

Deputation List

Agenda Briefing Forum

Deputations will be heard at the Agenda Briefing Forum at **7:00 pm, Tuesday 19 May 2026**.

The items will then be considered by Council at its Ordinary Council Meeting, scheduled for **7:00 pm, Tuesday, 26 May 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
10.1.1 - Leake Street Subdivision	
Janette Gee	Neutral
10.4.1 - Development Application Proposed Padel Courts Additions to Bedford Bowling Club	
Jaimie Forssman	In support
Martti Warpenuis	In support
10.4.2 - Proposed Change of Use to Unhosted Short-Term Rental Accommodation Units - Lot 800, 1 Mangini Street, Morley	
Mathew Stokes	Not in support
Tamina Stokes	Not in support
Carmine Zollo	Not in support
Arian Gorjy	In support
13.1 (Urgent Business) Access to Roe Estate Subdivision - Blackboy Way, Morley	
Alex Jarvis	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
10.4.1 - Development Application Proposed Padel Courts Additions to Bedford Bowling Club	
Rae Pearce	Not in support
10.4.2 - Proposed Change of Use to Unhosted Short-Term Rental Accommodation Units - Lot 800, 1 Mangini Street, Morley	
Katherine Kissack	Not in support
Emma Zollo	Not in support

10.4.1 - Development Application Proposed Padel Courts Additions to Bedford Bowling Club

Rae Pearce, Bedford

Thank you for the opportunity to provide a written deputation.

I appreciate the significant amount of information councillors are required to consider when assessing development applications. I also understand that you rely heavily on technical reports to guide your decisions.

In this case, because the proposal sits so close to highly sensitive residential properties and seeks to operate until 10pm, it is important that the acoustic information relied upon is complete, accurate, and fully aligned with the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997.

When residents raise specific, technical concerns about omissions or inconsistencies in a noise assessment, it is standard practice for the City to ensure those matters are properly examined — whether through clarification, additional modelling, or independent peer review. This protects both the community and the City by ensuring decisions are based on the best available information.

My intention is to simply highlight that several key aspects of the Regulations do not appear to have been fully addressed in the current assessment and to express my strong concern that the officer's report does not address the substantive issues raised regarding noise impacts and operating hours.

The recommendation relies entirely on the Environmental Noise Assessment prepared by Reverberate Consulting. However, the assessment contains significant omissions and methodological errors that materially affect its conclusions. These issues are not addressed in the officer's report.

Below is a concise outline of the key issues.

1. The report acknowledges the noise is impulsive, but does not apply the required +10 dB penalty
The consultant states that padel ball impacts and shouting “meet the definition of ‘impulsiveness’ defined in the Noise Regulations” (Section 4.1).
Under Regulation 9, impulsive noise must attract a +10 dB penalty.
Instead, the consultant applies only a +5 dB “modulation” adjustment, based on guidance written for basketball, not padel. This is not consistent with the Regulations, which require penalties to be applied based on the actual characteristics of the noise source.
2. Basketball guidance is substituted for padel impacts
The report quotes DWER's basketball guidance to justify downgrading the penalty. That guidance explicitly relates to basketball and even notes that a +10 dB impulsive penalty is “appropriate for a conservative assessment.”
Padel ball impacts are louder, sharper, and less repetitive than basketball bounces. The substitution is not justified and results in an underestimation of noise.
3. Evening noise limits are not properly assessed
The report lists the evening Assigned Levels but does not assess noise against the evening LA10 limit, which is the correct controlling criterion for 7pm–10pm.
Instead, it assesses only LA1, which is not the relevant metric for evening periods.
4. Real world operating conditions are not assessed
The modelling does not consider:
 - four courts operating simultaneously

- coaching or tournaments
- peak usage
- weather assisted propagation

These are all foreseeable and typical for padel facilities.

5. International evidence shows padel noise is frequently underestimated

Councils overseas have had to restrict or shut down padel courts because acoustic modelling underestimated real world noise. This pattern reinforces the need for a cautious and compliant assessment, particularly when the modelling already sits at the edge of compliance.

Request to Council

Given these unresolved issues, the officer's recommendation does not demonstrate that the noise assessment has been critically evaluated or that the proposal can comply with the Noise Regulations.

I respectfully request that Council:

1. Not endorse the recommendation in its current form.
2. Require a proper assessment of evening noise levels, including all required penalties.
3. Require an independent peer review of the Environmental Noise Assessment.
4. Consider reduced operating hours, particularly after 7pm.
5. Require additional Acoustic treatments to court structures including vibration damping materials, acoustic cladding on glass walls, sound-absorbing panels, and / or partial-roof structures

I would also request that the Operational Management Plan (OMP) to be prepared by the operators includes post-construction noise testing, compliance verification during evening periods, complaint response procedures, and enforceable corrective actions if limits are exceeded.

Thank you for considering this deputation.

10.4.2 - Proposed Change of Use to Unhosted Short-Term Rental Accommodation Units - Lot 800, 1 Mangini Street, Morley

Katherine Kissack, Morley

I 100% OPPOSE the apartment complex units being approved for individual short term stay rental { in any capacity or number of units } for the following reasons:

- My 7.5 year old daughter with special needs { autistic } attends Morley Primary School whereby the allocated oval is located adjacent to the apartment complex, by law children are required to participate in sporting activities on this oval, including sandpit which is merely metres from the complex & in recent weeks syringe needles were found in this sandpit which was not an issue prior to the apartments being built, the school was NOT notified in writing of the apartments being built nor their usage ie short term stay rental despite residing next door for approximately 90 years prior to the apartments being built.
- My daughter having special needs, whilst she is functional to attend a standard primary school, it is statistically known children with needs are MUCH more likely to be “lured” by false authority ie person who impersonates a teacher etc, the school does not have the resources to be with my daughter continuously throughout the day during her times on this oval hence is more likely to become a target in any capacity whether verbal, physical or the subject of footage.
- Whilst I appreciate “not everyone is a paedophile” as the City of Bayswater receptionist advised { without being asked which begs the question in itself for community concern } when a community member approached the council in person, the apartment complex is potentially promoting an “opportunity” for such people with minimal legal tracing due to its close proximity to the school & ability to watch children both at the school, take photos / videos & approach children walking by the fence line or to/from school etc, sending your child to a school to be educated whereby the neighbouring apartment complex has a high occupancy of unknown guests checking in/out at various times of the week/month/year is considerably increasing the risk for such an opportunity whether it consists of physical contact, verbal contact or photographing / recording behaviours.
- The apartment complex is located in a predominantly residential area whereby it is highly disruptive to both residents & businesses surrounding the complex for occupants to be “coming & going” whether it’s a week or a month at a time, hotels were created for this reason whereby they are secure, managed correctly & have more control in terms of the occupants it acquires, this is not able to be done in a reasonable & fair capacity with simply a “lockbox” on site & an air BnB guest profile, there is minimal traceable records of guests occupying the apartments should an incident of any kind occur, whether reported at the time or at a later date which is often the case with children in the vicinity.
- The owners began operating multiple apartments as short stay rentals PRIOR TO ANY COMMUNITY NOTICES BEING ISSUED OR COUNCIL APPROVAL CONSENT { this has been confirmed via air bnb website listing created by the owners } whereby both the owners & the council failed to issue the correct notices in writing to a REASONABLE number of surrounding residents & businesses.
- Despite having no legal council approval, the owners have continued to advertise 7 of the 9 apartments as short stay rentals to finance the property which should have been considered prior to the property initially being built I am bringing this argument forward in the hope it raises concern amongst the councillors to consider all aspects of the implications to the community, not simply the financial gain. Thanking you

10.4.2 - Proposed Change of Use to Unhosted Short-Term Rental Accommodation Units - Lot 800, 1 Mangini Street, Morley

Emma Zollo, Morley

Hello,

I am writing this deputation to strongly oppose the recommendation that the property of 1 Mangini Street, Morley be approved use for Unhosted Short-Stay Accommodation (STRA).

Community complaints of it sharing a boundary with Morley Primary School and it being a possible risk to children with its open fencing on school grounds and no privacy windows with full view of school grounds and any children present on those grounds during school and OSHC hours, should not be ignored.

On top of this, with the current housing crisis and so many people & families being unable to find a home to rent, or not having the capacity to buy in this market, using these units for STRA in such a community-focused area seems incredibly irresponsible of the council to consider approving.

With the properties faculties being suitable for elderly and disabled persons, they would be highly sought after as long-term rentals for people already in the community that also may wish to downsize, and therefore also possibly freeing up larger homes for families.

I hope the council will reconsider this recommendation.

Thank you.