

# Deputation List

## Agenda Briefing Forum – 2 December 2025

Deputations will be heard at the Agenda Briefing Forum at **7pm, Tuesday 2 December 2025**.

The items will then be considered by Council at its Ordinary Council Meeting, scheduled for **7pm, Tuesday 9 December 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 Expression of Interest – Lease of Premises – 14 King William Street Bayswater</b>	
David Hahn, Director of The Boring Business Co Pty Ltd (spokesperson) and Cheree Veletta.	Not in support <i>*has provided deputation notes as detailed below</i>
Tyler Wood (spokesperson) and Greg Da Rui on behalf of the Bayswater Traders Association	Not in support
<b>10.4.1 Proposed Two Grouped Dwellings – Lot 324, 24 Sopwith Elbow, Maylands</b>	
Gerard Wiebenga, Mark Osmond, Peter Robinson and Paul Owen	Not in support <i>*has provided deputation notes as detailed below</i>
Kien Neoh	Not in support

### Written deputations

No written deputation requests have been received.

## 10.1.2 Expression of Interest – Lease of Premises – 14 King William Street Bayswater David Hahn and Cheree Veletta

### Deputation

Spokesperson:	The Boring Business Co Pty Ltd, trading as Fabric Laundrobar. David Charles Hahn, Director. 58 Stuart Street, Maylands, WA 6051
Reference:	Agenda Item 10.1.2 Expression of Interest – Lease of Premises – 14 King William St, Bayswater
Time and Date:	7.00pm, 2 December 2025
Venue:	Agenda Briefing Forum, Embleton Room, Civic Centre, 61 Broun Avenue, Morley
Summary:	This deputation is <u>against</u> the recommendation being considered.

### **Acknowledgement of Country**

We acknowledge the Whadjuk people of the Noongar Nation as the Traditional Custodians of the land on which this meeting is held and pay our respects to Elders past, present and emerging.

### **Submission**

Agenda Item 10.1.2 Expression of Interest – Lease of Premises – 14 King William St, Bayswater

I, as Director of The Boring Business Co Pty Ltd, trading as Fabric Laundrobar, wish to register my deputation against the recommendation being considered with regard to this agenda item.

Of the three submissions I believe ours most thoroughly addresses the Council's objectives for the site.

It will provide local residents access to previously unavailable services, it will provide both employment and the opportunity for the startup of several small businesses, it will use care and respect to adaptively re-use the heritage listed building, and, it will drive visitation and traffic to the precinct that all local businesses will benefit from.

I wish to bring to the Council's attention key points of our business plan and how they best suit the Council's desired outcomes for the Old Bayswater Post Office. We believe that,

- (a) Our proposal has been incorrectly (negatively) evaluated against the EOI Evaluation Criteria,
- (b) Best fulfils the Key Result Areas 2.1, 2.2 and 4.3 of the City of Bayswater Council Plan 2025-35, and
- (c) Comprehensively addresses the four points outlined in the Conclusion/Recommendation.

#### **(a) EOI Evaluation Criteria**

##### **1. Business Concept (40%)**

*Please outline the proposed use of the space e.g. food and beverage concept and how your business contributes to or compliments the activation and enjoyment of the Bayswater town centre.*

There are currently no laundromat or dog wash facilities in the suburbs of Bayswater, Bedford and Embleton, a population of 24,604 residents (2021 census). The addition of a laundromat adds value to the current retail offering in the Bayswater Village precinct, providing another drawcard.

Our trading hours are long (6am to 9pm, 7 days per week), extending visitation/traffic to the area.

Laundromats are a long dwell time shopping mission. Inclusion of new tech such SMS notifications will allow customers to frequent other retail and hospitality businesses whilst doing their laundry.

Our Wash-Dry-Fold ("WDF") service provides opportunities for local residents such as stay-at-home parents to start their own small business, providing further employment and small business start-up opportunities with no capital outlay.

Our smart parcel lockers which assist in out-of-hours drop off and collection of WDF orders will be offered to all local retailers to fulfil deliveries out of hours to their customers, strengthening their retail offer.

Part of the building will be offered to another complementary small business, with fitout part-paid for by ourselves. This could be a tailor, alterations or cobbler, or a business that can take advantage of the long dwell time such as a nail salon. This provides yet another new business to the precinct and gives another person/persons the chance to start their own business with little capital outlay.

## **2. Business Plan and Financials (20%)**

*Please provide a detailed overview of the proposed business including financial statements and cash flows that make your business viable under the agreed rental amount.*

Our business is robust, profitable and sustainable as outlined in the financials provided in EOI submission.

## **3. Experience and Personnel (40%).**

*Please provide details of relevant experience including:*

- a. Previous operations and locations;*
- b. Number of key staff and experience;*
- c. Are you an investor or an independent operator?*

I have 30+ years in sales, marketing and business development spanning several countries, several industries and for some of the world's biggest and most successful companies, including Budweiser, Radisson Hotels and Sainsbury's Supermarkets overseas, and Red Rooster, Cadbury and Peters and Brownes locally. Most recently, 10 years at Dome Coffees Australia.

I know how to build, market and run successful, profitable brands and businesses.

My business partner Cheree Veletta similarly has 30+ years starting, developing and running a series of her own successful small businesses, spanning hospitality and retail. Currently Cheree is the visionary behind the successful cult barbershop brand Uncle Joe's.

Together we will be hands-on operators of Fabric Laundrobar, being the public face, working IN and ON the business.

### **(b) Key Result Areas 2.1, 2.2 and 4.3 of the City of Bayswater Council Plan 2025-35**

#### **Key Result Area: Built**

*Outcome 2.1 A Connected and Accessible City*

*Objective 2.1.2 Create liveable neighbourhoods and centres that include consideration of our built heritage.*

A laundromat is a cornerstone retail concept in local communities and shopping precincts worldwide. Here in Perth there are more than 60 laundromats across the city, with the suburbs of Bayswater, Bedford and Embleton being a rare exception.

Cheree and I have a passion for adaptive re-use of heritage buildings. Both Uncle Joes locations are contained within heritage buildings in Perth and Fremantle. During my time at Dome we re-purposed a 120-year old flour mill and redeveloped the circa-1865 heritage listed Farmers' Home Hotel into

luxury, award winning boutique hotels, bringing to 17 the number of heritage listed properties that Dome has redeveloped.

*Outcome 2.2 Built Infrastructure that Meets Current and Future Community Needs*  
*Objective 2.2.3 Plan, build and maintain current and future assets.*

The area surrounding the Bayswater Train Station has been earmarked for future medium-rise, high-density residential development. These residents are traditionally heavy users of laundromats, so the need for a local laundromat facility will only grow over time.

**Key Result Area: Economic**

*Outcome 4.3 Sustainable Thriving Businesses and Employment*

*Objective 4.3.1 Actively build relationships to support local businesses and increase local job opportunities.*

As outlined previously, our business provides employment opportunities for local residents and the opportunity to start and run their own small business.

The smart parcel lockers strengthen other small businesses by enabling out-of-hours fulfillment of their orders.

The long dwell time of laundry services encourages customers to frequent other local businesses whilst completing their weekly laundry.

**(c) Conclusion/Recommendation**

*(a) Tenancy of 5 years;*

We are proposing a long lease arrangement of 5+5, providing stability and certainty to the Council on the future of the site.

*(b) Rental amount as contained in **Confidential Attachment 1***

If our offer is considered insufficient to the Council we are open to an arrangement whereby there is a fixed portion of rent plus additional % of turnover once a certain threshold is met.

*(c) Outgoings paid by the tenant;*

Agreed

*(d) The premise is leased in an "as is" condition and the City will not be undertaking any upgrade to the premises (including fixtures and fittings) as part of the lease, with the exception of the City agreeing to remove the teller desks left in situ by the previous tenant.*

Agreed

**Summary**

In summary we believe our offer is best suited to fulfilling the Council's needs and objectives for the site and request that Council take this into consideration when making their final decision.

**Item 10.4.1 Proposed Two Grouped Dwellings – Lot 324, 24 Sopwith Elbow, Maylands**

**Gerard Wiebenga, Kien Neoh, Mark Osmond, Peter Robinson and Paul Owen**

***City of Bayswater (Planning Dept) for the Agenda  
Deposition opposing DA25-0275.***

---

**This deposition objects to the approval of DA-0275, the construction of two x 3 storey dwellings, 24 Sopwith Elbow Maylands.**

- 1 53 residents all of whom are owners of their respective homes whom immediately surround the proposed development at 24 Sopwith Elbow have submitted a petition objecting to DA-0275.
- 2 The petition was submitted on August 31 2025.
- 3 The DA shows two houses each being 3 storeys.
- 4 The petition was issued to the council in August, prior to the council elections and is yet to be considered.
- 5 In the interim, the planning department has since approved the DA without any consideration to the objections raised by the 53 residents on the petition.
- 6 On that basis, five of the residents of the petition have deputised Mr Gerard Wiebenga of 25 Sopwith Elbow Maylands to appeal the decision from the planning department.
- 7 The following is a summary of the objections raised in the petition against DA25-0275 and of which the planning department has either not considered and or has failed to apply sound judgement in their approval of the DA.
- 8 We therefore object to the approval of DA-0275 for the reasons as outlined in the following table and request the council to also reject the DA25-0275 at 24 Sopwith Elbow Maylands.



# Deputation List

***City of Bayswater (Planning Dept) for the Agenda  
Deposition opposing DA25-0275.***

Item	Petitioners' Initial Objections (Aug 31)	City of Bayswater Planning Department approval justification (9 Dec 25 agenda)	Petitioners' Comments objecting to the approval
1	<p><b>Non-compliance with R Codes for R40 zoning</b></p> <p>I. Maximum wall height for R40 is 7m. Proposed DA has total wall height of 7.96m, exceeding by nearly 1m.</p> <p>II. Only 2 storey homes are allowed for R40. Proposed DA had 3 stories as also assessed by the City's planning department.</p>	<p>Building Height – Justifies satisfying the design principles of Clause 3.2 of R codes, as proposal achieves a consistent scale, bulk and massing in relation to its adjoining dwellings.</p> <p>Planning department notes the 3<sup>rd</sup> storey is considered a "loft" or mezzanine level and not a "storey" under the planning framework.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Initially the planning dept originally identified DA25-0275 as a 3-storey development. And was rejected on that basis.</li> <li>2 Building height – the houses on the street have a smaller scale, bulk and mass as compared the proposed development at 24 Sopwith, hence there is no consistency with its surrounding properties to justify the use of design principles Clause 3.2 of the R codes as stated by the planning office</li> <li>3 The DA was initially rejected on the basis it exceeded the 2 storey limit by having 3 stories. The updated DA has simply relabelled the 3<sup>rd</sup> Storey as a <b>Loft/Mezzanine level</b>. The R codes do not distinguish between a Loft/Mezzanine level and a 3<sup>rd</sup> storey.</li> <li>4 The DA's 3rd storey, has been re-labelled on the revised DA, but the functionality and design remains the same with the intent of using the area as a 3rd storey, which is a breach of the R code.</li> <li>5 To comply with the R code requirement of not permitting the 3<sup>rd</sup> storey, in this instance the developer has resubmitted an DA and simply removed the internal partition walls in the 3<sup>rd</sup> storey and labelled the area as a <b>loft</b> on the DA. The structure remains the same and can be easily readapted to the initial proposal that was rejected by the planning department. Refer to the developers drawing A302. (On the initial DA and the revised DA)</li> <li>6 On the above basis, the planning department has redefined the 3<sup>rd</sup> storey as a <b>loft</b> and therefore approved the DA without any justifiable application of the R codes.</li> <li>7 The petitioners request the council to reject the proposal on the basis that the design intent remains for a 3<sup>rd</sup> storey and can be easily adapted back to its original design that was previously rejected.</li> </ol>

**City of Bayswater (Planning Dept) for the Agenda  
Deposition opposing DA25-0275.**

Item	Petitioners' Initial Objections (Aug 31)	City of Bayswater Planning Department approval justification (9 Dec 25 agenda)	Petitioners' Comments objecting to the approval
			<p>8 Should the council confer with the planning department to approve the 3<sup>rd</sup> storey loft, then to ensure the loft cannot be reverted back into the 3<sup>rd</sup> storey, we request the following modifications to the design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The loft windows overlooking the lake in the loft of units 1 &amp; 2 be removed such they never installed.</li> <li>b) The 3<sup>rd</sup> storey windows previously purposed as toilet windows be removed.</li> <li>c) The remaining windows facing south to 22 Sopwith are to be screened and unopenable. This is a requirement under the R codes under privacy requirements that was omitted by the planning department.</li> <li>d) All planned services to the 3rd storey loft toilets and bathrooms (sewerage and water) that were initially planned, are <b>NOT</b> to be installed or provisioned for future installation.</li> </ul>
2	<p><b>Breach of 4m lake backing setback and primary street setback of the MREDP</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Lake wall setback of 4.0m has been breached. The upper levels of both units encroach into the 4m set back to the lake wall due to the cantilevered design.</li> <li>2 Primary street setback. Unit 1 especially the upper floors breach this setback requirement of a minimum of 4.5m and average of 6m from the lot boundary.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Lake wall setback – States that the DAP's alternating setbacks are considered to enhance the development's relationship to the lake, and is considered acceptable and consistent with the relevant objectives of the MREDP.</li> <li>2 Primary street setback: The planning department has not addressed this and the setbacks remain in breach of the R codes.</li> </ul>	<p>The petitioners' object to the approval on the following basis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 The 2 objectives of the MREDP is to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) <b>Facilitate development that is consistent with the established local character.</b> The encroachment of the 2 upper stories within 1.9m of the lake wall is <b>not consistent with the 100 or more surrounding houses</b> around the lake of which have at least a 4m setback from the lake wall.</li> <li>(ii) <b>Ensure that development does not unduly impact upon local amenity.</b> The larger building bulk due the upper floors cantilevered design would unduly impact local amenity as the houses south of the DAP would have their views towards Lake Bungana partially blocked. There are no other houses that have a cantilevered design over the 4m setback of the wall.</li> <li>(iii) Contrary to the statement noted by the planner, the design <b>does not "enhance the development"</b> This is a subjective statement and not noted or endorsed by any R code</li> <li>(iv) Rather, the bulk, overhang and mass of size <b>detracts</b> from the lakes natural beauty and surrounds and is not consistent with any other house surrounding the lake.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

**City of Bayswater (Planning Dept) for the Agenda  
Deposition opposing DA25-0275.**

Item	Petitioners' Initial Objections (Aug 31)	City of Bayswater Planning Department approval justification (9 Dec 25 agenda)	Petitioners' Comments objecting to the approval
			<p>2 Primary Street setback – Was not addressed by the planning department and the DA remains in breach of the R code on this criteria</p> <p><b>Note:</b> The city of Bayswater has a requirement to ensure access to the lake wall for maintenance purposes. The retaining walls were constructed at least 25 years ago. It is foreseeable that in the near future some form of wall maintenance work may be required. The approved DA has a cantilevered building over the lake wall setback, which would impede the access and operation of equipment need form maintenance.</p>
3	<p><b>Requirement for geotechnical report and lake wall report</b></p> <p>1 Geotechnical report: As part of the applicant's land subdivision approval from WAPC, a pre-works geotechnical report was required.</p> <p>2 Lake retaining wall structural report: The City required this engineers report as part of the DAP.</p>	<p>1 Geotechnical report – The 9 Dec 25 agenda is silent on the status of the WAPC geotechnical report.</p> <p>2 Lake wall report - City has received report stating that the retaining wall is capable of support the additional loads associated with the development.</p>	<p>1 <b>Geotechnical report:</b></p> <p>I. Matter not addressed by the planning department</p> <p>II. As stated in the petition, the geotechnical report is critical as it help ensure that the substrate and surface are structurally stable enough to support the planned development and will not impact the lake, land slippage or impact the neighbouring properties.</p> <p>2 <b>Lake wall structural report</b></p> <p>I. The council previously admitted it not have the original design drawings and structural details of the wall.</p> <p>II. In the absence of these critical documents needed to assess the structural integrity of the wall, the petitioners request a copy of the engineers report obtained by the developer.</p> <p>III. The terms of reference for the engineers' wall report have not been identified or are visible to the petitioners and as such may be inadequate.</p> <p>IV. We anticipate the engineers report of which was obtained by the developer, will have provided an <b>engineer's certification</b> stating the wall has the structural integrity and is designed such that the wall and the substrate of the block and surrounding areas including the lake and the environment, will <b>not</b> be impacted by the current DA.</p>

**City of Bayswater (Planning Dept) for the Agenda  
Deposition opposing DA25-0275.**

Item	Petitioners' Initial Objections (Aug 31)	City of Bayswater Planning Department approval justification (9 Dec 25 agenda)	Petitioners' Comments objecting to the approval
			<p>V. Should both the wall and geotechnical reports confirm and provide the assurance to meet the above criteria, the petitioners concerns will have been addressed.</p>
4	<p><b>Visual privacy impact to southern lot 22 Sopwith Elbow</b></p> <p>1 The petition identified breach of R codes in relation to visual privacy breach for units 1 &amp; 2 onto 22 Sopwith Elbow.</p>	<p>1 The City's planning department has required that the south facing windows of the lofts of Units 1 &amp; 2 be screened/obscured. (Page 141 of the 9 Dec 25 agenda)</p>	<p>1 To rectify the visual privacy breach of the lofts/mezzanine floors (3<sup>rd</sup> Storey), the obscured windows should <b>not</b> be able to be opened. However, the diagram (page 140 of the agenda) shows that the south facing windows can be opened to allow natural cross ventilation. This is consistent with (page 141 of the agenda) that shows the units still has south facing awning and sliding windows that can be opened even if obscured. This is still a breach of the visual privacy requirements of the R codes.</p> <p>2 We request the matter be rectified as per the R codes.</p> <p>3 This was also noted in item 1 above.</p>
5	<p><b>Non-compliance with R-codes</b></p> <p>1 Common Bin areas - R Codes 5.4.4 clause C4.6 requires the provision of a communal pick-up area/areas to store all rubbish bins and this be fully screened. <b>The common bin areas were not identified in the DAP plans.</b></p> <p>2 Clothes drying area: The clothes drying areas of both units are located within the 4m setback from the lake wall, making them clearly visible to the residents of Hinkler Loop and Tourer Court</p>	<p>City officers have undertaken a full assessment of the proposal against the requirements of the City's planning framework which demonstrates it meets the standards for waste management, vehicle access, external areas, visual privacy and overshadowing.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In relation to common bin areas and clothes drying area concerns. The City's response does not address the non-compliance with State R codes requirements.</li> <li>• Also, it does not detail specifically how these areas of non-compliance have been addressed.</li> <li>• The current plans in 9 Dec 25 agenda do not provide alternative locations to appropriately address these 2 issues.</li> <li>• On this basis the DA remains in breach of the R codes.</li> </ul>

***City of Bayswater (Planning Dept) for the Agenda  
Deposition opposing DA25-0275.***

Item	Petitioners' Initial Objections (Aug 31)	City of Bayswater Planning Department approval justification (9 Dec 25 agenda)	Petitioners' Comments objecting to the approval
	and general public. This breaches R Codes clause 5.4.4 P4.2 and C4.7.		
6	<p><b>Ensuring compliance with City's DAP approval conditions and advice notes</b></p> <p>As part of their conditional approval of DA25-0275, the City's officer required 14 conditions and 10 Advice notes be complied with by the developer.</p>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 How will the City ensure that these conditions imposed on the developer be monitored and met during and after the construction of the buildings?</li> <li>2 For context, the sediment and site debris control netting installed on the lake wall fencing on 24 Sopwith Elbow has failed, and remains unrectified</li> <li>3 We would appreciate if the City provide the petitioners' with their proposed compliance monitoring plan for DA25-0275 noting the frequency of monitoring and how any non-compliance will be addressed.</li> </ol>