

Public Questions In Writing

ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING – 29 April 2025

Kevin Russell Maylands

Item 10.3.2 Maylands Lakes - Environmental Masterplan Update

Question 1

Page 343 of agenda (Nutrient inputs) shows 15% N input & 1% P. From surface runoff. Surface runoff is 27% of total water input. This is a significant proportion of nutrient input not being captured, especially as identified as a terminal lake system. The hydrologist now on the SAP advised in 2016, that the principal source of nutrients was via the drains Yet in 2024 stated didn't know the source of the nutrients. Why is this not being addressed?

Response 1

Maylands Lakes is a key asset for managing urban stormwater in the Peninsula Estate. Managing nutrients entering the lakes via the drainage system will be addressed as part of landscape design and reduction in fertiliser use in the catchment.

Question 2

Establish an offline biofiltration system (page 349) referenced as a possible solution that may work but no funding provision. I assume this is to address stormwater runoff? Is this similar to stormwater drainage pit treatments? If a correct assumption why no inclusion in costings in light of the preceding point/question?

Response 2

The list provided on page 349 contains all possible actions to address water quality at Maylands Lakes. These actions were ranked utilising a multi-criteria analysis (MCA) to provide a final list of 25 prioritised actions.

The offline biofiltration system mentioned is primarily aimed at reducing nutrients within the water column rather than addressing stormwater drainage pit treatments. An internal biofiltration system was selected through the MCA to reduce nutrients within the water column. This has been scheduled as part of phase 3, with indicative costings provided on page 353.

Question 3

The most critical question of all under risk management considerations (page 396) CoB may not have financial capacity to deliver planned services. What steps have been taken to ensure

that costs do not fall onto ratepayers and are adequate for full implementation of all proposed stages? Is there any currently allocated funding?

Response 3

The environmental restoration of Maylands Lakes is a key advocacy project, and the City has engaged the state and federal government to explore funding opportunities.

The City has existing allocated funding as part of the Federal Government's Urban Rivers Program.

The officer's recommendation to Council is to allocate \$2.4M in the draft 2025/26 Budget to implement Phase 1.

Jessica Raschi

Bayswater

Item 10.3.1 - Frank Drago Soccer Precinct Redevelopment - Feasibility and Advocacy Findings Report

Question 1

Given that substantial portions of Frank Drago Reserve are leased to clubs and not always freely accessible, can the council provide a breakdown of how much genuinely unrestricted public open space will be available within walking distance for new and existing residents around Meltham?

Response 1

Frank Drago Reserve Soccer Precinct is available and accessible to the community as public open space, apart from when pitches have been formally booked by users.

Question 2

The redevelopment of Frank Drago Reserve has started without clear information about how much space will remain freely accessible for casual public use — especially with more people moving into the area with the land rezoning around Meltham station. While Frank Drago Reserve is classified as public open space, significant areas are regularly fenced off, locked, or require payment for access.

How is the council ensuring truly accessible, casual public open space — not just club-controlled areas — for all residents?

Response 2

Frank Drago Reserve Soccer Precinct is available and accessible to the community as public open space, apart from when pitches have been formally booked by users

Pamela Medlen

Bayswater

Item 10.3.1 - Frank Drago Soccer Precinct Redevelopment - Feasibility and Advocacy Findings Report

Question 1

Can the City of Bayswater council defer making any decisions on the future and funding of Frank Drago Soccer Precinct Redevelopment (Item 10.3.1 on Tuesday's agenda) until there is a complete council present i.e. when the two vacant West Ward positions have been filled, due to the fact the project affects the West Ward residents?

Response 1

The question is noted and will be considered by Council in relation to the item.

Question 2

Can the Councillors see that a commitment of \$6million (plus a further \$7 million for stage two, plus the increased cost of maintenance over the lifetime of the precinct) of ratepayers money to the Frank Drago Soccer Precinct Redevelopment is excessive for a club that has just 200 senior playing members (just 1000 members all up) when similar amounts of money were put towards projects such as Bayswater Waves and Bayswater Sport and Rec centre - which are multi-sport and multi-use, not single-club memberships?

Response 2

The question is noted and will be considered by Council in relation to the item.

Question 3

Can the Council assure the local residents who use the park daily as a social community hub and dog walking space and who are frequently mentioned in the report as being the biggest group of users of the park, that they will still be able to use the space as it is currently used?

Response 3

There are no plans to amend access at this point in time however Council does review its dog exercise areas periodically.

Melissa Ford

Bayswater

Item 10.3.1 - Frank Drago Soccer Precinct Redevelopment - Feasibility and Advocacy Findings Report

Question 1

Loss of public open space is a big concern; a number of locals use the reserve twice a day, including for dog walking. Only one line in the PFS acknowledges these community members,

for whom this is an important resource. Noting that during matches and training, access is prioritised to the soccer club, what public access will be available outside these times? Will all grassed areas be fenced and locked by the soccer club? What green space will still be accessible to the public for recreation?

Response 1

The intention is to maintain the current access arrangement.

Tammi Doyle

Bayswater

Item 10.3.1 - Frank Drago Soccer Precinct Redevelopment - Feasibility and Advocacy Findings Report

Question 1

Council, how many Bayswater Soccer Club members, both as a percentage of its total membership and as a number, reside in Bayswater suburb and Bayswater Shire?

Response 1

This information is unknown and not recorded by the City in relation to any club operating within the City.

Question 2

Under the redevelopment proposal, will the official Soccer precinct expand to include the north east end, and if so, with the astro turf pitches be made available to other sports such as hockey to use?

Response 2

The soccer precinct is retained within areas currently used for soccer training. Any future proposed small sided area, whether astro turf or not may be considered for other suitable sports such as hockey.

Question 3

Will all proposed facilities, be made available to Bayswater Soccer Club non-members and if so, what entity receives income generated from that usage? (E.g. northern astro pitches, gym facilities etc)?

Response 3

The plans are at concept stage currently. The final management responsibility of any building facilities are yet to be determined and finalised. Bayswater City Soccer Club currently hold the lease to the clubroom facilities and as the long-term term tenant are intended to be the head tenant moving forward. In order to maximise occupancy and usage some facilities are very likely to be accessible to non members.

Ian Harris

Bayswater

Item 10.3.1 - Frank Drago Soccer Precinct Redevelopment - Feasibility and Advocacy Findings Report

Question 1

The findings report indicates that to complete both stages of the project to City will need to find \$13.5 million, will the City have to increase rates to service the loan(s), if so how much extra can the residents expect their rates to increase.

Response 1

The City contribution in relation to stage 1 is recommended to be sourced from the Major Capital Works Reserve with no impact to rates. Proposed future stage 2 works remain pending and subject to future funding.

Lynsey Strachan

Bayswater

Item 10.3.1 - Frank Drago Soccer Precinct Redevelopment - Feasibility and Advocacy Findings Report

Question 1

Can the Council please explain how the proposed redevelopment relating to the new pitches and the available open green space will still support free and open access to residents and dog walking. In the proposed development the current green space is taken up by pitches. Can the council confirm dog walking will be allowed on the pitches or will be it limited to the perimeter? are the pitches going to be individually fenced?

Response 1

No changes are proposed to the existing access arrangements.

David Lunn

Bayswater

Item 10.3.1 - Frank Drago Soccer Precinct Redevelopment - Feasibility and Advocacy Findings Report

Question 1

How can Council assure ratepayers that casual recreational users (esp dog walkers) of the Frank Drago Reserve (some 50% of community engagement survey respondents) won't be disadvantaged as a result of the proposed development. The proposed concept plan essentially describes a precinct almost exclusively for soccer club users and patrons. Maintaining public access (to presumably permit people walking around and across unused playing fields) seems incidental consideration at best.

Response 1

No changes are proposed to the existing access arrangements.

Paul Bradley

Bayswater

Item 10.3.1 - Frank Drago Soccer Precinct Redevelopment - Feasibility and Advocacy Findings Report

Question 1

In the feasibility the BCSC noted a desire to have connection with junior teams that play at Emberson Reserve. Did the Council look at the relocation of the BCSC to a larger reserve that would enable all sides to play in close proximity? E.g. Redevelop Emberson (less site works req.), the club can access Waltham and Crimea reserves for other teams (230m and 740m from Emberson). Has this option been looked at as a better outcome for BCSC than redeveloping a space that the club has outgrown?

Response 1

A feasibility was conducted mid 2024 comparing and considering alternative sites. Frank Drago Reserve was considered as a suitable site to accommodate both soccer training and match play whilst Emberson and other reserves are used by Bayswater City Soccer Club and other sporting clubs.

Question 2

In the Feasibility study, the report competitor analysis looks at facilities that have not recently been redeveloped. The feasibility (and council given it is committing over \$12 million to this project (and borrowing money)) also states the desire of council to incorporate community into the redevelopment through things like a cafe, running tracks and playground. The proposal before council is very uninviting for the community and seems to be driven only for needs of the BCSC - enclosed fencing, reduced/no open space, etc. Has the council consider looking at other developments that have been completed by other councils recently for other sports that provide more contemporary outcomes for the community and club? (I would reference recent redevelopments of East Fremantle Oval and Claremont Oval (also Tier 1 semi-professional sports teams) which have no border fencing and have been landscaped to allow community access and multiple uses (play grounds, personal training, bbqs, etc))

Response 2

Yes, the consultant preparing the Frank Drago report in conjunction with the City also developed the concept and business case for a range of other sites including the stated East Fremantle Oval example.

Matthew Morgan

Bayswater

Subject: Traffic Calming on Traylen Road, Bayswater

Question 1

By Council design, Traylen rd has become a 'rat run'. Belmont residents continue to 'rat run' through Traylen rd to avoid traffic on Guildford and Garratt Road. Bayswater residents are subjected to higher risk of road trauma, dangerous speeding, road rage, noise and air pollution; and less vibrant, active streets. This convenience to City of Belmont residents causes hardship for Bayswater residents.

Does the Bayswater Council value Belmont residents more than its own residents on Traylen Rd?

Response 1

The City has responded to questions of a similar nature at its Ordinary Council Meetings of 25 February 2025 and 25 March 2025.

Question 2

Traylen road has been confirmed as an unsafe road (tabled in December 2024 Ordinary Meeting). The council has decided against installing speed cushions and has indefinitely delayed LCURS. It has been noted that the council have installed temporary Variable Message Boards to remind drivers of the 50km/h speed limit. The community appreciates the council has acknowledged a problem, however, this does not physically force drivers to slow down or deter 'rat running'. What other measures is the council doing to improve Traylen Road?

Response 2

Traffic calming treatments have been approved by Main Roads and are currently awaiting funding availability for implementation under the Low Cost Urban Road Safety (LCURS) Program.

Given the delay in implementing LCURS treatments, Council will be considering an allocation in the draft 2025/26 Budget. In the meantime, the City will explore the feasibility of temporary measures.

Question 3

Traylen road was identified on the Safe Routes to School program. A traffic count survey conducted November 2023 (tabled December 2024 Ordinary Meeting) confirmed the 85th percentile are driving dangerous speeds. Since then, the Council decided against installing temporary speed cushions (email 14 December 2023) and have indefinitely postponed LCURS program. Why has the council not made any permanent safety improvements to Traylen Road?

Response 3

The City has prepared designs for the installation of treatments under the LCURS Program. These treatments will be implemented once funding becomes available.