

## **AGENDA**

---

### **Floodplain Risk Management Committee**

**Wednesday, 18 March 2026**

**2.00PM**

**Dragon Room**



## FLOODPLAIN RISK MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING

### ORDER OF BUSINESS

#### OPENING

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTRY

Council acknowledges the Bidjigal people of the Eora Nation, who are the Traditional Custodians of all lands, waters and sky in the Georges River area. I pay my respect to Elders past and present and extend that respect to all Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples who live, work and meet on these lands.

#### APOLOGIES / LEAVE OF ABSENCE

#### REQUEST TO JOIN VIA AUDIO VISUAL LINK

#### NOTICE OF WEBCASTING

#### DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

#### CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>FRMCC001-26 Confirmation of the Minutes of the Floodplain Risk Management Committee Meeting held on 1 July 2025</b><br>(Report by Senior Assets Engineer - Stormwater)..... | 3 |
|--|---|

#### COMMITTEE REPORTS

|   |    |
|---|----|
| <b>FRMCC002-26 Update on Blakehurst and Kogarah Bay Wards Flood Study</b><br>(Report by Senior Assets Engineer - Stormwater).....   | 8  |
| <b>FRMCC003-26 Update on the Feasibility Study of Flood Risk Mitigation Options at the Gloucester Road-Stoney Creek Road Intersection and the Morgan Street-Gloucester Road Intersection, Beverly Hills</b><br>(Report by Senior Assets Engineer - Stormwater)..... | 16 |
| <b>FRMCC004-26 Floodplain Risk Management Committee - Updated Terms of Reference and Outcome of EOI - Community Representative Role</b><br>(Report by Senior Assets Engineer - Stormwater).....   | 19 |
| <b>FRMCC005-26 Update from the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (DCCEEW)</b><br>(Report by Senior Assets Engineer - Stormwater).....   | 28 |

## **CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

**Item:** FRMCC001-26 Confirmation of the Minutes of the Floodplain Risk Management Committee Meeting held on 1 July 2025

**Author:** Senior Assets Engineer - Stormwater

**Directorate:** Assets and Infrastructure

**Matter Type:** Previous Minutes

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Minutes of the Floodplain Risk Management Committee Meeting held on 1 July 2025, be confirmed.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment [↓](#)1 Minutes of the Floodplain Risk Management Committee Meeting held on 1 July 2025

# MINUTES

---

## Floodplain Risk Management Committee

Tuesday, 01 July 2025

2:00 PM

Online

UNCONFIRMED MINUTES



**GEORGES RIVER COUNCIL**

## **PRESENT**

### **COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP**

Councillor Christina Jamieson (Chairperson)  
Mr David Grasby (Sydney Water, Senior Planner)  
Ms Angela Halcrow (DCCEEW, Senior Natural Resource Officer)  
Mr Sadeq Zaman (DCCEEW, Senior Floodplain Engineer)  
Mr Thomas Anders (SES, Local Representative)  
Ms Shelly Stingmore (SES, Acting Deputy Zone Commander, East Command Metro Zone)  
Mr Nicholas Sharpe (SES, Planning and Research Officer)  
Mr Erin Sellers (Community Representative)  
Mr Neville Naicker (Bayside Council, Coordinator Asset Planning)  
Mr Andrew Latta (GRC, Director Assets and Infrastructure)  
Ms Hayley Barnes (GRC, Manager Strategic Placemaking)  
Mr James Magee (GRC, Acting Manager City Technical Services)  
Mr Luke Oste (GRC, Acting Manager Strategic Planning)  
Mr Pulak Saha (GRC, Senior Assets Engineer - Stormwater)  
Mr Rabi Pokharel (GRC, Stormwater Assets Officer)  
Ms Priyani Jayaweera (GRC, Principal Development Engineer)  
Mr Firoz Ahmed (GRC, Senior Development Engineer)

### **NON COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

Mr Seenithamby Paramanandarajah (GRC, Asset Coordinator)  
Mr Akshay Mokal (Bayside Council, Stormwater and Floodplain Engineer)  
Mr Isaac Kim (KBR, Senior Engineer – Consultant)  
Mr Joshua Eggleton (KBR, Principal Engineer – Consultant)

### **GEORGES RIVER COUNCIL STAFF**

Ms Nickie Paraskevopoulos (Executive Services Officer)  
Ms Stephanie Liu (PA to Manager Strategic Placemaking – Minutes)  
Mr Arun Job (IMT Services – Technical)  
Mr Chris Stojanovski (IMT Services – Technical)  
Mr Mark Tadros (IMT Services – Technical)

## **ABSENT**

### **COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP**

Ms Dayna Ingram (SES, Local Representative)  
Ms Catherine McMahon (GRC, Manager Strategic Planning)  
Ms Feiya He (Canterbury Bankstown Council, Catchment Management Planner)  
Mr Hooman Khakzad (Canterbury Bankstown Council, Team Leader Asset Planning - Stormwater)  
Mr Peter Cinque (SES, Senior Manager Emergency Risk Management)

## **CONFIRMATION OF QUORUM**

Quorum for this meeting requires three voting members to be present.

## **OPENING**

The Chair, Councillor Jamieson, opened the meeting (via audio visual medium) at 2:04pm.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTRY**

The Chair, Councillor Jamieson acknowledged the Bidjigal people of the Eora Nation, who are the Traditional Custodians of all lands, waters and sky in the Georges River area. I pay my respect to Elders past and present and extend that respect to all Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples who live, work and meet on these lands.

## **APOLOGIES/LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

I have an apology from Ms Dayna Ingram, Local Representative of SES.

## **NOTICE OF WEBCASTING**

The Chair, Councillor Jamieson advised staff and the public that the meeting is being recorded for minute-taking purposes.

## **DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST**

There were no disclosures of interest made.

## **CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

**FRMCC001-25 Confirmation of the Minutes of the Floodplain Risk Management Committee Meeting held on 10 December 2024**  
(Report by Senior Assets Engineer - Stormwater)

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Minutes of the Floodplain Risk Management Committee Meeting held on 10 December 2024, be confirmed.

### **Record of Voting**

For the Motion: Representative DCCEEW – Sadeq Zaman  
Councillor Jamieson

## **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

**FRMCC002-25 Blakehurst and Kogarah Bay Wards Overland Flow Flood Study - Draft Flood Study Report**  
(Report by Senior Assets Engineer - Stormwater)

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

- (a) That the Floodplain Risk Management Committee receive and note the verbal presentation from Kellogg Brown & Root Pty Ltd (KBR) on the progress of the Blakehurst and Kogarah Bay Ward Overland Flow Flood Study.
- (b) That the Floodplain Risk Management Committee (The Committee) receive and note the attached Draft Blakehurst and Kogarah Bay Ward Overland Flow Flood Study.
- (c) That the Committee provide recommendation to Council to undertake community consultation for the purpose of gathering community feedback on the attached Draft Blakehurst and Kogarah Bay Ward Overland Flow Flood Study.

### **Record of Voting**

For the Motion: Community Representative – Erin Sellers  
Representative DCCEEW – Sadeq Zaman

### **FRMCC003-25 Grant update for Floodplain Risk Management for Hurstville, Mortdale and Peakhurst Wards**

(Report by Senior Assets Engineer - Stormwater)

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Floodplain Risk Management Committee receive and note the update on flood risk management grants for Hurstville, Mortdale and Peakhurst Wards.

### **Record of Voting**

For the Motion: Representative DCCEEW – Angela Halcrow  
Community Representative – Erin Sellers

### **GENERAL BUSINESS**

There was no General Business to discuss.

### **CONCLUSION**

The Meeting was closed at 2:56pm.

---

Chairperson

**COMMITTEE REPORTS****Item:** FRMCC002-26 Update on Blakehurst and Kogarah Bay Wards Flood Study**Author:** Senior Assets Engineer - Stormwater**Directorate:** Assets and Infrastructure**Matter Type:** Committee Reports**RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Floodplain Risk Management Committee receive and note the verbal presentation on the final draft of Blakehurst and Kogarah Bay Wards Overland Flow Flood Stud and provide a recommendation to Council to

- (a) receive and adopt attached final Draft of the Blakehurst and Kogarah Bay Ward Overland Flow Flood Study;
- (b) delegate authority to the General Manager to make minor modifications to any numerical, typographical, interpretation, formatting errors, if required, to the final flood study;
- (c) endorse the inclusion of the required legal notation on the 10.7 Planning Certificates for identified properties; and
- (d) publish the adopted flood study report on Council's Website.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

1. Kellogg Brown & Root (KBR), in partnership with Council, has prepared the Final Draft Blakehurst and Kogarah Bay Ward Overland Flow Flood Study (the Study). The Study provides a comprehensive assessment of existing flood risk (2025 baseline) and projected future flood risk to 2100, including full hydraulic hazard assessment, property flood tagging, and identification of flooding hotspots across the study area.
2. The study was publicly exhibited between 15 September and 3 November 2025.
3. At residents' request, Council staff, KBR and representatives from the Department of Climate Change, Energy, Environment and Water undertook final ground-truthing (including visual site inspections) in November–December 2026.
4. Following the exhibition period, further amendments to the Flood Study report and flood tagging database were completed in 2026, informed by:
  - (a) direct discussions with affected residents;
  - (b) review of flood modelling outputs;
  - (c) desktop assessment and on-site verification of topographical condition and stormwater asset locations; and
  - (d) review of the LEP 2021 Coastal Hazard and Risk Map.
5. Reflecting community feedback and verification, the following refinements were applied:
  - (a) Flood notation was removed for properties found to experience negligible overland flooding.
  - (b) Refinement of the Probably Maximum Flood tagging criteria by removing properties solely affected by the H1 hazard category (generally safe for people, vehicles and buildings). Properties affected by H2 to H6 hazards with less than 5% of the site impacted were also removed.

- (c) Properties impacted solely by sea level rise were removed from the overland flood notation. These properties are already identified under the LEP 2021 Coastal Hazard and Risk mapping.
- 6. Council and KBR undertook a comprehensive review and refinement of property flood-tagging in response to community feedback, resulting in:
  - (a) 1% AEP flood-tagged lots decreased from 2,931 to 1,912
  - (b) PMF flood-tagged lots decreased from 4,554 to 3,057
- 7. It is recommended adopt the Blakehurst and Kogarah Bay Ward Overland Flow Flood Study (Final Draft). Adoption will:
  - (a) trigger updated wording for Planning Certificate (s10.7) flood risk notation;
  - (b) inform a subsequent Floodplain Risk Management Study and Plan for risk mitigation options; and
  - (c) guide flood related development controls for future development.

**BACKGROUND**

- 8. Under the NSW Government’s Flood Prone Land Policy, councils must periodically review their Flood Studies and Floodplain Risk Management Studies. In 2023, Georges River Council (GRC), supported by the NSW Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water, commenced the Blakehurst and Kogarah Bay Wards Overland Flood Study.
- 9. The Study provides a detailed, catchment-wide technical understanding of overland flooding, using advanced hydrologic and hydraulic modelling and incorporating community feedback. It identifies the nature and extent of overland flooding that occurs when intense rainfall exceeds the capacity of the local drainage system, providing essential evidence to improve community safety and resilience to flash flooding.
- 10. The Study was publicly exhibited from 15 September 2025 to 3 November 2025 to allow the community review and submissions.
- 11. Table 1 shows the status of the study:

| <b>Table 1 - Blakehurst and Kogarah Bay Wards Flood Study Project Stages</b> |   |  |               |
|--|---|--|---------------|
| <b>Stage</b>   | <b>Description</b>  | <b>Deliverables</b>  | <b>Status</b> |
| <b>1</b>   | Data Collection and Community Consultation                  | Data provision and review, site inspection, and Stage 1 of Community Consultation  | Completed     |
| <b>2</b>   | Hydrological and Hydraulic Model Development and Validation | Development and validation of hydrologic/hydraulic model(s), preparation of draft Flood Study Report (Hydraulic and Hydrologic Model Development and Validation section) | Completed     |
| <b>3</b>   | Design event modelling, model simulations and mapping       | Simulation of design events, preparation of draft Flood Study Report (Design Event Modelling section)  | Completed     |
| <b>4</b>   | Draft Flood Study Report                                    | Draft Flood Study Report   | Completed     |
| <b>4.1</b>   | Community Consultation                                      | Community Consultation   | Completed     |

|   |                                |                                |  |
|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| 5 | Final Flood Study Report       | Final Flood Study Report       | Presented for the committee review and requires Council resolution |
| 6 | Handover of relevant materials | Handover of relevant materials | Expected in May 2026   |

FRMCC002-26

**Public Exhibition 2025**

12. During the exhibition period (15 September–3 November 2025), all property owners identified within the Flood Planning Area (FPA) up to the PMF extent were formally notified in writing. Approximately 11,300 letters were issued. Council further promoted the exhibition via:
  - (a) Community e-News sent to over 18,500 recipients
  - (b) Your say newsletter sent to 3,947 recipients
  - (c) Media release published on Councils website
  - (d) Leader ad insert – approximately 50,000 copies were delivered
  - (e) Social media post – 5,219 views on Facebook and 1,530 views on Instagram
  - (f) Social awareness video – 3,559 views on Facebook and 1,636 views on Instagram
13. Engagement metrics:
  - (a) project page received 2,900+ visits, converting 1,904 aware participants to 153 engaged participants.
  - (b) The feedback and booking online form were completed 174 times from 153 participants.
  - (c) Approximately 60 hardcopy and email submissions received. However, some of these had already been submitted through the online your say page. After the removal of the duplicate feedback, a total of 220 unique responses received.
  - (d) Project documents were downloaded a total of 810 times.
  - (e) The FAQ page was accessed 261 times.
14. The community provided their views on the flood study through a feedback form, where residents selected their key concerns. Questions selected via online form (your say webpage) are grouped and shown in Table 2:

**Table 2: Questions selected in Your Say website during consultation**

| Description  | Total | Comments   |
|--|-------|--|
| How can I request a review of how my property has been tagged? | 76    | Council and consulting engineers reviewed all requests, undertook further consultation and provided the outcome of review to all residents who provided their contact information. |
| How can I view the maps and study?                             | 12    | Additional information was provided to the residents via email.  |
| What methods were used to identify my property in              | 59    | Lot tagging criteria provided during consultation meeting and via emails.  |

|  |    |  |
|--|----|--|
| the study?                                   |    |  |
| Can I still develop on my property?          | 26 | Reference made to the FAQ in Your Say platform and also explained during the consultation  |
| Will this study change my insurance premium? | 47 | Insurance premiums are based on a range of factors and may or may not increase due to the flood study. Each provider applies its own pricing model based on insured amount and all known risks and claims for the LGA.<br>Council do not undertake studies for the insurance companies. Local councils are primarily responsible to prepare flood studies, consider it in planning decisions and keeping the community informed. |
| Will this study change my house value?       | 46 | Property values influenced by many external factors such as location, market conditions, and interest rates. There is no evidence to suggest that the adoption of overland flow data alone would cause impact on property values.  |
| How to I prepare for flooding?               | 8  | Reference made to the FAQ in Your Say platform   |
| Where can I find more detail on the study?   | 22 | Additional information was provided as per detailed request  |
| Other (please specify)                       | 15 | Other questions were responded to during the consultation meeting  |

15. As shown in the table above, the largest proportion of responses received related to requests to review the draft flood control lot tagging of their property.
16. Council reviewed detailed submissions and grouped them into thematic categories. Council's responses and changes to the final report are summarised below.

**Table 3: Detailed submissions in thematic categories**

| Category                              | Generic Submission Comments  | Comments   | Changes made to the final report |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|----------------------------------|
| Historic Vs Predicted flood behaviour | Observed flooding behaviour conflicts with model. Property never flooded during past flood events. | The properties were tagged based on modelled flood depths greater than 150 mm and modelled inundation area greater than 10% of land parcel for 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP). For PMF properties were tagged where flood hazard (H2 to H6) affects at least 5% of the site.<br><br>Typically planning is undertaken for a 1% AEP event. This is considered a reasonable level of risk to plan for as per the industry standard. | Amended the tagging map          |

|   |  |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|
|   |  | <p>The flood model indicates potential flooding because it is based on rare design events, including the 1% AEP flood. Historical events experienced by residents have been considerably smaller, which explains why the property has not flooded in the past despite the modelled risk.</p> <p>However, all feedback were considered and flood notations amended accordingly.</p>  |   |
| Stormwater Infrastructure, Maintenance & Local Conditions | Blocked pits, ageing pipes, incorrect asset data, and lack of maintenance are seen as the real cause of localised flooding, not overland flow. | <p>A blockage sensitivity assessment was undertaken as part of the model calibration by removing applied pit blockage factors for stormwater inlet pits.</p> <p>The assessment demonstrated that, while removal of blockages enabled the stormwater network to convey slightly more flow and reduce reliance on overland flow, the overall impact was minimal and significant flood depths were still modelled at the location. This indicates that flooding is primarily driven by overland flow behaviour and surface flow obstruction, rather than pit blockages alone.</p> <p>While drainage maintenance remains important for managing nuisance flooding, the study findings confirm that overland flow conditions not isolated asset blockages are the main contributor to the modelled flooding behaviour.</p> | <p>No changes required to the final report.</p> <p>Staff are currently preparing a list of high priority pits for frequent cleaning regime which are sensitive to the blockage.</p> |
| Modelling Methodology, Assumptions & Data Concerns        | Residents distrust the modelling methodology, especially the use of assumptions and computerised model.  | <p>The study was conducted in accordance with the latest NSW Government guidelines and industry best practices, following the NSW Government's Flood Prone Land Policy and the Floodplain Risk Management Manual.</p> <p>Consultant has undertaken calibration and validation of the flood model based on past flood events to improve the accuracy of the model.</p> <p>Site specific concerns were reviewed, and where required, the flood report has been amended accordingly.</p>   | <p>No methodological change required. Minor clarifications where needed.</p>  |
| Property Classification,                                  | Community members feel   | Technical working group for this study used a set criterion to identify   | Tagging maps refined following  |

|  |  |   |   |
|--|--|---|---|
| Tagging & Fairness                             | property classification is unfair, inconsistent, and overly reliant on theoretical scenarios rather than on-site verification. | properties which are in risk of flooding.<br><br>On site verification were completed to ensure the flood mappings are accurate.   | verification.   |
| Insurance, Financial Impacts & Property Values | Flood tagging will increase insurance premiums, reduce property value.   | Staff acknowledges community concerns regarding potential impacts of flood mapping on insurance premiums, property values, and future development. Local government in NSW has a statutory responsibility to identify and manage flood risk to protect community safety and inform appropriate land-use planning.<br><br>Insurance premiums are based on a range of factors and may or may not increase due to the flood study. Each provider applies its own pricing model based on insured amount and all known risks and claims for the LGA. | No changes required   |
| Development Restrictions & Future Works        | Flood tagging will restrict future developments.   | Flood notations do not sterilise a land from future development. Flood-related development controls ensure new buildings are safe and don't make flooding worse.  | No changes required   |
| Planning Certificate (10.7 certificate)        | Resident requested to include more information in planning certificate flood related questions                                 | Questions in planning certificate are set out by the state government. Council provides information in the certificate as per the legal advice received.<br><br>Currently Council staff provides detailed flood information to the residents upon a formal application to Council (subject to the payment of a fee).  | Commitment to work with strategic planning and legal to improve certificate wording and references. |
| Residents requested site meeting               | Many residents requested site inspections, opportunities for reclassification, or full removal from the flood notation.        | Staff has reviewed all site-specific requests and undertook on site verification.<br><br>Flood tagging database has been reviewed based and amended accordingly.  | Final report and mapping amended accordingly.   |

17. Following community consultation and verification, Council refined the Flood Planning Area tagging criteria to better differentiate negligible overland flow impacts and to remove properties captured only by sea-level-rise or low-hazard PMF conditions..

**Table 4: Changes to the Flood Planning Area (FPA) Criteria**

|              | <b>Draft report</b>   | <b>Final report – after community consultation</b>  | <b>Reason</b>  |
|--------------|---|---|--|
| FPA Criteria | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Post-processed flood model results and filtered flood extent is established</li> <li>• Isolated flood island less than 200m<sup>2</sup> removed</li> <li>• Lots subject to inundation of at least 10% and depths of more than 150mm are initially tagged</li> <li>• Desktop analysis</li> <li>• Ground truthing</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood notation was removed for properties found to experience negligible overland flooding,</li> <li>• Refinement of the Probably Maximum Flood tagging criteria by removing properties solely affected by the H1 hazard category (generally safe for people, vehicles and buildings). Properties affected by H2 to H6 hazards with less than 5% of the site impacted were also removed.</li> <li>• Properties impacted solely by sea level rise were removed from the overland flood notation (already mapped under the LEP 2021 Coastal Hazard and Risk).</li> </ul> | Responds to community requests for review and ensures overland flow notation focuses on material flood risk. |

FRMCC002-26

18. The flood-tagging database was comprehensively reviewed and refined. Following community feedback, site inspections, and additional analyses:
  - (a) 1% AEP flood-tagged lots decreased from 2,931 to 1,912
  - (b) PMF flood-tagged lots decreased from 4,554 to 3,057
19. Updated maps (attached as part of the final draft flood study) identify properties removed from 1% AEP and PMF flood notation consistent with the refined criteria.
20. The Final Draft Flood Study incorporates the following updates to reflect consultation outcomes and technical refinements
  - Executive Summary
  - Community Consultation/Public Exhibition
  - Flood Control Lot Tagging
  - All mapping with updated study area layer
21. Following the public consultation in 2025, it is recommended that the Floodplain Risk Management Committee provide a recommendation to Council to receive and adopt Final Draft of Blakehurst and Kogarah Bay Ward Overland Flow Flood Study.

**NEXT STEPS**

22. Subject to Council endorsement1:
  - a) Publish the Study on Council’s website and implement its findings across relevant Council functions.

- b) Update Planning Certificate (s10.7) wording to reference and align with the Final Flood Study.
- c) Complete grant acquittal requirements for the Study.
- d) Apply for grant funding to undertake the Floodplain Risk Management Study and Plan for this catchment to identify and prioritise risk-mitigation options.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

23. Within budget allocation.

**COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**

24. Table 5 below includes Community engagement details:

| Description                   | Duration                              | Communication Method  | Number of Submissions |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| <b>Community Flood Survey</b> | 18 January 2024 to 07 March 2024      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Your Say</li> <li>• Council Webpage</li> <li>• Newspaper Ad</li> <li>• Social Media</li> <li>• Letter sent to the residents with survey questionnaire</li> </ul>   | 746                   |
| <b>Community Consultation</b> | 15 September 2025 to 03 November 2025 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Your Say</li> <li>• Council Webpage</li> <li>• Newspaper Ad</li> <li>• Social Media</li> <li>• Letter sent to the residents</li> <li>• Community e-News</li> </ul> | 220                   |

**FILE REFERENCE**

D26/52912

**ATTACHMENTS**

- Attachment 1 Final Draft - Blakehurst and Kogarah Bay wards Flood Study - *published in separate document* (Confidential)
- Attachment 2 Presentation Slides - Blakehurst and Kogarah Bay Wards Flood Study - pdf - *published in separate document* (Confidential)

**Item:** FRMCC003-26 Update on the Feasibility Study of Flood Risk Mitigation Options at the Gloucester Road-Stoney Creek Road Intersection and the Morgan Street-Gloucester Road Intersection, Beverly Hills

**Author:** Senior Assets Engineer - Stormwater

**Directorate:** Assets and Infrastructure

**Matter Type:** Committee Reports

#### RECOMMENDATION:

- (a) That the Floodplain Risk Management Committee receive and note the presentation on current progress Update on the Feasibility Study of Flood Risk Mitigation Options at the Gloucester Road-Stoney Creek Road Intersection and the Morgan Street-Gloucester Road Intersection, Beverly Hills.
- (b) That the Floodplain Risk Management Committee note the preferred options which are selected for detailed cost-benefit assessment.

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. BG&E (consultant) was engaged in 2025 to undertake a two-stage Feasibility and Concept Design Study to identify and evaluate six flood mitigation options.
2. The consultant has recently completed the stage 1 of the study (attached), which involved the development and testing of six flood risk modification measures.

#### BACKGROUND

3. As part of the *Overland Flow Floodplain Risk Management Study and Plan for Hurstville, Mortdale, and Peakhurst Wards* (prepared by WMAwater in 2023 on behalf of Georges River Council), several flood-prone locations across the catchment were identified for further investigation.
4. One of the priority areas highlighted in the study was the intersection of Gloucester Road and Stoney Creek Road. Recent flooding on adjacent residential properties and road infrastructure has reinforced the need to further investigate flood affectation and feasibility of various flood risk modification measures.
5. In 2025, BG&E was engaged to undertake the detailed feasibility of the flood risk mitigation options in two stages.
  - (a) Stage 1 - the development and testing of six flood modification measures, including drainage upgrades, road re-surfacing, culvert augmentation, and overland flow intervention.
  - (b) Stage 2 - detailed modelling and design of selected mitigation options
6. The study is jointly funded by Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (DCCEEW). Total funding available for this study is \$180,000. The funding ratio for this project is 3 (DCCEEW) :1 (Council).
7. The objectives of the study are to:
  - (a) Reduce flood risk and overland flow affectation at and near the intersection of Gloucester Road and Stoney Creek and Gloucester Road and Morgan Street.
  - (b) Address safety and property damage concerns at affected residential areas.
  - (c) Identify practical and feasible flood mitigation solutions for affected land

8. The study area is shown in the figure below:

Figure 1: Study Area



9. The study focuses on potential flood mitigation measures for Gloucester Road-Stoney Creek Road and Gloucester Road-Morgan Street intersection.

**Table 1 below includes summary of the stage 1 investigation and preferred options for stage 2 assessment**

| Options  | Description                              | Benefit                                       | Key Risks / Concerns   | Officer Recommendation |
|----------|--|---|--|------------------------|
| Option 1 | Drainage network upgrade at intersection | Minor localised benefit (10 mm reduction)     | Limited effectiveness for key properties; increased flow to downstream channel   | Not recommended        |
| Option 2 | Terrain modification at intersection     | Significant improvement (60–120 mm reduction) | Requires roadworks on major TfNSW road; approval and constructability challenges | Proceed to Stage 2     |

|          |  |  |  |                    |
|----------|--|--|--|--------------------|
| Option 3 | Overland flow channel through Gloucester Reserve     | Minimal benefit  | Reduction in public open space; does not address primary flooding at the intersection                        | Not recommended    |
| Option 4 | Combined drainage + terrain works + Morgan St outlet | Best overall balance (intersection and downstream benefits up to 200 mm) | Construction complexity; requires coordination with multiple authorities                                     | Proceed to Stage 2 |
| Option 5 | Morgan Street channel augmentation                   | Localised 20–30 mm reduction near Morgan St only                         | Significant construction constraints under railway; low broader catchment benefit                            | Not recommended    |
| Option 6 | Stoney Creek Rd culvert upgrade                      | Substantial upstream reduction (up to 250 mm), but downstream impacts    | Flood level increase downstream (up to 100 mm); high risk to properties on Cahill St and lower Gloucester Rd | Not recommended    |

10. This information provides a basis for the Committee and Council to consider preferred options for further benefit and cost assessment.

11. The consultant will provide a presentation on the current progress of the study.

#### **Next Steps:**

12. Upon approval from the Committee, the consultant will be engaged to undertake Stage 2 of the study for the selected flood risk mitigation measures identified in Table 1.

#### **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

13. Within budget allocation.

#### **COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**

14. Community engagement will be conducted after the completion of the stage 2 of the feasibility study.

#### **FILE REFERENCE**

D26/63610

#### **ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment 1 Gloucester Rd - Stage 1 - Feasibility Study and Concept Design - presentation slides - *published in separate document* (Confidential)

Attachment 2 Stage 1 Report on the Feasibility Study of Floodplain Risk Mitigation Options - *published in separate document* (Confidential)

**Item:** **FRMCC004-26 Floodplain Risk Management Committee - Updated Terms of Reference and Outcome of EOI - Community Representative Role**

**Author:** Senior Assets Engineer - Stormwater

**Directorate:** Assets and Infrastructure

**Matter Type:** Committee Reports

**RECOMMENDATION:****That the Floodplain Risk Management Committee**

- (a) Receives and notes this report on the updated Terms of Reference for the Floodplain Risk Management Committee and the recent appointment of community representatives.
- (b) Notes the resignation of former Community Representative Erin Seller and formally acknowledges Erin's contribution to the Committee.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

1. This report provides an update on the Terms of Reference for this committee and the latest engagement of community representatives.
2. Following public exhibition, Council, at its meeting held on 22 November 2025, endorsed the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Floodplain Risk Management Committee (FRMC) (Reference: CCL102-25 / ASS038-25).
3. As part of this resolution, Council also endorsed the appointment of four additional community representatives to the Committee.

**BACKGROUND**

4. The Georges River Council Floodplain Risk Management Committee (the Committee) was established by Council resolution on 24 September 2018.
5. The Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Committee were recently updated to align with:
  - (a) the NSW Floodplain Risk Management Manual, and
  - (b) the Flood Risk Management Committee Handbook.
6. These revised ToR were publicly exhibited and formally adopted by Council in 2025. The attached updated Terms of Reference outline the Committee's objectives, membership, structure, delegations, and operational requirements.
7. In parallel with the ToR review, Council officers completed an Expression of Interest (EOI) process to appoint additional community representatives. As a result, the following four new community members have been appointed:
  - (a) Rita Vella
  - (b) Hunter Pennacchio
  - (c) Harry Phan
  - (d) Tony Polchleb
8. A welcome package—including the Council Code of Conduct, the Committee Terms of Reference, and the NSW Government floodplain risk management information guide—has been issued to these new members via email.

9. It is also noted that previous community representative Erin Seller has resigned from the Committee. Council acknowledges and thanks Erin for his contribution.

### **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

10. No budget impact for this report.

### **COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**

11. In 2025, community engagement for the revised Terms of Reference and the recruitment of community representatives was completed through Council's your say webpage.

### **FILE REFERENCE**

D26/65988

### **ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment [↓](#)1 Floodplain Risk Management Committee - Terms of Reference (ToR)



# Floodplain Risk Management Committee – *Terms of Reference*

## DOCUMENT ADMINISTRATION

|                                     |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Document Owner</b>               | <i>Director, Assets and Infrastructure</i>   |
| <b>Related Documents</b>            | <i>Georges River Council Code of Conduct, 2022</i>   |
| <b>References &amp; Legislation</b> | NSW Flood Risk Management Framework 2023<br>NSW Flood Risk Management Manual 2023<br>Local Government Act 1993 |
| <b>Document Identifier</b>          | D26/12719  |

## NAME AND PURPOSE

The Committee shall be known as the Georges River Council Floodplain Risk Management Committee (The Committee). The Committee was established by resolution of Council dated 24 September 2018.

The Committee provides important links to state agencies, key stakeholders, and the community. The purpose of the Committee is to assist Council in reducing the risk to life and property from riverine and overland flooding across the Georges River Council Area. These terms of reference outline the Committee's objective, structure, delegation, and other requirements.

## INTERPRETATION

For this document:

- Committee means Georges River Floodplain Risk Management Committee
- Council means Georges River Council
- Voting Member means a voting member of The Committee.
- Non-Voting Member means a non-voting member of The Committee.
- Chairperson means the chairperson of The Committee.

## STATUS OF COMMITTEE

The Committee is not a committee within the meaning of the *Local Government Act (1993)*, but a technical advisory committee to provide a forum for discussions on riverine and overland flooding across the Georges River Council Local Government Area in alignment with NSW Government Flood Risk Management Guidelines.

## OBJECTIVE

The Committee will:

- **Act as an interface** between Council, stakeholders, and the Community regarding flooding, including promotion of flooding awareness.

- **Act as a forum** to discuss technical, social, economic, environmental, and cultural issues and to distil differing viewpoints on issues into flood studies and floodplain risk management planning.
- To **oversee** the development and implementation of floodplain risk management plans throughout the Georges River Council area in accordance with the NSW Flood Risk Management Manual 2023.
- **Provide advice** on priorities for implementation of appropriate floodplain risk management options and flood related development controls.

## STRUCTURE

**Voting:** Voting members of the Committee will comprise of the following:

- One nominated Councillor to act as Chairperson, or their alternative.
- Two additional Councillors
- Up to five with a minimum of three Community Representatives

Where there is a conflict of interest, voting members shall exclude themselves from voting.

**Non-Voting:** The following representatives can be included in the Committee, as non-voting members. The Committee may add to this list as required.

- NSW State Emergency Services Representative
- Office of Environment and Heritage Representative
- Sydney Water
- Georges River Combined Councils' Committee
- Neighbouring Councils (Bayside and Canterbury Bankstown)
- Georges River Councils Local Emergency Management Officer (LEMO)
- Georges River Council officers with specialist skills and knowledge in floodplain risk management, project delivery, building and development and strategic planning. These officers include:
  - Director Assets and Infrastructure
  - Manager Strategic Placemaking
  - Manager City Technical Services
  - Manager City Operational Services
  - Manager Strategic Planning
  - Manager Development and Building
  - Coordinator Asset Management
  - Senior Stormwater Asset Engineer

## COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES

Following an expression of interest process, the General Manager appoints up to five with a minimum of three community representatives who adequately meet the following experience, it is not necessary to meet all desired experience:

- **Local Knowledge and Experience:** A strong understanding of the local area, its history with flooding, and how rain events have impacted the community.

- **Environmental or Engineering Background:** Experience in environmental science, civil engineering, hydrology, or floodplain management is often sought, as these areas provide technical expertise about flood risk.
- **Planning and Policy:** Knowledge of urban planning, land use management, or local government policies can be useful, especially in how they relate to flood risk reduction and disaster management.
- **Emergency Management:** Experience in disaster response, resilience planning, or emergency management, especially flood-related events.
- **Legal or Regulatory Knowledge:** Understanding the laws and regulations related to floodplain management, land use, and environmental protection.
- **Stakeholder or Project Management:** Experience managing projects or working with diverse stakeholders can help ensure that the committee runs smoothly and that all interests are considered.

## OTHER ATTENDANCE AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

- **Other Councillors:** Apart from the appointed Councillor members, all other Councillors are welcome to attend meetings of The Committee and contribute to discussions but are not entitled to vote.
- **General Public/ Public Participation:** The Committee is a technical advisory body and is not open to members of the public. The Community Representatives are selected for this purpose. The Committee will not be broadcast to members of the general public due to confidentiality of the matters discussed and the technical nature of the Committee.
- **Other Specialists:** Representatives of organisations may be invited to address The Committee on matters on the agenda.
- **Council officers:** Additional Council officers may be invited to attend meetings but do not have voting rights. This includes Council officers who support the running of the Committee.

## AUTHORITY

The Committee does not have the power to incur expenditure or to bind Council. The Committee can make recommendations to Council on all relevant business presented at the Committee. Recommendations of The Committee will be presented to Council's Assets and Infrastructure Committee and ultimately to Council in the written form of minutes, accompanied by the agenda and reports from relevant Council officers.

## TERM OF THE COMMITTEE

Councillor and Community representation will be reviewed following each General Election of Council or upon a vacancy in these positions. In the case of Council's elected representative, the selection of new members shall be by Council resolution.

A person ceases to be a Committee member if the person:

- resigns that membership in writing
- is absent for three consecutive Committee meetings without leave or apology, or

- is expelled from the Committee by Council

## FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS

Meetings of The Committee shall be held approximately six monthly or as required /determined by The Committee. Members can request for an extraordinary meeting to be called outside the quarterly schedule by contacting in writing, the Chairperson of the Committee, provided that at least seven days written notice is first given to members.

## QUORUM

The quorum of the Committee shall be three voting members and must include a Councillor.

## VOTING

The Committee shall operate in a democratic manner keeping formalities to a minimum. Each Committee member appointed as a voting member shall be entitled to one vote in respect to any matters before The Committee.

The Committees advice to Council on any given proposal should be in the form of the following: unanimous support, majority support, split vote, minority support, or unanimous decline.

## PROCEEDINGS

The administrative provisions applicable to the proceedings of meetings of the Committee are contained within these Terms of Reference. The proceedings of each meeting are recorded in the minutes of the meeting, including those present, apologies, conflict of interests, recommendations on matters before The Committee and general business. Where questions are taken on notice, these will be recorded in the minutes and provided as a separate report to the next meeting.

General Business matters must be submitted in writing one week prior to the meeting, to be considered by the General Manager. However, if it is a substantial issue, a report is to be prepared and included on the agenda at a future meeting.

The minutes of each meeting accompanied by the agenda and reports are submitted to the next available meeting of Assets and Infrastructure Committee, and then to Council with a view to the Committee's recommendations being considered.

## AGENDA AND MINUTES

The agenda shall be determined by the Director Assets and Infrastructure in consultation with the Chairperson of the Committee and circulated to members at least one week prior to any meeting.

Minutes of all meetings are to be recorded accurately, approved by the Chairperson and circulated to members within two weeks of the meeting.

Note: Meeting minutes do not include verbatim discussion of the Committee and those present.

## **MEDIA PROTOCOL**

Those present at The Committee are not permitted to speak to the media in their capacity as Committee members or guests. Any approaches by media must be directed to Council's Coordinator Communications and Engagement.

## **VENUE**

The Committee meetings will be held in the Georges River Council Civic Centre, corner of MacMahon and Dora Streets, Hurstville and online.

## **OBSERVING THE CODE OF CONDUCT**

All members of The Committee are required to observe the provisions of the Georges River Council Code of Conduct and any other requirement applicable to the proper functioning of the Committee.

A breach of the Code of Conduct may lead to the member being expelled from the Committee.

## **CONFIDENTIALITY AND PRIVACY**

Members will be privy to confidential and/or personal information collected and retained by Council. Members are required to maintain the security of any confidential or personal information and not to use for other purposes, divulge, or retain any such information accessed during their role.

Members may have contact with confidential or personal information retained by Council. If so, members are required to maintain the security of any confidential or personal information and not access, use, or remove any information, unless the member is authorised to do so.

Should a member become aware of any breach of the security, or misuses, of Council's confidential or personal information please contact Council's Public Officer. All members of Council Committees are required to observe the provisions of the Georges River Council Privacy Management Plan relating to their access to personal information.

## **PROCEDURAL MATTERS**

In relation to any procedural matter, the Chairperson's ruling shall be final.

## **VARIATION TO THE TERMS OF REFERENCE**

The Terms of Reference may be added to, repealed, or amended by resolution of the Council in consultation with or upon the recommendation of the Committee.

### VERSION CONTROL AND CHANGE HISTORY

| Version | Amendment Details   | Document Owner                            | Period Active                            |
|---------|---|---|--|
| 1.0     | <i>Complete a new version no previous version was referenced or amended</i> | <i>Director Assets and Infrastructure</i> | <i>24 June 2019 – 27 November 2023</i>   |
| 2.0     | <i>Updated Terms of Reference</i>   | <i>Director Assets and Infrastructure</i> | <i>27 November 2023 – 26 August 2024</i> |
| 3.0     | <i>Minor amendments to remove reference to Code of Meeting Practice</i>     | <i>Director Assets and Infrastructure</i> | <i>26 August 2024 – November 2025</i>    |
| 4.0     | <i>Changes to voting and frequency of meetings</i>                          | <i>Director Assets and Infrastructure</i> | <i>December 2025 - Ongoing</i>           |

**Item:** FRMCC005-26 Update from the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (DCCEEW)

**Author:** Senior Assets Engineer - Stormwater

**Directorate:** Assets and Infrastructure

**Matter Type:** Committee Reports

**RECOMMENDATION:**

- (a) That the Committee receives and notes the verbal update provided by the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

1. Representative from the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water will provide verbal update on recent projects which may benefit this committee.

**BACKGROUND**

2. Staff have recently reached out to the representatives from the DCCEEW to provide an update on current projects which may benefit this committee.
3. A verbal update will be provided on the following matters:
  - (a) Georges, Woronora and Cooks River Valley Study
  - (b) Flood warning infrastructure and systems and associated community awareness
  - (c) draft proposed Climate Change and Natural Hazards State Environmental Planning Policy (SEPP)
  - (d) Next round of grant applications

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

4. No budget impact for this report.

**FILE REFERENCE**

D26/66053

**ATTACHMENTS**

Nil

**CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS (CLOSED MEETING)**

Council's Code of Meeting Practice allows members of the public present to indicate whether they wish to make representations to the meeting, before it is closed to the public, as to whether that part of the meeting dealing with any or all of the matters listed should or should not be considered in closed session.

**RECOMMENDATION**

That in accordance with the provisions of Part 1 of Chapter 4 of the Local Government Act 1993, the following matters be considered in closed Meeting at which the press and public are excluded.

That in accordance with the provisions of Section 11(2) of the Act, the reports and correspondence relating to these matters be withheld from the press and public.