



Deputation List

Agenda Briefing Forum – 13 January 2026

Deputations will be heard at the Agenda Briefing Forum at **7pm, Tuesday 13 January 2026**.

The items will then be considered by Council at its Ordinary Council Meeting, scheduled for **7pm, Tuesday 20 January 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
10.3.2 Lease Renewal – Jade Lewis and Friends Inc. – 96 Slade Street, Bayswater	
Jade Lewis	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 Request for Minor District Boundary Realignment	
Bren Croll (spokesperson), Jessica Coyle, Beth Oregan, Vernon McQuistan, Adele Reygate and Kanishka Dayaram	Not in Support
11.1 Cr Cale Black - Replacement of Trees Lost in December 2025 Storm Event	
Wendy Garstone	In Support
Rosemary Lynch	In Support

Item 10.1.3 Request for Minor District Boundary Realignment

Bren Croll

Written deputation – currently overseas until late February.

I am the owner of 143 Crawford Road and the resident who initiated this request with the support of all affected neighbours. Please contact me by email and not by phone if required as I am contactable by phone.

- I speak on behalf of all directly affected properties, all of whom have provided written, unanimous support.
- This is a resident-led request to correct a small, clearly defined boundary anomaly, not a broader boundary reform.
- The current district boundary zig-zags through Oxford Street and Crawford Road.

The residents disagree that the request should be deferred into a broader district boundary discussion. The proposal is deliberately narrow, affects a very small number of adjoining properties and has unanimous resident support. It is irrelevant that the request wasn't brought up in a broader district boundary review - the district boundary change process via LGAB exists precisely for this purpose.

Furthermore, we disagree with the notion that transferring the requested properties to the City of Stirling has a similar risk of missed waste collection services considering Crawford Road is one way street in this section. The aspect that is confusing about the waste run is that the current scenario has adjacent properties on a single street in different suburbs which makes no logical sense.

The other examples of similar "zig-zag" boundaries between City of Stirling and City of Bayswater that were provided as examples for City of Bayswater to reject or delay this request, and to justify a broader review are not equivalent. For example, 9 Wood Street is Coles Supermarket and the associated carpark, 169 Salisbury Street is St. Peters School, 119 Ninth Avenue and 28 Carrington Street are large blocks of apartments.

The Local Government Advisory Board process exists precisely for these kinds of minor corrections. Addressing one anomaly does not obligate the council to address others as each proposal is assessed independently on its own merits. We note the concern raised regarding potential administrative burden should other residents make similar enquiries in the future. This is not a sound basis on which to delay or decline a lawful, resident supported request.

The City of Stirling have already resolved to support progressing this proposal and all affected residents are in agreement. The possibility that other residents may one day make other unrelated enquiries is speculative and should not override the merits of this case. The Local Government Advisory Board process exists precisely to assess requests individually and filter those that do not meet the criteria. Managing future enquiries is an ordinary function of local government administration and cannot be used as a reason to defer a straightforward correction that is ready to proceed now.

Item 11.1 Cr Cale Black - Replacement of Trees Lost in December 2025 Storm Event

Wendy Garstone

I support Councillor Black's motion requiring officers to replace trees lost in public spaces due to the storm using tree species that are the most suitable for each location.

As the officer's report outlines the steps that officers take using standard work procedures I ask that councillors vote to approve additional funding if required if additional tree stock is needed to replace trees lost, so that the planting schedule is not impacted.

I also suggest that the planting period to replace storm damaged trees be extended to 2027 if sourcing suitable stock for each location is not possible for the 2026 planting period.

I also think it is necessary that we all understand the impact the storm has had on the canopy coverage in the City. I suggest that information on the locations and species of trees lost to the storm is provided to Council and the public, and that this includes at least an estimate of trees lost on private property.

Perhaps an estimate could be obtained via a call out using social media. Surely it's best to quantify canopy loss now, as I understand that the next LiDAR aerial survey is scheduled for 2027?

Item 11.1 Cr Cale Black - Replacement of Trees Lost in December 2025 Storm Event

Rosemary Lynch

Proposed motion 11.1 - Replacement of Trees Lost in December 2025 Storm Event.

Noting that the December 2025 storm far exceeded the damage that typically be expected, the proposed motion by Cr Cale Black is highly commendable in its intent.

I would suggest that the wording of the motion requires some amendment for it to work in favour of the City and tree canopy. I would suggest simplifying the wording to be:

"That Council requests the Chief Executive Officer to replace trees lost during the December 2025 storm on verges and other public land, as far as practicable, in accordance with its established processes, during the next available planting season, in addition to the City's regular planting program."

The City's capable officers should have the autonomy to select appropriate replacements following the City's established procedures, prioritising locally occurring native species to provide the greatest habitat wherever practicable for the various Zones as per the 'Garden Planting Guideline 2020' developed with Josh Byrne and Associates which is an absolutely fantastic resource.

Kind regards,

Rosemary