgina Ker	Not in support

In-person Deputation Notes

Item 10.1.2 Market Engagement Development Opportunity - 92 Railway Parade, Bayswater Glenn Morley, Bassendean

Would like to discuss the proposed Market Engagement Development Opportunity of Lot 1 and 2 at 92 Railway Parade, Bayswater.

This lot is currently the only safe and accessible car park for our community sporting club and we have not had any level of engagement with the City in advance of this proposal in terms of what implications this will have on our club.

Item 10.1.2 Market Engagement Development Opportunity - 92 Railway Parade, Bayswater; and Item 10.1.3 Partial Disposal of Lot 2, No. 60 Embleton Avenue, Embleton (Wotton Reserve) Wendy Garstone, Maylands

My deputation is about concerns raised about the City's overall public open space amenity. These have come from the Wotton Reserve development proposal and the sale of 92 Railway Parade. I'm not against the proposals, I generally support repurposing land to meet changing needs. I'm here to ask: why is there no analysis regarding the overall public open space assets in this City in the officer's reports?

I was told that there would be a public open space strategy with the Wotton Reserve disposal report, but the information provided is scant. I've been told that the City does not have an accurate measure of POS land tenure, but at a time when a large area of POS is being sold, surely this needs to be known? The State Govt has set a benchmark of 10% of public open space amenity, but it seems that our public open space is available for State Government projects as the State Government wishes.

- The Wotton Reserve proposal means that, is it 50% of its area will go to housing?
 - Solve Properties reports states 'there is materially a lower provision of public open space in the suburbs surrounding the site'.
 - What is meant in the report by 'public open space replacement arrangements' – surely this needs to be clarified? Will the additional rates revenue contribute to future new areas of public open space?
 - One of the officer's comments in the report on the disposal of Wotton Reserve was that 'The disposal of this land and the broader proposal will create a more efficient use of Wotton Reserve'. I wonder if Councillors are curious about what sort of efficiencies will be possible. I assume it is financial, as for every sqm of public open space the City does not have to maintain equals savings.
- The Morley Windmills Soccer team will move to Emberson Reserve, I assume that a new clubroom and expanded car park will be needed, changing the amenities in this park.
- The 92 Railway Parade proposal does not discuss the impact on the lacrosse club or the adjoining Halliday Park.
 - Will a new car park be needed for lacrosse events?
 - Why did the lapsed proposal include a portion of Halliday Park?
- Most of Rose Avenue Park was used to make way for buses next to the Bayswater train station.

- A 1000 sqm plus area has already been taken from Wotton Reserve and used by the State to build a car park for the Morley train station car park and an access road to get to the station.
- In Bedford, a large portion of Grand Promenade Reserve will be resumed to build a new Inglewood Primary School campus.
- Charles Newman Gardens is a local park located on Guildford Rd, but it is still in private hands and is zoned R25. Managed by the City under a lease agreement, with a caveat on the title restricting its use to "Public Garden." Can this park be used for development?
- How many mobile towers are located on reserves?
- Undergrounding power means transformers are often located on public open space. These examples are simply those that I am aware of. Are there others? The City's Parks and Reserves Asset Renewal Plan states that The City rarely disposes of Parks and Reserves assets without replacing them. Is there a replacement strategy?

If public open space is being used for housing, surely funds must be provided so as to purchase land elsewhere to provide POS where it is lacking. Resuming land for other purposes is part of the history of this park and part of the history of this City, it can be done. Some of our older parks are parks only from the efforts of previous City of Bayswater councillors. Halliday Park and Bert Wright Park were purchased by the City because there was no public open space in the Bayswater Town Centre.

To conclude, before selling half of Wotton Reserve I think we need to fully understand what public open space we have, the impact on these assets by development, and where our future public open spaces will be.

Item 10.1.3 Partial Disposal of Lot 2, No. 60 Embleton Avenue, Embleton (Wotton Reserve)
Cynthia Huet de Froberville, Beechboro

Good evening Mayor, Councillors and City officers.

My name is Cynthia Huet de Froberville, President of the Bayswater Pétanque Club. With me this evening are Charles Jodun, our Treasurer; Gilbert Tourneur, our Vice President; and Jocelyn Brunet, our former President and a long-standing, active and valued member of our Club. We are here this evening on behalf of our Management Committee and our 150-plus members.

Firstly, I would like to thank the City of Bayswater, and in particular Jon Vines, for the consultation and communication throughout this process. We appreciate the opportunity to work with the City and to have our views heard.

We understand that the proposed redevelopment of Wotton Reserve is an important project for the City and the wider community. We are not here to oppose the redevelopment. We simply ask that, as this project moves forward, Bayswater Pétanque Club is also looked after and its future is protected.

Our Club has proudly called Wotton Reserve home since 1997. Over nearly 30 years, we have become much more than a sporting club. We are a welcoming and inclusive place built on friendship, volunteering and bringing people together.

Pétanque is a unique sport within the City of Bayswater. It is one of the few sports where men and women, young and old, can all compete together in the same competition. We are proud that our Club attracts people of all ages and backgrounds, and we are seeing more young people becoming involved in the sport. Our regular training sessions, competitions and social gatherings bring families together,

where it is common to see grandparents, parents, children and even great-grandchildren enjoying time together. That is the legacy we hope to preserve.

Throughout our history, BPC has always been more than a sporting club. It has been a place where people connect, volunteer and support one another. We are proud to have supported Women with Purpose by providing our facilities free of charge for community events that bring women together and promote social connection and inclusion. We also welcome the Young at Heart group, providing seniors with companionship and opportunities to stay socially connected.

In addition, our clubhouse is used by the JD Dojo martial arts group for young people and a line dancing group, making our facility a valuable community space used by people of all ages. Our members have invested not only thousands of volunteer hours over nearly 30 years, but also financially. When our current clubhouse was established, the Club contributed approximately \$100,000 from the sale of our previous clubhouse. Since then, generations of members have continued to build, maintain and care for this facility.

If relocation becomes necessary because of the redevelopment, we respectfully ask that BPC is given the opportunity to continue that legacy in a new home. Our request is straightforward. We ask the City to work with us to provide a permanent, independent and fit-for-purpose facility that is equal to or better than our current one. Maintaining our independence is very important to us. Having our own clubhouse has enabled us to build a strong club culture, host local, state and international competitions, welcome community groups and provide a place where people feel they belong.

We also understand that finding suitable land may be challenging. If the City cannot provide an appropriate site within the City of Bayswater, we respectfully ask that the City work with neighbouring local governments, particularly the City of Swan, to explore suitable alternatives that allow our Club to remain close to the community we have built over many years.

Finally, I would like to make one important point. Bayswater Pétanque Club is not choosing to relocate. If we need to move, it will be because of the redevelopment of Wotton Reserve. Our Club simply does not have the financial capacity to build a new clubhouse and sporting facility. We therefore respectfully ask that the cost of providing an agreed replacement facility is not placed on our members.

Mayor and Councillors, we are not asking for special treatment. We are simply asking that a Club which has proudly served this community for almost 30 years be given the opportunity to continue serving it for many years to come. Our request is not simply for a new facility. It is for the opportunity to continue building community, creating friendships and bringing generations together for many years to come.

Thank you for your time. Jocelyn, Gilbert and I would be pleased to answer any questions you may have.

Cynthia Huet de Froberville

Item 10.5.2.2.1 Policy Review: Street Verges

Wendy Garstone, Maylands

This City has worked hard to create strategies and programs that reflect the changing expectations of the community regarding the environment. Banning synthetic lawn in 2024 was part of this work. It would be a backwards step to allow fake grass. The officer's report mentions the practical challenges of implementing the policy since 2024, then goes on to discuss enforcement. I suggest that education is the key factor missing since 2024.

I ask that councillors either:

1. Adopt option 4: retain the ban, and officers work with owners to transition the synthetic surfaces to a permissible treatment; or

2. Keep the ban, but accept the synthetic lawns already in place. Advise owners of preferable alternative treatments, and focus on education to the wider community.

I have checked the Bayswater Brief editions after July 2024 and didn't find any articles advising residents that synthetic lawn had been banned. Was this information included in Rates notices? Have councillors and officers been part of getting the message out? The decision was fair, but I suggest that not running an education campaign has created this situation.

I assume if this policy is adopted as recommended by the Policy Review Committee that officers will need to liaise with 21 homeowners to ensure that a street tree is planted, and where a street tree exists, that synthetic lawn laid up to tree base will be removed to a 1m setback. Cutting the plastic, digging out the subbases and disposal of both will require a significant cost to the owners and the City. To gain a slightly healthier environment for x number of trees, and x number of new trees (meanwhile, synthetic lawn minimises chances of a street tree thriving because it limits amount of water and oxygen reaching tree roots) is a surely not the best use of resources.

I suggest it would be a better outcome if the City spent the money on educating the community about the synthetic lawn ban and the maintenance of street trees not associated with synthetic lawn. To educate, perhaps a message to the letterbox of all residents and ratepayers, on the front cover of Bayswater Brief? A clear message – with a photo of a native verge planted using one of the native verge rebate schemes. The City of Bayswater does not support the use of synthetic lawn. Owners installing synthetic lawn in the future will be required to remove it. This is because...

And that this message is reinforced via Bayswater Buzz, social media, and by Councillors and Officers. Tell a friend – synthetic lawn was banned in 24 – don't use it! I think that birds, insects, the trees along our streets and pedestrians would far prefer a weedy verge to a lifeless plastic one. Please maintain the ban and support the environmental objectives of this City!

Item 10.5.2.2.1 Policy Review: Street Verges

Aileen O'Rourke, Bayswater

I want register my strong objection to the proposal currently before Council to reverse the existing prohibition on synthetic (artificial) turf under the City's Street Verges Policy. I understand Council is considering allowing synthetic turf as a permissible verge treatment, reversing a position the City reaffirmed as recently as its last policy review.

The current Street Verges Policy was reviewed and readopted on 23 July 2024 ago states in unambiguous terms:

"The planting and maintenance of a natural lawn (artificial lawn is not permitted)."

"Under no circumstances is synthetic lawn permitted as a permissible verge treatment."

I have not seen any new evidence, changed circumstances, or public groundswell since that 2024 review that would justify reversing a position so recently and deliberately reaffirmed. On the contrary, the research on artificial turf's environmental and public health effects has continued to build — and it supports the City's existing position, not a reversal of it.

As others have mentioned, there was little or no information provided to ratepayers about this ban and it seems little attempt at the council to police any installations of plastic coatings.

I will do no more than mention the toxicity, heat island and loss of biodiversity that comes with plastic coverings on verges as I am sure the members of the policy committee and other Councilors would have been diligent enough to do their own research on these issues.

I would like to question issues of impermeability which must ultimately lead to increased storm water run off. I am not an engineer, so I am just proposing some questions that perplex me. Again I hope these matters have been researched by all involved.

The draft policy states that artificial turf must be at least 50% permeable. As worded, this condition refers only to the plastic material itself, not to the base layer it is installed over. My understanding is that Standard Australian installation practice uses a compacted crushed rock or road base sub-base, topped with a finer crusher dust levelling layer, compacted again before the turf is laid. My understanding is that over time, further settling, migration and surface clogging from organic debris typically reduce infiltration well below installation-day figures, particularly in poorly maintained installations. Will this be monitored by Council?

Bayswater's draft condition has no equivalent base-material or compaction standard. Some commentary I have seen notes a lack of research quantifying effects on stormwater runoff, retention and drainage for residential-style installations which limits how much confidence can currently be placed in permeability claims made for the turf product alone.

My, perhaps flawed logic, would suggest, given the heavy downpours we are receiving would have an serious impact on stormwater run-off. Again, I would hope this has been considered.

In Writing Deputations

Item 10.1.3 Partial Disposal of Lot 2, No. 60 Embleton Avenue, Embleton (Wotton Reserve)

Leon McGrath

I make this deputation to urge you to reject the Officer's Recommendation to dispose of 21,163 square metres of public land at Wotton Reserve in Embleton for \$1 to Pelligra Group Pty Ltd. I acknowledge and support the promotion of women's sport and development of community facilities in the City of Bayswater to further grow participation in women's football and community sport generally. However, I do not support the proposed sale of land at Wotton Reserve in Embleton for significantly below market value, and I believe that the value for money for ratepayers has not been properly considered in this proposal.

In support of my deputation, I submit the following key points for Council's consideration regarding the proposed disposal of land at Wotton Reserve:

- Land valuation is much lower than true potential: The Officer's report notes an adjusted market value of \$529,075 for 21,163 square metres of land to justify the sale for \$1. In my view, this significantly downplays the opportunity cost to ratepayers for the disposal of the land. The valuation equates to a nominal valuation of just \$25 per square metre for the land, based on an 'as-is – current zoning' basis. There is nowhere else in Embleton that land can be purchased at such a low cost. At this valuation, the equivalent price for a 400 square metre block would be just \$10,000. Councillors should interrogate the instructions provided to the independent valuers by the City's officers and consider if a valuation based on the current zoning (that is, as a public reserve) is reasonable and appropriate, or if obtaining a valuation based on the land's highest and best use as a proposed mixed commercial and residential development may be more appropriate. I note that on the one hand, the Officer's report says that there has been an Improvement Plan submitted (p 31), yet elsewhere in the report (p 36) it says that the valuation does not assume any future residential, commercial or mixed-use development potential. With respect, this seems to be an inadequate justification to not consider the reasonably probable use of this land as discussed elsewhere in the report. Standard residential land in Embleton is currently priced upwards of \$1,500 per square metre in the current market. When factoring in future multi-storey commercial and residential mixed-use potential and proximity to public transport and the city, the true value of this site may be worth anywhere between \$20- \$30 million based on a conservative estimate. I request that Council provides further instructions to its independent valuer to revalue the land based on its reasonably probable highest and best use, and releases this valuation to ratepayers.
- Absence of an open tender process: Handing over a strategically located asset directly to Pelligra Group Pty Ltd for \$1 without an open, competitive tender process denies other developers the opportunity to bid and fails to test the true market value of the land. Although I am not a developer, I would pay at least double (\$2) for this land. Ratepayers deserve a transparent, competitive process to ensure the best possible financial and community outcome.
- Public benefit assessment: I understand that the figures provided on page 36 for capital investment (\$128 million) are the developer's estimated capital costs for the development, rather than a direct benefit to the community. These costs will be recoverable by the developer, plus a profit margin to generate a commercial return. The estimated 10-year NPV for rates shows only \$1.05 million in rates back to the City. A better return to the City could be obtained if the land was sold at its market value.
- Exploring alternative government funding: this development proposal has been presented to ratepayers as a foregone conclusion, rather than showing consideration for alternative uses for this

site. If women's football is the sole focus of this development, then further consideration should be given to obtaining alternative funding, such as from the State Government. I note the in-principle support given by the Deputy Premier on behalf of the State Government, but I would question why the State Government cannot instead provide financial support to develop the sporting facilities to ensure that the land remains in public hands. The City should actively engage with the State Government to secure sports infrastructure grants and funding partnerships, allowing community sporting facilities to be built while keeping this land in public hands.

- Transparency in public consultation: The Officer's report currently lacks a breakdown quantifying the exact number of the 34 public submissions received in support versus those in opposition, as I would usually expect to see following a period of public submission. While supporting community sport and women's football is a noble pursuit, in my view the ends do not justify bypassing a competitive tender or losing sight of securing value for ratepayers and safeguarding public land. I respectfully urge the Council to approach this development with a clear mind and to defer this matter for further consideration. This should at a minimum require an open competitive tender process, a review of the initial valuation instructions to reflect highest and best use, and further explore state-funded alternatives.

Thank you for your consideration of my deputation.

Leon McGrath

Item 10.5.2.2.1 Policy Review: Street Verges

Maria Kostecki, Morley

I have installed artificial turf at my premises at a cost of \$23,000. In doing so I have used the best available Australian manufactured product which is both durable and aesthetically very pleasing. The installation ensured that drainage was optimised. All of the products used were free from toxic and noxious substances and meets all Australian and international standards.

The reasons for installing the artificial turf are as follows:

1. The verge treatments in my area are exceptionally poorly maintained by either the occupiers or the City and does nothing to enhance the amenity of the area;
2. The water usage for natural turf is exorbitant and not a proper use of this scarce resource;
3. The contiguous properties are rented and there is a reluctance on the part of tenants to spend money on water to maintain natural turf;
4. There are a number of trees on the verge of my property which throws shade and inhibits the growth of natural grass;
5. I also have a well maintained garden as part of the front of my property and this is maintained by me without any impost on the City;
6. I am 81 years of age and it is likely that physical impairments will, in the future, inhibit my capacity to properly maintain natural turf, hence the installation of artificial turf;
7. The treatments on the verges meet and exceed all City environmental requirement and pose no danger to any person or animal traversing it;

8. In ensuring the acceptable amenity of the area the City has allowed, for decades, the installation of artificial turf and the current policy is a radical departure which is an unreasonable impost on homeowners who take pride in the amenity of the area and their properties in particular;
9. The alternative for the City is to itself undertake the proper maintenance of all verges in its area at its own cost. This will inevitably visit further hardship on owners and occupiers;
10. I urge the city to take a pragmatic approach to this issue and on balance I have more than adequately complied with all environment criteria such as 50 percent permeable artificial turf, superlative drainage, and many mature trees to serve as a canopy.

Item 10.5.2.2.1 Policy Review: Street Verges
Lauren Pratt, Baywater

Hi City of Bayswater,

I have just seen in Perth Now that the CoB is contemplating a reversal on the full ban on synthetic verges.

I am emailing to let you know that I oppose the reversal. I believe that synthetic verges (and synthetic lawns in general) should be completely banned in the CoB as it is against the city's green targets and waterwise verge program.

This is very distressing news to hear that the 'Garden City' is even considering this.

Item 10.5.2.2.1 Policy Review: Street Verges
Annette Pratt, Baywater

I am against synthetic grass verges in the City of Bayswater. As a resident of Bayswater for around 20 years I am pleased to see new initiatives such as the tree verge initiative and water wise verge garden initiative , all of which we have taken advantage of. Reversing the ban on synthetic grass verges would contradict the values of the community and the council. Bayswater is known as the garden city, not the synthetic grass city?? Why would you be reversing a decision that was progressive and good for the environment only to reverse it in the future? Where is the leadership and forward thinking and planning for the future community and climate? Please review your thoughts on this matter.

Item 10.5.2.2.1 Policy Review: Street Verges
Nich Stalker

I strongly oppose the City of Bayswater's proposed reversal of the plastic grass verge ban.

I am against having plastic verges in our 'Garden City' and I think this would be a detriment to the City and our environment.

Item 10.5.2.2.1 Policy Review: Street Verges
Kathryn Lance, Maylands

Artificial turf is a health hazard: It would be negligence if approved to be used. More importantly you all have a responsibility to future generations to NOT exacerbate existing health issues.

This could lead to a class action... The synthetic grass fibres are made of plastics like polyethylene or polypropylene. Over time, weather, UV radiation, and foot traffic cause these blades to fray, break, and shed tiny plastic fragments smaller than 5mm.

60 Minutes Australia: A recent investigative broadcast highlights cutting-edge research warning how humans act as "guinea pigs" for ingested microplastics that gather in the gut and vital organs e.g. endocrine-disrupting chemicals infiltrate our daily diets, digestive systems, and reproductive health.

See below:

1. Cardiovascular System (Heart and Blood Vessels)
Where: Found in blood vessels, arteries, and heart tissue.
Impact: Linked to higher risks of heart attacks, strokes, and blood clotting.
2. Brain and Nervous System
Where: Detected in brain tissue and cerebrospinal fluid.
Impact: Can cross the blood-brain barrier to cause neuroinflammation. Higher concentrations have been observed
3. Digestive System (Liver and Gut)
Where: Found in the liver, gut lining, and colon.
Impact: Disrupts the gut microbiome, causes physical cellular damage ("leaky gut"), and links to inflammatory bowel disease and potential colorectal cancer risks.
4. Respiratory System (Lungs)
Where: Lodged in lung tissue via inhalation.
Impact: Associated with lung tissue damage, inhibited growth, asthma symptoms, and chronic inflammation.
5. Reproductive System and Placenta
Where: Found in placentas, breast milk, umbilical cord blood, and reproductive organs.
Impact: Acts as an endocrine disruptor (interfering with hormones), which may impact fertility and fetal development.

So, it's a definite no from me plus it should never be allowed to have a review date going forward.

Item 10.5.2.2.1 Policy Review: Street Verges
Yvette Coyne, Bayswater

To the Mayor and Councillors, City of Bayswater

I ask Council to retain the current prohibition on synthetic turf. The City's current policy does not permit artificial lawn on residential verges and instead supports natural lawn, native and waterwise gardens, groundcovers and other natural treatments.

The report notes that there are currently a relatively small number of verges with synthetic lawn. Given this, I believe this is an opportunity to gradually transition these verges back to permissible, natural treatments rather than changing the policy to allow synthetic turf more broadly.

To assist affected residents, I suggest the City consider offering a voucher or planting subsidy for native and waterwise plants as part of the verge transition program. This would provide a practical incentive for residents to replace synthetic turf while supporting the City's environmental and biodiversity objectives.

Option 4 listed in the report provides a reasonable and positive pathway: it retains the City's environmental standard while assisting existing properties to transition. I respectfully ask Council to choose Option 4 rather than Option 3, and to consider including a native plant voucher or similar incentive within the transition program.

Thank you for considering my deputation.

Item 10.5.2.2.1 Policy Review: Street Verges
Matthew Morgan, Bayswater

A property owner has rights to their verge but they do not own their verge. Ultimately a verge can be viewed a public good. Verges provide the community with tree canopy, public space, rubbish collection, footpaths, bicycle paths, bus stops, street libraries and car parking.

I am against this deputation for the following reasons:

- Studies show that synthetic lawns often increases rainwater surface runoff than living grass roots or mulches; that retain and filter water more effectively. This excess water runoff depletes the ground water supply.
- Additionally, in direct sunlight, the plastic in the synthetic lawn degrades overtime and leaches micro plastics into the ground water. This depleted water supply and increased micro plastics will severely inhibit the City of Bayswater's tree canopy.
- Synthetic lawns destroy microbial life caused by reduced gas, air and water exchange. Microbial lifeforms such as Mycorrhizal fungi create underground networks to distribute nutrients to trees. Synthetic lawn creates a barrier that destroys these underground microbial networks. This is why a mulch zone around a tree with a synthetic lawn is not sufficient to provide these nutrients.
- Additionally, the greenhouse house effect from the layer of plastic will create a heat sink that will destroy any remaining microbial lifeforms. A tree's life literally depends on these essential microbes.
- Synthetic lawns still require maintenance as it can attract weeds between the cracks and joins. Rips and tears in the fabric can also be unsightly and become a trip hazard.
- Any utility work on the verge such as sewerage or road works is made more difficult to access for installers.
- Synthetic lawn is a petrochemical that releases carcinogenic fumes. City of Bayswater residents already inhale significantly high amounts of carcinogenic pollutants from car exhaust fumes, car tyre and car brake air particulates.

The City of Bayswater has been unsuccessful in reducing rat running in my neighbourhood by their inability to install no-through roads. This additional air pollution with adversely affect senior citizens, children and pregnant women.

Elected members continually use social media with themselves promoting tree canopy. This social media promotion does not make a difference to the City of Bayswater's tree canopy coverage if they vote for items that damage it. Ultimately, elected members need to stop 'rubber stamping' the City of Bayswater Officer's recommendation and vote according to their elector's needs.

Item 10.5.2.2.1 Policy Review: Street Verges

Abigaille Perrotte, Morley

WHY SYNTHETIC (FAKE) GRASS SHOULD STAY BANNED ON VERGES

WHAT THIS IS ABOUT

The City's current rules say fake grass (synthetic turf) is not allowed on street verges. Council is now looking at changing that rule to allow it. This paper explains why the current ban should stay. It is based on real scientific studies, listed at the end.

THE SHORT VERSION

Fake grass is made of plastic. Over time it breaks down into tiny plastic bits that wash into our drains, creeks and rivers. It also gets much hotter than real grass or garden beds — hot enough to burn skin on a summer day. It contains chemicals that can be harmful to health, especially for children who play on it. And when it wears out after 10–15 years, it cannot be recycled — it just goes to landfill. Allowing it on verges would work against everything the Verge Policy is trying to achieve.

1. BAD FOR THE ENVIRONMENT

1.1 It breaks down into plastic pollution

Fake grass sheds tiny plastic pieces called microplastics all the time — from sun, rain, and people walking on it. A 2024 science review found that fake grass may cause 12% to 50% of all the microplastic pollution in the world. In Europe, about 16,000 tonnes of rubber crumbs wash off fake grass fields every year, mostly through rain. This is such a big problem that the European Union has banned this type of rubber infill.

Here is how much plastic one fake grass area can lose each year:

- Each fake grass area loses about 0.5% to 8% of its plastic fibres every year — that can be over 1,000 kilograms of plastic waste from one field, every single year.
- Studies found up to 20,000 plastic fibres a day washing into waterways from just one fake grass area.
- Because plastic does not break down naturally, this pollution does not stop — it keeps happening for the whole 10–15 years the fake grass is down.

These tiny plastic bits end up in our creeks, the Swan River, and eventually the ocean. Scientists have even found microplastics in human blood and lungs.

1.2 It makes flooding and drainage worse

A normal grass or garden verge soaks up rain like a sponge. This helps stop water rushing into the street drains all at once. Fake grass sits on a hard, packed base underneath, so it lets much less water soak in. This means more water runs off quickly into our drains — the same problem the City already worries about with paving and concrete on verges.

1.3 It gets dangerously hot — and this matters in Perth

Real grass stays cool because it releases moisture into the air, a bit like sweating. Fake grass is plastic, so it just absorbs the sun's heat and gets very hot. Studies have measured the difference:

- In Perth, real grass in full summer sun reached about 46°C. Fake grass measured elsewhere gets much hotter than that.
- One overseas study measured ordinary fake grass reaching 62.5°C, compared to just 35°C for real grass on the same hot day — a difference of over 27 degrees.
- A university study in the United States measured fake grass reaching 93°C on a sunny day, while real grass stayed under 38°C.

Surfaces above about 50°C can burn bare skin. That is a real safety risk for children, pets, and anyone walking barefoot on a Perth verge in summer. It also makes the whole street hotter — the opposite of what a “garden city” should be doing.

1.4 It kills off life in the soil

A verge with grass, gardens or trees supports insects, bees, and healthy soil. Covering the ground with a sealed plastic mat stops air, water and life from reaching the soil underneath, for as long as the fake grass stays down. This works directly against the City's own goal of “Verge Greening.”

2. BAD FOR PEOPLE'S HEALTH

2.1 “Forever chemicals” (PFAS)

Independent lab tests found harmful man-made chemicals called PFAS (often called “forever chemicals” because they never break down) in both the grass blades and the backing of fake grass products — not just in the rubber infill, as people used to think. Even the US Environmental Protection Agency has said fake grass contains chemicals known to cause cancer. PFAS chemicals have been linked to lower immunity in children, hormone problems, and increased cancer risk. Once fake grass is installed, these chemicals stay in place for as long as it is down.

2.2 Heavy metals and other harmful chemicals

A 2024 review of health studies on fake grass found levels of certain chemicals — including cadmium, mercury and zinc — that went above safe European limits. These chemicals can get onto skin or be swallowed, especially by young children who put things in their mouths. The review found this could raise the risk of cancer and other health problems in children who play on it regularly.

Turf makers do not have to say exactly what chemicals are in their products. Government testing in the US has found over 350 different chemicals in fake grass rubber infill — and there is no safety data at all for about half of them. This means the real health risk could be worse than we currently know.

2.3 Health experts are already worried

A children's health centre at a major US hospital (Mount Sinai) has called for a pause on new fake grass installations until it can be proven safe. Other health groups have linked fake grass chemicals to fertility problems, cancer risk and immune system issues. When health experts are already recommending

caution, a residential street verge — where children and pets play up close — is not the place to relax the current ban.

3. WHAT HAPPENS WHEN IT WEARS OUT

Fake grass usually needs replacing every 8 to 15 years. It is made of several layers of plastic and rubber glued together, so it cannot be recycled. When it is removed, it goes straight to landfill, where the plastic and chemicals stay for good. Every other verge treatment the City already allows — lawn, garden beds, woodchips, mulch — returns naturally to the earth. Fake grass never does.

4. WHY THE BAN SHOULD STAY

- It keeps polluting with plastic for its whole life — this is why the European Union has already restricted it.
- It gets dangerously hot, worse than measurements already taken in Perth of real grass in summer.
- It contains chemicals linked to cancer and health problems, in a place where children and pets play.
- It makes flooding and drainage worse and kills soil life, working against the City's own greening goals.
- It cannot be recycled and always ends up in landfill — unlike every other treatment currently allowed.

Based on this evidence, the City should keep its current rule that fake grass is never allowed as a verge treatment.

FINAL WORD

Every piece of fake grass laid down today is plastic and harmful chemicals that will sit on our verges for over a decade, then go to landfill forever. This is not guesswork — it is backed by real studies, including heat measurements taken right here in Perth. Allowing fake grass on our verges would trade a small amount of convenience for a long-lasting cost to our environment, our drains, our streets, and our children's health. The safest and smartest choice is to keep the current ban in place.

SOURCES USED

1. Ryan-Ndegwa, S. et al. Exploring the Human Health Impact of Artificial Turf Worldwide: A Systematic Review. Environmental Health Insights, 2024. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC11653453/>
2. Mechanisms of Generation and Ecological Impacts of Nano- and Microplastics from Artificial Turf Systems in Sports Facilities. Environments, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.3390/environments12040109>
3. Microplastic emissions and degradation mechanisms in artificial turf systems. Environmental Science: Advances (RSC), 2026. <https://pubs.rsc.org/ua/article/5/5/1252/1241330/Microplastic-emissions-and-degradation-mechanisms>
4. Microplastics from artificial turf versus hybrid turf. Wasser 3.0, 2025 (summarising Beyond Plastics 2024 and EU findings). <https://wasserdreinull.de/en/blog/microplastics-from-artificial-turf-versus-hybrid-turf/>
5. Position Statement on the Use of Artificial Turf Surfaces. Institute for Exposomic Research / Mount Sinai, 2025. <https://mountsinaixposomics.org/position-statement-on-the-use-of-artificial-turf-surfaces/>
6. Artificial Turf Health Risks. Institute for Exposomic Research / Mount Sinai. <https://mountsinaixposomics.org/artificial-turf/>

7. New Studies Show PFAS in Artificial Grass Blades and Backing. Environmental Working Group, 2019. <https://www.ewg.org/news-insights/news/new-studies-show-pfas-artificial-grass-blades-and-backing>
8. Dangerous Play: Studies find harmful 'forever chemicals' in artificial turf fields. Environment America, 2024. <https://environmentamerica.org/pennsylvania/center/updates/dangerous-play-studies-find-harmful-forever-chemicals-in-artificial-turf-fields/>
9. The Turf is Artificial, But the Harm is Very Real. Clean Water Action, 2024. <https://cleanwater.org/2024/09/16/turf-artificial-harm-very-real>
10. Artificial Turf. Washington State Department of Health. <https://doh.wa.gov/community-and-environment/schools/artificial-turf>
11. As the world heats up, so does the debate around artificial turf (citing UC San Diego, 2010). The New Lede, 2025. <https://www.thenewlede.org/2024/08/as-the-world-heats-up-so-does-the-debate-around-artificial-turf/>
12. Cooling artificial turf through evaporation from a subsurface water storage unit (Netherlands field trial). Frontiers in Sustainable Cities, 2024. <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/sustainable-cities/articles/10.3389/frsc.2024.1399858/full>
13. Artificial Grass Increases Urban Heat (citing Penn State University data). Youth Environmental Press Team, 2024. <https://www.yept.org/latest-stories/artificial-grass-increases-urban-heat>
14. Intense summer heat fluxes in artificial turf harm people and environment (Perth, WA surface temperature data). ScienceDirect, 2016. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0169204616301992>
15. Dynamic material flow analysis of microplastics lost from artificial turfs: A case study from Norway. ScienceDirect, 2025. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048969725007946>

Item 10.5.2.2.1 Policy Review: Street Verges**Georgina Ker, Bedford**

This deputation is not in support of the Committee's Recommendation to council. I would like to see the ban on synthetic lawn as a verge treatment continue.

In 2024, when the City clarified that synthetic lawn was not a permissible verge treatment, I was pleased to see this step in the right direction towards improving the health and biodiversity of our suburbs. Since then, community voices and other local governments around Australia have continued to speak up against using synthetic lawn on verges. Why does Bayswater want to go backwards?

The arguments against include:

- the urban heat island effect
- lack of permeability
- microplastics and the impact on human health
- loss of biodiversity
- impact on trees

Attached is a photo of a verge I ride past every day in West Ward. The synthetic lawn was installed before the 2024 policy, so I am not alleging the owners have done anything wrong, but in 2018 there were three healthy street trees here (planted approximately 20 years ago).

By 2020, they began showing signs of decline. By 2022, one was dead. It was replaced, and the replacement died. The second now looks pretty dead to me, and the third is rapidly heading the same

way. While I appreciate that the amended policy requires a buffer zone for trees, how do we know this is enough? We simply cannot afford to be losing mature trees for the sake of this plastic ground covering. The amended policy also fails to establish what happens if a tree planted within synthetic lawn dies – does the adjacent property owner have to pay to replace it or is this a further burden on the City?

The number of synthetic lawns on verges across the City is relatively low. This indicates that although there have been failings in publicizing and enforcing the 2024 verge treatment policy, most property owners in the City don't want synthetic lawns. I'd rather see the City work with this small number of affected property owners to come to a solution, for example a transition or grace period and advice on other suitable low-maintenance verge treatments, than see this backwards step in sustainability and environmental health.

The officers' report also notes that no public consultation has taken place on this matter. If Council is not comfortable endorsing a policy that outright retains the ban on synthetic lawn, I would like to see a public consultation process via Engage Bayswater to gauge attitudes across the City.

