



Public Questions In Writing

Ordinary Council Meeting – 28 April 2026

Name: Linh Nguyen, Bayswater

Subject: Construction on Stone Street, Bayswater

Question 1

What is the impact on traffic number would be for traffic calming on Stone Street?

Response 1

Stone Street is currently classified as a Local Distributor Road with a capacity of 6,000 vehicles per day. Its current measured traffic volumes show it is carrying in the order of 2,500 vehicles per day.

Stone Street is also serviced with a standard form of a traffic calming device within 100m of the Stone Street and Garratt Road intersection, and there are currently no proposals for any further treatments along Stone Street.

Question 2

What is happening to street parking?

Response 2

Street parking on Stone Street from Garratt Road to the end of the bus bay is currently prohibited as per the Traffic Code requirements. Based on the assumption that this question relates to the proposed Garratt Road intersection signalisation project, if the project were to proceed in future, it is expected that similar restrictions would apply. The length of restriction would depend on the intersection design.

Question 3

What is about my driveway?

Response 3

The driveway would be reduced length wise (by approximately 3.3 m) in close proximity to the footpath alignment however the lateral width (6.0 m wide) into your property will not change.

Name: Clare Duxbury

Subject: Proposed signalisation at Stone Street, Frinton Street and Garratt Road

Question 1

Why did the City of Bayswater not adopt the GHD consultant's report of "left in and left out" on Stone St to Garratt Rd reducing rat running and resulting in a very small change to the no.41 bus route, as it would only add about 1 minute to the route, with the bus using the roundabout after the Garratt Rd bridge and then continuing up Stone St?

Signalisation will duplicate the flow of traffic from Guildford Rd through residential streets and increase rat running.

Response 1

The right turn out of Stone Street serves as the only direct southbound connection from Maylands Peninsula precinct onto Garratt Road. Removing or restricting this movement would redistribute the demand of approximately 1000 vehicles per day to other residential streets of lower road classification hierarchy than Stone Street. This is likely to be Traylen Road to gain access to Guildford Road.

Whilst this option was not discussed with the Public Transport Authority (PTA) it is unlikely that they would support the detour of bus service 41 through the Grandstand Road roundabout. Bus operators often prefer simpler more direct routes. The City will need to seek confirmation from PTA regarding this option.

Question 2

Does the City believe that the extreme verge reduction, especially on Frinton and Stone Street, to nearly property boundary and along the edge of the very narrow footpath, to be dangerous preventing wheelchairs, bicycles, prams and kayaks to pass safely? Also the loss of parking and reversing into traffic signals for the residents concerned?

Response 2

At this stage, Council has not decided to proceed with the proposal and is currently seeking community feedback.

If Council decides to proceed with the proposal following consideration of all submissions received, then the design will need to take into consideration the safety of all users and will need to comply with the relevant standards.

It is recommended that resident concerns, such as verge and parking limitations, be submitted during the community consultation period to ensure it is captured as feedback on the proposal. Consultation is currently open until 17 May.

Question 3

Has a T-junction traffic light been considered on Darby St and Guildford Rd, as Darby St has a residential slip road and opens onto commercial property on Guildford Rd?

This would help with the school runs being easily able to exit onto Guildford Rd and local traffic to access Guildford Rd. It would also help with the RAC Risky Urban Roads, naming Guildford Rd as one of the 10 most risky roads in the metro area.

Response 3

There are currently no plans for traffic light installation at Darby Street and Guildford Road intersection. Guildford Road is a state road under the jurisdiction and responsibility of Main Roads WA.

Traffic volume along Darby Street is unlikely to warrant the installation of traffic lights at the intersection.

Name: Matt Duxbury

Subject: Proposed signalisation at Stone St, Frinton St and Garratt Rd

Question 1

Minute Officer crash figures differ from GHD's (48 vs 41) and rely on MRWA's 65% KSI (Killed or Seriously Injured) reduction to support signalisation, why is KSI the right metric?

Response 1

GHD's report is based on crash statistics from 2019 to 2023 (inclusive), whilst the October 2025 Council report is based on crash statistics from 2020 to 2024 data (inclusive).

The 65% reduction percentage is based on Main Roads Treatment Resource Guide which captures the reduction for KSI (Killed or Seriously Injured) crashes only. This is to meet the objective of the Safe System approach to eliminate deaths and serious injury crashes. It is also a criterion for the funding of Blackspot submissions through State and Federal funding.

Question 2

Does the City have a long-term, overall traffic plan for the South and West Wards, south of Guildford Rd, framed in the Liveable Neighbourhoods principles concept, within which the signalisation has been determined as part of a broader plan?

Response 2

The City's plan for the Maylands Peninsula Precinct is for the installation of traffic calming devices on local roads to assist in the reduction of operational speeds of traffic and deter any non-local traffic through the area.

Following the completion of the program, the City intends to request for a speed reduction to 30km/h or 40km/h through Main Roads.

While the principles of Liveable Neighbourhoods are considered at a strategic level, they are not used to determine specific intersection treatments in established areas.

The need for signalisation at this intersection has instead been identified through detailed traffic assessment, including safety considerations, traffic volumes and operational performance, in accordance with relevant guidelines and standards.

Question 3

Have Councillors seen the preliminary intersection design and if not, are Councillors aware of the impact on affected residents, including the below?

- **The extent of verge resumption needed,**
- **Increase safety risks in accessing their property, having to reverse into two lanes of queued traffic,**
- **Reduced parking, with no commentary in the Minute or the GHD report**
- **Increased traffic flow and general significant reduction in liveability**

Response 1

Councillors were advised of the consultation process and provided with access to the engagement platform, which includes the concept design.

The design is preliminary and may be refined following community consultation and further technical assessment, including consideration of impacts on verge, access and on-street parking.

Access arrangements near signalised intersections are assessed in accordance with relevant standards, to ensure safety for all road users.

The proposal is intended to address identified safety and operational issues at the intersection, with broader traffic management measures also being considered for the surrounding area.

Residents are encouraged to submit feedback through the consultation process, which is open until 17 May.

Name: Nirmal Singh

Subject: City of Bayswater's financial relation with WALGA

Question 1

For the last three financial years, how much were the WALGA membership fees for City of Bayswater?

Response 1

Assuming membership fees in relation to the annual subscriptions for association membership to use supplier panels, procurement, tax, employee relations, local laws and governance services - the total cost over three years is \$230,127.65.

Question 2

For the last three financial years, how much was actually spent on WALGA membership fees?

Response 2

\$230,127.65

Question 3

For the last three financial years, how much money was spent on WALGA training for Staff and Elected Members (noting some EM training is now mandatory)?

Response 3

Training which also includes seminars and conference related costs total \$88,449.50 over three years.

Name: Matthew Morgan

Subject: Construction of Stone Street and Frinton street traffic signals

Question 1

At the 24 March 2026 ordinary meeting, Council unanimously passed motion 1 regarding restricted movement traffic calming devices for Traylen Road that council "includes the suggested treatment as a comment in the Community Engagement".

Why has council not provided this as a comment in the community engagement survey?

Response 1

Motion 1, adopted by Council at the 24 March 2026 Ordinary Council Meeting, resolved both that the treatment at Traylen Road not be included in the current project (Limb 1), and that the suggested treatment be included as a comment within the community engagement process (Limb 2).

At the time this resolution was made, community engagement had already commenced on 9 March 2026 and the survey had been released. As such, the survey questions could not be amended partway through the engagement period.

In accordance with Limb 2 of the resolution, the suggested treatment is being captured as part of the community engagement process through the consideration of submissions and feedback received. The survey also provides an opportunity for respondents to raise additional comments, which enables matters such as this to be included and assessed.

All feedback, including Council's resolution, will be reviewed as part of the engagement outcomes and will inform any future design considerations.

Question 2

Obtained by FOI request, the GHD report 8.4.1 states “It is recommended that upgrades be made to this intersection in the future to reduce the risk of excessive delays for vehicles. This could include: Restrict Traylen Road to left in and left out movements only”.

Given that Community Engagement processes present recommendations available to residents, why was this recommendation omitted from the Community Engagement survey?

Response 2

This recommendation is informed by the projected traffic conditions 10 years after the installation of the proposed signals, reflecting anticipated growth across the wider network. The treatment may be considered as part of the current project, subject to community feedback and Council endorsement, or alternatively delivered as a stage 2 component in the future.

Question 3

During Community Engagement there have been problems such as “experienced issues with the distribution of letters”, recommendations have been omitted in community surveys, public misconceptions have been festering about concept drawings and final designs and, there was no knowledge of Bus Route 41 changes (emails obtained by FOI request).

Given that construction has not commenced, does the Transport and Infrastructure department have the competence necessary to manage this project?

Response 3

The City engaged a private distributor to deliver the original consultation letters, however, based on community feedback from residents having not received this letter, and numerous follow ups with the distributor, the City arranged for a second letter to be distributed through Australia Post.

Information regarding the 41 bus service, along other relevant information is already included in the survey portal under the FAQ section.

The proposal is at the consultation stage, and no decision has yet been made by Council to proceed with the project. If the project goes ahead, the City will determine the most appropriate project management model for its delivery.

Name: Nana Maeshinjo

Subject: Traffic light installation at Frinton and Stone Street

Question 1

Full transparency and disclosure is essential for Community Engagement for residents to make informed rational decisions. Some residents on Stone and Frinton street could have their verge space forcibly removed.

Why was the GHD report suppressed from residents and a Freedom of Information Request required to access this report to facilitate Community Engagement?

Response 1

The report was prepared by a third party and approval from them had to be made before sharing the document under FOI.

Question 2

Evidence based research concludes that wider roads are more unsafe and adding extra lanes to residential streets encourages rat-running. The road widening, extra lanes and opening up of Stone and Frinton street will inevitably encourage rat-running as these streets run parallel to Guildford road.

Why has this been presented as the only default option available during the Community Engagement survey?

Response 2

The provision of additional lanes at the intersection is required to meet Main Roads signalisation standards which require two lanes at the stop line. The layout and operation of the intersection will be further refined in the detailed design stage, taking into account feedback received through community consultation.

The installation of traffic signals is considered the most feasible treatment to address safety concerns at the intersection, given the site constraints. Alternative options were explored during preliminary assessment, however, were either found to be unfeasible or were not supported by Main Roads.

Question 3

The council recently voted in favour of item 10.3.2, at the 28 October 2025 Ordinary meeting without disclosure in the Agenda regarding the residents' land removal of their verge to accommodate the road widening of Stone and Frinton street.

Why was this information not disclosed in the Agenda for council to make an informed decision on behalf of the residents on Stone and Frinton Street?

Response 3

The purpose of the report was to present the options that had been explored for improving the intersection and to seek Council endorsement to proceed to community consultation on the preferred concept. At this stage of the project, only high-level concept planning had been undertaken and detailed design had not yet commenced.

As a result, specific impacts, such as the extent of verge modifications adjacent to individual properties, had not been finalised and were therefore not included in the Agenda report.

These matters are typically resolved through the detailed design phase, following Council endorsement to proceed with the project.

Council's decision was to support further investigation and consultation only, including engagement with affected residents, prior to any detailed design or construction decisions being made.

It is also noted that all works are proposed within the existing road reserve and no land acquisition is required. While the concept design indicates potential verge impacts, the layout will be refined during detailed design to minimise effects on adjoining properties, while maintaining compliance with relevant standards.

Name: Wendy Garstone

Subject: Tree Canopy

Question 1

At the March OCM I asked questions regarding future tree canopy amenity at the Galleria Shopping Centre, and Admin advised that 79 trees will be retained, 12 will be transplanted and approximately 300 new trees to be planted across the site. How many mature trees will be removed as per the approved plans and are these plans available online?

Response 1

There are approximately 180 trees on the approved plans which are not indicated as being either retained or transplanted. A copy of the landscape masterplan can be found on the Metro Inner Development Assessment Panel website.

Question 2

Will all car parks across the Galleria Shopping Centre site that won't be located under built shade infrastructure (including the car park located next to the sump on the Russell St side) be provided with one shade tree per four bays?

Response 2

The City will require detailed landscaping plans for future stages of the Galleria development which take into consideration the provision of trees that provide shade cover for the development, at a minimum rate of one tree per four bays of open-air car parking.

Question 3

With reference to the OCM minutes 22 July 2025: what is the current status of the Expression of Interest process for the disposal of the City owned properties at the corner of Guildford Road and Slade Street, Bayswater, comprising Lot 27, Lot 168, no's 466-476 Guildford Road, and no's 94, 96 and 102 Slade Street?

Response 3

The City is undertaking preliminary site investigations to inform the scope of the EOI.