

Public Questions In Writing

Ordinary Council Meeting – 22 September 2026

Name: Wendy Garstone, Bayswater
Subject: Item 10.5.2.2.1 Policy Review: Street Verges

Question 1

At the ABF we were told that funds to cut holes in 21 synthetic verges would come from the Verge Tree budget. I assume that plastic cutting, digging out the sub-base, disposal of both, replacing the area with soil and officer time in liaising with residents and undertaking the work will not be cheap. What is the approximate cost to the City for creating 21 holes in synthetic turf to allow for either tree planting or as a setback to existing trees?

Response 1

The works are expected to be undertaken by the City's internal tree planting teams as part of the annual tree planting program. The City currently plants approximately 3,200 trees each year under this program, and the 21 locations represent a relatively small component of this program.

The estimated cost of procuring, planting and maintaining a verge tree for its first three years is approximately \$500 to \$750 per tree. Where synthetic turf is present, there may be some additional work required to cut and remove the turf and, where necessary, remove compacted base material and replace it with suitable soil. The incremental cost of this work is expected to be minor and able to be absorbed within the existing verge tree planting program.

Accordingly, a separate cost estimate has not been prepared for creating the 21 openings. The works would be funded from the Verge Tree budget as they directly support new verge tree planting or the provision of an appropriate setback around existing verge trees.

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

Question 2

To preface, I am not against changing land use from public open space to other purposes such as housing. I am asking for transparency around all changes including State led infrastructure and development projects that impact parks and reserves.

When will the City create a Public Open Space Strategy and Plan that outlines how the public open space asset is provided across the City's suburbs now and into the future, including the provision of new public open spaces for areas with poor amenity?

Response 2

Public open space plays an important role in the liveability, health and wellbeing of our communities, and the City recognises the importance of planning for both current and future needs in a transparent and strategic way.

The preparation of a Public Open Space Strategy has been on hold while the City awaited updated direction from the State Government regarding public open space planning. This followed the advertising and subsequent deferral of the draft WAPC *Operational Policy 2.3 - Planning for Public Open Space*.

In December 2025, the WAPC released its *Position Statement: Public Open Space*, with a transition period extending until December 2027. The City is currently considering the resources and timing required to commence preparation of a new Public Open Space Strategy from 2027.

When developed, the Strategy will provide an opportunity to take a broader and longer-term view of public open space across the City, including how existing parks and reserves are distributed, future community needs, areas where access or amenity may be limited, and opportunities to improve the open space network as our community grows and changes.

In the meantime, the City will continue to assess public open space needs through its planning processes and strategic projects to help ensure our communities have access to quality open space opportunities.

Name: Kathryn Lance, Maylands

Subject: Item 10.5.2.2.1 Policy Review: Street Verges

Question 1

Has the City considered microplastics and nano plastics as a potential environmental and health issue?

Response 1

Yes. The City is aware that synthetic turf is a plastic-based product and that its use has the potential to contribute to the release of microplastics into the environment.

Synthetic turf is also a product that is widely used in both public and private settings. The potential environmental impacts, together with the practical benefits and disadvantages of its use on verges, form part of the matters for Council to consider in its deliberations on the proposed policy this evening.

Question 2

Given that artificial turf is a plastic based product that can deteriorate through UV exposure, heat and normal wear, has the City specifically investigated the potential release of microplastics and nano plastics from artificial turf over its full service life?

Response 2

The City has not undertaken a specific technical investigation into the release of microplastics or nanoplastics from synthetic turf over its full-service life.

As outlined in Response 1, the City acknowledges that synthetic turf is a plastic-based product and has the potential to release microplastics. This potential environmental impact is one of the matters that may be considered by Council in determining the proposed policy.

Question 3

What evidence does the council have that artificial turf will not release microplastics or nano plastics into the environment over its entire service life, and can you provide the independent testing supporting that conclusion?

Response 3

The City has not concluded that synthetic turf will not release microplastics or nanoplastics over its service life and therefore does not hold independent testing supporting such a conclusion.

As outlined above, the City acknowledges the potential for synthetic turf to release microplastics into the environment. The proposed policy does not represent a finding by the City that synthetic turf is free from potential environmental impacts.

Name: Aileen O'Rourke

Subject: Item 10.5.2.2.1 Policy Review: Street Verges

Question 1

At the Agenda Briefing Forum last week it was stated that there were ' only' sixty verges with artificial turf in Bayswater. How has this figure been calculated? Could there be more?

Response 1

The figure of approximately 60 verges has been estimated by City operations staff based on their observations while undertaking day-to-day activities across the City and their knowledge of the local area. It is not based on a formal audit.

Accordingly, the actual number of verges containing artificial turf may be higher or lower than the current estimate. An exact figure could only be determined through a City-wide audit.

Question 2

After the clarification that artificial turf was not an acceptable verge treatment (in July 2024), what actions did the Council take to inform the community of the policy change?

Response 2

Following the clarification in July 2024, the City updated the verge information on its website and amended the City's Verge Treatment Application and Self-Assessment Form to reflect that artificial turf was not an acceptable verge treatment.

Question 3

The policy states that the verge treatment must be 50% permeable. Does that

- (a) include the base layer and**
- (b) how will permeability be tested at installation and then after a number of years?**

Response 3

The 50% permeability requirement is intended as a general safeguard to maintain reasonable infiltration across the verge area and reduce the potential for additional stormwater runoff.

The overall risk is considered relatively low, as individual verges form only part of a much larger drainage catchment containing a range of permeable surfaces. Accordingly, a single verge with lower permeability would generally be unlikely to have a material impact on the performance of the broader drainage catchment.

The City does not propose to routinely undertake physical permeability testing at installation or in subsequent years. Compliance would generally be assessed having regard to the proposed materials and installation method. Where a particular installation is considered likely to create a drainage or runoff issue, alternative drainage measures, such as small soak wells, may be required to the satisfaction of the City.

Name: Georgina Ker

Subject: Item 10.5.2.2.1 Policy Review: Street Verges

Question 1

Does the City collect any data about the reason for verge tree deaths? (For example, reached end of natural life, heat stress, vandalism, failure to thrive.)

Response 1

The City maintains records for its verge trees, including information regarding the cause of a tree's death where this can reasonably be determined. However, in many cases there is insufficient or inconclusive evidence to identify a definitive cause of death.

Question 2

Does the City keep any notes on the environment in which dead verge trees died - for example, paved verge, artificial lawn verge?

Response 2

The City does not routinely record the surrounding verge treatment or environment as part of its tree records. However, where particular site conditions are considered relevant to the health or death of a tree, this information may be noted as part of the assessment.

Question 3

Under this proposed policy, if a verge tree dies after the adjacent property owner has chosen to encase it in plastic (artificial lawn), who pays for the replacement of the verge tree and what

is the estimation of that cost per tree (including the additional watering and maintenance supplied in the first two years)?

Response 3

The proposed policy requires an area extending at least one metre from the base of a verge tree to be free of synthetic lawn and other non-permeable treatments and to be maintained with mulch or woodchips.

Where a verge complies with the policy and a tree subsequently dies, the City would be responsible for replacing the tree as part of its normal street tree management program.

Where synthetic lawn or another non-compliant treatment has been installed within the required tree protection area and is considered to have contributed to the death of the tree, the City may require the property owner to rectify the non-compliant verge treatment and seek reimbursement of the costs associated with replacing and establishing the tree.

The estimated cost of replacing and establishing a verge tree, including watering and maintenance during the establishment period of three years, is approximately \$500 to \$750 per tree.

Name: Matthew Morgan, Baywater

Subject: Community road safety concerns for Maylands Peninsula Primary School

Question 1

The Gilbert Street cul-de-sac in lieu of a footpath is not proceeding due to residents on Goldmead Street fearing increased rat running on their Street. This is a major set back for the Safe Routes to School for Maylands Peninsula Primary School. Why is the City of Bayswater not considering plans to close off the link between Goldmead and Darby Street to eliminate Goldmead Street residents concerns of rat running and still allow Gilbert Street to become a cul-de-sac?

Response 1

At its Ordinary Meeting held on 26 May 2026, Council considered a report on this matter (Item 10.3.1.3) and resolved, in part, as follows:

“Defers progression of the Gilbert Street and Rosher Place cul-de-sac project, pending completion of the Low-Cost Urban Road Safety Program (LCURS) treatments in the surrounding network, to allow a further assessment of the effects of LCURS and changes to traffic behaviour.”

Consistent with this resolution, the City is not proposing further changes to traffic access within the surrounding network, including the Goldmead Street/Darby Street connection, until the LCURS treatments have been completed and their effects on traffic movements can be assessed.

The LCURS treatments for the Maylands Precinct are expected to be completed by the end of the 2026/27 financial year, with the City scheduled to assess their effectiveness in 2028/29. The outcomes of that assessment can then inform consideration of any further traffic management measures in the area.

Question 2

At 24 February 2026 Council meeting, it was stated to reduce rat running the traffic light “timings can be adjusted to provide only minimum green for traffic existing Stone Street that allows only few vehicles at a time” essentially forcing cars to idle to disincentivise rat-running. Given that idling vehicles increase carcinogenic exhaust pollutants to nearby residents, why did the City of Bayswater not advocate for restricted movement traffic calming instead of relying traffic signals to reduce rat running?

Response 2

The proposed traffic signals are an accepted traffic management treatment within an urban environment and are subject to the approval of Main Roads WA (MRWA).

The primary purpose of the proposed signals is to improve safety at the Stone Street/Garratt Road intersection, particularly for vehicles turning right into and out of Stone Street. Signal timings can also be managed to regulate the amount of traffic entering and exiting Stone Street while continuing to provide access for legitimate local traffic.

Restricted movement treatments, such as road closures or diverters, were not preferred as they would also restrict legitimate local traffic movements and may redistribute traffic to other local streets rather than reduce traffic within the broader road network.

The City therefore considered that the proposed signals provide an appropriate means of improving intersection safety and managing traffic movements while maintaining local access.

Question 3

At the August 2026 ordinary meeting, when asked if the City of Bayswater had even requested Main Roads WA to reduce the speed limit on Garratt Road, the council conceded “No the City has not formally requested Main Roads WA to reduce the posted speed limit on Garratt Road”. Given the community requests through the Stone Street community survey, can the City of Bayswater formally request Main Roads to reduce the posted speed limit on Garratt Road?

Response 3

Yes. The City can formally request that Main Roads WA (MRWA) consider reducing the posted speed limit on Garratt Road.

Garratt Road is classified as a District Distributor A road, with two traffic lanes in each direction and a function of carrying relatively high volumes of traffic. The current posted speed limit is 60 km/h.

MRWA has previously advised the City to generally limit speed zone review requests to locations where there is a reasonable prospect of the request being supported. Based on the road classification, configuration and function of Garratt Road, City officers consider it unlikely that MRWA would support a reduction from 60 km/h to 50 km/h.

For this reason, officers have not recommended that the City formally request a speed limit reduction on Garratt Road.

Name: Bruce Rollerson, Maylands
Subject: Illegal Parking Enforcement

Question 1

In August, the City of Bayswater issued fines for parking infringements to parents dropping their children to Maylands Peninsula Primary School (MPPS). At the same time, cars parked on the footpath on Swan View Terrace, a route to the school for pupils walking or cycling, were given warnings or allowed to remain there all day by the Rangers, despite there being ample legal parking within 20 metres.

What guidance is given to Rangers on the use of discretion? That is, under what circumstances will Bayswater residents hear “it is not legal to park there, here is a fine”, and when will they hear “it is not legal to park there, but please stay as long as you like”?

Response 1

The City adopts a balanced and proportionate approach to compliance and enforcement. Officers are expected to exercise professional judgement, taking into account factors such as public safety, the level of risk or obstruction created, the circumstances of the offence, previous compliance history, and the most effective way to achieve compliance.

While education and voluntary compliance are often effective, enforcement action may be undertaken where required to address safety risks, repeated non-compliance, or ongoing issues.

Question 2

MPPS has limited parking and no choice when pupils must arrive and leave. The only way of alleviating parking issues around the school is if pupils travel to school by alternate means than motor vehicles. Parents are less likely to allow their children to walk or cycle to school if the footpath is not safe. Why is the CoB exacerbating its parking issues by not considering this when applying discretion to cars blocking the footpath?

Response 2

The City recognises the importance of safe and accessible footpaths, particularly around schools where many students walk, ride and use other forms of active transport. The City does not support vehicles obstructing footpaths and expects officers to consider pedestrian safety when determining the most appropriate compliance response. The use of discretion is intended to achieve compliance in a manner proportionate to the circumstances and should not be interpreted as acceptance of unlawful parking behaviour.

The City remains committed to supporting safe access to schools through a combination of education, compliance and enforcement activities.

Question 3

What specific actions will the City of Bayswater take to ensure that footpaths are safe for vulnerable path users?

Response 3

The City is committed to maintaining safe and accessible footpaths for all users, particularly children, people with disabilities and other vulnerable pedestrians.

To support this objective, the City will continue to undertake parking compliance activities across the City, including around schools and locations where footpath obstructions have been identified. A combination of education and enforcement is used to encourage lawful parking behaviour and ensure footpaths remain safe and accessible for the community.