

Agenda Briefing Forum Summary Notes

Meeting	Agenda Briefing Forum – for Ordinary Council Meeting – 22 September 2026			
Location	Council Chambers			
Date	15 September 2026	Start Time	7:01 pm	Finish Time 9:23 pm

1. ATTENDANCE

<u>Members</u> Mayor Filomena Piffaretti Cr Elli Petersen-Pik – Deputy Mayor Cr Calla Loiacono Cr Steven Ostaszewskyj Cr Cale Black Cr Donovan MacDonald <u>Leave of Absence</u> Nil. Public: 20	<u>Officers</u> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Jeremy Edwards</td><td>Chief Executive Officer</td></tr> <tr> <td>Bianca Sandri</td><td>Executive Manager Strategic Projects</td></tr> <tr> <td>Catherine Halsall</td><td>Acting Director Corporate Services</td></tr> <tr> <td>Bryce Coelho</td><td>Acting Director Infrastructure Assets</td></tr> <tr> <td>Amanda Albrecht</td><td>Manager Governance and Strategy</td></tr> <tr> <td>Dan Barber</td><td>Manager Parks and Gardens</td></tr> <tr> <td>Adrian Di Nella</td><td>Acting Manager Property and Economic Development</td></tr> <tr> <td>Emily Dempsey</td><td>Governance Advisor</td></tr> </table> <u>Apologies</u> Cr Anthony Pittaway Cr Michelle Sutherland Cr Nat Latter Kym Leahy, Director Corporate Services Ryan Hall, Director Community Services Luke Botica, Director Infrastructure and Assets	Jeremy Edwards	Chief Executive Officer	Bianca Sandri	Executive Manager Strategic Projects	Catherine Halsall	Acting Director Corporate Services	Bryce Coelho	Acting Director Infrastructure Assets	Amanda Albrecht	Manager Governance and Strategy	Dan Barber	Manager Parks and Gardens	Adrian Di Nella	Acting Manager Property and Economic Development	Emily Dempsey	Governance Advisor
Jeremy Edwards	Chief Executive Officer																
Bianca Sandri	Executive Manager Strategic Projects																
Catherine Halsall	Acting Director Corporate Services																
Bryce Coelho	Acting Director Infrastructure Assets																
Amanda Albrecht	Manager Governance and Strategy																
Dan Barber	Manager Parks and Gardens																
Adrian Di Nella	Acting Manager Property and Economic Development																
Emily Dempsey	Governance Advisor																

2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST SUMMARY

The following disclosures of interest were made at the Agenda Briefing Forum and will also apply at the Ordinary Council Meeting when the matters are considered:

Name	Item No.	Type of Interest	Nature of Interest
Cr Cale Black	10.5.2.2.3	Impartial	I am a social Member of Bedford Bowling Club, Bedford Bowling Club and BMDCC – all mentioned in the Officers report.
Cr Steven Ostaszewskyj	10.1.3	Impartial	I have an association with the Morley Windmills Sports Club, having been a member and Committee Member. I know people from the three clubs and still keep in contact with them. I have met with the Presidents of the Morley Windmills Sports Club and the Morley Windmills Soccer Clubs to understand their perspectives on this matter.
Cr Calla Loiacono	10.5.2.2.3	Impartial	I am a Committee Member of the Bedford Morley Cricket Club and know a lot of members from the other Clubs.

3. DEPUTATIONS

In person deputations

In person deputations were received by the Council in the Chamber.

10.1.2 Market Engagement Development Opportunity - 92 Railway Parade, Bayswater

1. In relation to item 10.1.2, Glenn Morley spoke on the item.

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

1. In relation to item 10.1.3, Cynthia Huet de Froberville spoke on the item;
2. In relation to item 10.1.3, Susan Phonsongkham, Isobel Dalton, Stephen Peters and Ben Leaver spoke *in support* of the officer's recommendation;
3. In relation to item 10.1.3, Garth Hokinson spoke on the item;
4. In relation to item 10.1.3, John Dols spoke on the item;
5. In relation to item 10.1.3, Wendy Garstone spoke on the item.

10.5.2.2.1 Policy Review: Street Verges

1. In relation to item 10.5.2.2.1, Wendy Garstone spoke *in opposition* to the officer's recommendation;
2. In relation to item 10.5.2.2.1, Aileen O'Rourke spoke *in opposition* to the officer's recommendation.

Written deputations

Written deputations were circulated to Council and copies provided on the City's website.

10.1.2 Market Engagement Development Opportunity - 92 Railway Parade, Bayswater

1. In relation to item 10.1.2, Wendy Garstone, submitted a written deputation on the item.

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

1. In relation to item 10.1.3, Leon McGrath, submitted a written deputation in *opposition* to the officer's recommendation;

10.5.2.2.1 Policy Review: Street Verges

1. In relation to item 10.5.2.2.1, Maria Kostecki, submitted a written deputation in *support* of the officer's recommendation;
2. In relation to item 10.5.2.2.1, Lauren Pratt, submitted a written deputation in *opposition* of the officer's recommendation;
3. In relation to item 10.5.2.2.1, Annette Pratt, submitted a written deputation in *opposition* of the officer's recommendation;
4. In relation to item 10.5.2.2.1, Nich Stalker, submitted a written deputation in *opposition* of the officer's recommendation;
5. In relation to item 10.5.2.2.1, Margaret Lockyer, submitted a written deputation in *opposition* to the officer's recommendation;
6. In relation to item 10.5.2.2.1, Kathryn Lance, submitted a written deputation in *opposition* to the officer's recommendation;
7. In relation to item 10.5.2.2.1, Yvette Coyne, submitted a written deputation in *opposition* to the officer's recommendation;
8. In relation to item 10.5.2.2.1, Matthew Morgan, submitted a written deputation in *opposition* to the officer's recommendation;
9. In relation to item 10.5.2.2.1, Abigaille Perrotte, submitted a written deputation in *opposition* to the officer's recommendation;
10. In relation to item 10.5.2.2.1, Georgina Ker, submitted a written deputation in *opposition* to the officer's recommendation.

4. QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE FROM ELECTED MEMBERS ON AGENDA ITEMS

The following questions were taken on notice at the briefing and responses are provided below to assist Councillors in their deliberations on the matter.

Item 10.1.3 Partial Disposal of Lot 2, No. 60 Embleton Avenue, Embleton (Wotton Reserve) Cr Elli Petersen-Pik Deputy Mayor

Question 1

What proportion of Wotton Reserve is up for sale? Is it 30 or 50 percent?

Response 1

Bianca Sandri, Executive Manager Strategic Projects advised that the reserve is approximately 55,000 square metres, and the proposed contractor sale is seeking 21,163 square metres.

Question 2

Can you take the question on notice and provide us with the percentage?

Response 2

The percentage of land for disposition is 37.9% of Wotton Reserve (21,163m² of 55,793m²).

10.5.2.2.1 Policy Review: Street Verges Cr Cale Black

Question 1

I'm just hoping to get more understanding of what alternative drainage could be on the onus of the applicants?

Response 1

The main purpose of alternative drainage measures is to ensure that stormwater runoff generated from the verge is appropriately managed to prevent any detrimental impacts on adjoining private property. The intention is not necessarily to require the removal of the synthetic lawn. Alternative drainage measures that could be considered include the installation of soakwells and/or grading the verge to direct runoff towards the existing tree well.

Question 2

Clause 5(b) refers to tree(s) must be planted and maintained on the verge, which was changed from the initial language. What determines whether a tree or multiple trees are planted on the verge as a condition of approval?

Response 2

The minutes of the Policy Meeting of 7 September 2026 indicated the reason for the change in the language:

"REASON FOR CHANGE: The Committee changed the officer's recommendation as it believed it would be difficult to identify whether a tree would provide sufficient canopy coverage at maturity to shade an entire synthetic lawn area and would create compliance and enforcement challenges. It also wanted to ensure it was clear that synthetic lawns installed in accordance with the policy before it was amended in 2024 were not required to comply with the provisions of the new policy."

The number of trees required will depend on the size, species and available space within the verge. As a minimum, the City will seek to provide at least one tree per verge, where practicable, with the potential for two or more trees where the verge area allows and site conditions are suitable.

Question 3

Further on clause 5(b), it says the City will plant and establish the tree(s) at its cost as part of its Annual Tree Planting Program. One of the Deputies referred to a verge that they have ridden past since 2023 with dead trees from a synthetic lawn. Does the City have an idea of the impact of synthetic lawn on tree health and maintenance? I'm thinking about the replacement cost to ratepayers and the City if they don't survive.

Response 3

While the City does not have specific data quantifying the impact of synthetic lawn on street tree mortality, there is evidence that artificial turf can create conditions that are less favourable for tree health. These conditions can include higher soil temperatures, reduced water infiltration, reduced oxygen exchange within the soil profile, and restrictions on natural root growth where turf is installed too close to the tree trunk.

It is important to note, however, that tree health and survival are influenced by a range of factors including species selection, soil quality, irrigation, seasonal conditions, vandalism, and establishment practices. As a result, it is generally difficult to attribute the decline or failure of a particular tree solely to the presence of synthetic lawn without undertaking a site-specific assessment.

The City's experience is that newly planted trees are most vulnerable during their establishment period, typically the first two to three years after planting. Any treatment or surface covering that limits access to water, air, or healthy soil conditions may increase the risk of stress and reduce the likelihood of successful establishment.

Where a verge tree fails during or after establishment, there is a direct cost to the City and ultimately ratepayers through the need for replacement planting, watering, maintenance, and ongoing establishment works. For this reason, the draft policy includes tree health mitigation measures designed to support the long-term establishment and growth of verge trees. This includes requiring a minimum 1 metre radius mulched area around each verge tree and maintaining adequate permeable space to allow water infiltration, air exchange, and healthy root development.

It is also noted that the example photographs provided of impacted trees do not appear to incorporate a 1 metre radius exclusion area free of synthetic turf around the tree, which is a key requirement of the draft policy intended to mitigate potential impacts on tree health and establishment.

Question 4

The policy refers to being in place from 23 July 2024 when it was last reviewed. How does Council intend to verify compliance with the existing turfs that have been installed after 23 July 2024? With reference to the date it was installed, whether policy conditions are being met, and whether conditional approval is to be issued?

Response 4

City officers will assess the 21 non-compliant verges against the revised policy criteria, should the revised policy be endorsed. Where a verge meets the revised requirements, the City will issue retrospective

approval. Where a verge does not meet all requirements, the City will engage with the homeowner to identify the required changes and work with them to bring the verge into compliance.

Question 5

Could I also seek advice on what the compliance process looks like? Does it involve digging up the substrate layer base to ensure compliance with that installation?

Response 5

The compliance process generally consists of a visual assessment of various elements of the verge, including the synthetic turf material and its grass blade density, level of perforation, the grade and hardness of the verge surface, and whether existing tree wells or garden beds are available to accommodate stormwater runoff.

Where runoff is identified as an issue, a more detailed assessment will be undertaken. It is uncommon for the substrate layer to need to be excavated or removed, as drainage issues can generally be addressed through minor drainage improvements, such as the installation of a soakwell.

This approach is consistent with the way the City assesses other hardstand verge treatments such as brick paving.

Question 6

If a resident installed synthetic turf after 23 July 2024 and it is found to be noncompliant with this policy (if it were to pass) and the residents refuse or don't agree to remediation efforts to meet the policy guidelines. What course of action does the city have to meet the requirements, such as planting a tree?

The current draft, with the recommended changes in the scope, refers to synthetic lawns installed prior to 23rd of July 2024 being exempt from the requirements of clause 5(a) to 5(c) not after.

Response 6

Of the 21 non-compliant verges installed after 23 July 2024, retrospective approval will be issued where the verge is found to comply with the revised policy. For verges that remain non-compliant, the City will contact the relevant homeowner and advise them of the changes required to bring their verge into compliance.

Where the required remediation includes planting a tree or creating the required radius around an existing tree and filling the area with mulch, the City will notify the homeowner that these works will be undertaken by the City, at the City's cost.

Where further remediation is required and the homeowner does not agree to undertake the required changes, the City will consider further enforcement options.

Question 7

Can the City elaborate on the permit process? What information is to be provided by the applicant? What information on the products they are intending to use? Can we get some clarification as to what that would look like?

Response 7

Applicants will be required to submit a Verge Treatment Application and Self-Assessment Form, consistent with the City's current verge application process. The current application information is available on the City's website: <https://www.bayswater.wa.gov.au/verge>

The City will develop an updated application form to reflect the proposed policy changes. Supporting information will also be made available on the City's website, including a checklist, the updated policy, greening guideline information, and guidance on the types of materials the City would generally accept.

Applicants will be required to provide a sketch plan of the verge showing the proposed treatment area and any hardstand areas. The application should include:

- the type of proposed treatment, such as paving or synthetic turf;
- manufacturer details, including the product number or code;
- details of the proposed material;
- details of the base course or substrate layer;
- the location of any existing or proposed trees, garden beds or permeable areas; and
- any other relevant information needed to assess compliance with the policy.

Where brick paving or another hardstand treatment is proposed, applicants will also need to provide details such as the paving type, colour, pattern, product code and layout pattern.

10.5.2.2.1 Policy Review: Street Verges

Cr Elli Petersen-Pik – Deputy Mayor

Question 1

If there is a non-compliant paved verge, let's say with 50 per cent or 100 per cent paved, after the policy is adopted, what will the City do? What's the compliance action? Will the city remove the bricks? Has compliance action by the City ever occurred in these circumstances?

Response 1

Where an application is received for brick paving that exceeds 30% of the verge area, the City will assess the application against the policy requirements.

If the application includes one or more trees that are capable of providing the required shading once fully mature, the verge treatment will be considered compliant under the policy and no compliance action will be required.

The City's preferred approach is to work with residents to achieve compliance, including by planting additional trees on the verge where appropriate, rather than requiring the removal of brick paving.

Based on the City's records, officers are aware of only one or two instances in the past 15 years where non-compliant hardstand areas caused stormwater runoff onto adjoining properties.

In those cases, the matters were resolved cooperatively, with the applicants agreeing to install soakwells to address the runoff issue.