

## **SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA**

---

### **Council Meeting**

**Tuesday, 28 April 2026**

**7:00 PM**

**Dragon Room**

**Civic Centre**

**Hurstville**



**LATE ITEMS****COUNCILLOR QUESTIONS ON AGENDA ITEMS**

<b>CQR015-26</b>	<b>Update on Blakehurst and Kogarah Bay Wards Flood Study - Beach Street Blakehurst</b> (Report by Councillor Jamieson).....	3
<b>CQR016-26</b>	<b>Update on Blakehurst and Kogarah Bay Wards Flood Study - Wisdom Street Connells Point</b> (Report by Councillor Jamieson).....	6
<b>CQR017-26</b>	<b>Draft Penshurst Town Centre Public Domain Plan</b> (Report by Councillor Jamieson).....	9
<b>CQR018-26</b>	<b>Road Safety Concerns - Kingsway and Maluka Place, Beverly Hills</b> (Report by Councillor Jamieson).....	10
<b>CQR019-26</b>	<b>Removal of Palm Trees on King Georges Road, Beverly Hills</b> (Report by Councillor Jamieson).....	12
<b>CQR020-26</b>	<b>Draft 2026/27 Operational Plan, 2025-29 Delivery Program and Updated Resourcing Strategy</b> (Report by Councillor Jamieson).....	14

**COUNCILLOR QUESTIONS ON AGENDA ITEMS**

**Item:** CQR015-26 Update on Blakehurst and Kogarah Bay Wards Flood Study - Beach Street Blakehurst

**Author:** Councillor Jamieson

**Directorate:** Office of the General Manager

**Matter Type:** Councillor Questions on Agenda Items

**COUNCILLOR QUESTION RELATING TO:****AGENDA ITEM NO.**

CCL021-26/ASS008-26/FRMCC002-26

**ITEM TITLE:**

Update on Blakehurst and Kogarah Bay Wards Flood Study

**COUNCILLOR QUESTION**

1. Can you please address the issues raised in Beach Street regarding the 2025 baseline and the issues raised by the resident in the public forum?
2. What happens if we wait until the beach Street mapping is postponed?
3. Has this information been verified? Please provide information in response to the issues raised by the speaker.

**OFFICER RESPONSE**

1. Issues raised.

**Absence of pipe:**

The flood model was prepared using Council's internal stormwater asset database. The resident's surveyor has since confirmed that the 400 mm pipe shown as running between Princes Highway and Beach Street does not exist. This discrepancy was raised with the consultant (KBR), who reviewed the matter and confirmed that the absence of this pipe is unlikely to result in a material change to flood behaviour during a 1% AEP (1 in 100 year) flood event.

This is because, during major flood events, underground drainage infrastructure such as small residential pipes typically exceed its hydraulic capacity and surcharge. Once capacity is exceeded, floodwaters are conveyed predominantly by overland flow, following natural surface flow paths governed by topography rather than pipe networks. Accordingly, whether the 400 mm pipe is present or absent does not materially reduce flood risk for a 1% AEP event, as overland flow would occur across the site in either scenario.

Furthermore, the presence of a drainage easement and an existing pipe traversing the subject site indicates that the land naturally functions as an overland flow path, reinforcing the modelling outcome.

**Physical reality/Brick Wall:**

Retaining walls and fences are not explicitly modelled for the following technical reasons:

- They are not considered permanent, catchment-defining hydraulic controls. These features are frequently altered, removed, rebuilt, or modified over time without record, and cannot be relied upon as stable inputs for a long-term flood model.

- The terrain for flood studies is derived from LiDAR and broad survey data, which cannot resolve whether a boundary fence or wall is solid, porous, stepped, or discontinuous. Attempting to infer this would introduce significant uncertainty and inconsistency.
- From a hydraulic perspective, a retaining wall constructed on a boundary can deflect overland flow onto adjoining land (in this case #22 Beach Street), which is generally not an acceptable outcome from a drainage and flood behaviour standpoint. In NSW a landowner must accept the natural overland flow of surface water from higher land, but must not redirect, concentrate, or increase that flow onto another property.

This approach is consistent with standard practice for catchment-wide flood studies, where minor boundary structures such as retaining walls and fences are not individually represented, and their hydraulic effect is instead captured through land-use roughness assumptions. Site-specific impacts arising from such structures are managed through development assessment and detailed design review rather than through modification of the catchment wide flood model.

The owner's consultant has also confirmed the suitability of the current model:

*It should be noted that the non-inclusion of fine-scale topographic features, such as landscape walls, represents a limitation of the current regional Council model resolution, rather than an error in model setup.*

This is a standard practice in catchment wide flood modelling. Therefore, flood model does not require further amendments.

### **Tagging criteria and methodology**

The tagging criteria were used as an initial screening tool to automate the preliminary selection of potentially affected lots. This initial selection was then refined and verified through a detailed assessment, including visual site inspections, review of LiDAR-derived ground elevations, inspection of adjacent drainage infrastructure, and examination of the flood model outputs and existing planning controls.

Properties that are affected solely by sea level rise were excluded from this assessment, as they are addressed under Council's existing coastal hazard and risk frameworks. However, properties that are impacted by a combination of sea level rise and overland flooding were retained, as they are subject to flood risk from multiple mechanisms.

The flood modelling indicates that, during a Probable Maximum Flood (PMF) event, overland flood depths at the subject site can reach approximately 400 mm.

Floodwater velocity at the site is primarily a function of runoff generated from the upstream catchment and the natural topography, rather than absence of local stormwater pipes. During major flood events, pipe systems are typically surcharged, as they are designed to capture minor stormwater runoff.

Based on the flood study results, more than 10% of the site is affected during a 1% AEP (1 in 100 year) flood event. In a PMF event, almost the entirety of the site is at risk of flooding.

As noted previously, site-specific features such as boundary walls or fences were not represented in the catchment-wide flood model. This approach is consistent with standard flood modelling practice and is aligned with methodologies applied in other catchment-wide flood studies undertaken within this LGA.

### **Coastal Hazard Tagging**

Properties that were only impacted by projected sea level rise and were already subject to coastal hazard tagging were removed from flood tagging as part of the updated review. For this reason, other properties mentioned above were removed.

In contrast, properties that remain affected by overland flooding mechanism, were retained within the flood hazard mapping.

Accordingly, the removal of flood tags from neighbouring properties does not establish inconsistency or discrimination. The retention of flood tagging for Nos. 20, 22 and 24 and 26 Beach Street reflects their exposure to overland flow paths and hydraulic conditions.

2. What happens if we wait until the beach Street mapping is postponed?

If Council delays completion of the current flood study to wait for the Beach Street mapping to be postponed or revised, the study will not be completed within the timeframe approved under the flood grant. Council is required to submit all final data to DCCEEW and complete the grant acquittal report by **5 June 2026**.

Any delay to incorporate further model changes or revised mapping would require additional time and budget beyond the current scope.

As a result, waiting for changes to the Beach Street mapping would place Council at risk of failing to meet the grant conditions. This may lead to non-compliance with the funding agreement and could adversely affect Council's eligibility or competitiveness for future flood-related grant funding.

Postponing completion of the study would introduce financial, and funding risk, with no guarantee that the revised mapping would materially change the flood risk outcomes.

3. As per the response to issues raised in 1.

Answer published in the business paper.

## ATTACHMENTS

Nil

**Item:** CQR016-26 Update on Blakehurst and Kogarah Bay Wards Flood Study - Wisdom Street Connells Point

**Author:** Councillor Jamieson

**Directorate:** Office of the General Manager

**Matter Type:** Councillor Questions on Agenda Items

**COUNCILLOR QUESTION RELATING TO:**

**AGENDA ITEM NO.**

CCL021-26/ASS008-26/FRMCC002-26

**ITEM TITLE:**

Update on Blakehurst and Kogarah Bay Wards Flood Study

**COUNCILLOR QUESTION**

Could you please discuss the issues raised by the Wisdom Street Connells Point resident and respond to the requests that were raised by the resident at the public forum?

Could Council:

1. Confirm in writing whether any properties within Wisdom Street, Connells Pint have been classified or identified as flood affected in the draft Blakehurst/Kogarah Bay Overland Flood Study and the basis for any such classification.
2. Provide the verified source data relied upon for stormwater drainage infrastructure inputs in Wisdom Street, including any WAE drawings, survey pickup data, CCTV inspection data and certified engineering confirmation.
3. Confirm whether Council holds records indicating awareness of inaccurate stormwater mapping or drainage infrastructure data affecting Wisdom Street and the surrounding catchment over the past 25 years, including Council meeting records, stormwater mapping revisions, internal correspondence, or rectification works.
4. Confirm whether any flood study or stormwater model inputs have been amended following the mapping error acknowledged in 2024.
5. Confirm whether the draft flood study is being progressed toward endorsement without verified WAE or equivalent validation of the stormwater drainage network.
6. Ensure that no planning restrictions, flood notations, or property classifications are applied to properties in Wisdom Street until the stormwater network data is properly validated and independently confirmed.

**OFFICER RESPONSE**

1. Yes. Multiple properties (from #2 to #12) along Wisdom Street have been classified as flood affected in 1% AEP event and #14 is identified as PMF flood affected lot.

This classification is based on the hydraulic results of the draft Blakehurst/Kogarah Bay Overland Flood Study model, which simulates overland flow behaviour for a range of design flood events across the entire catchment using a two-dimensional hydraulic model.

The model was also verified against observed behaviour during real storm events using information provided by the community during the initial survey phase of the study.

2. Council's internal drainage asset database was used to inform stormwater infrastructure inputs for the flood model. This database is compiled from multiple sources, including:
  - Historical stormwater design plans
  - Sydney Water records
  - Development approval documentation
  - Stormwater asset data collection programs
  - Recent Works-As-Executed (WAE) plans, where available

No WAE drawings or site-specific survey data was available for Wisdom Street properties.

It is noted that for catchment wide flood modelling, detailed site-specific conditions and work as executed plans are not mandatory. Such data is typically necessary for localised flood impact assessments or detailed design of flood mitigation works rather than strategic flood studies.

3. Council's Asset and Development Assessment teams undertook site inspections in 2024 and collected stormwater asset information in the Wisdom Street area. This information was incorporated into Council's drainage database and utilised in the flood modelling.
4. No mapping error was identified in 2024. Accordingly, no amendments to the flood model inputs were required.
5. Catchment-wide flood studies do not rely on comprehensive WAE validation of the stormwater drainage network across the entire study area. This level of validation is generally undertaken for:
  - Site-specific flood impact assessments
  - Detailed hydraulic design
  - Flood mitigation option assessment

The draft flood study adopts an industry-standard approach appropriate for strategic, catchment-scale modelling. Where drainage pit depth information was not available, a set of assumption was used as per the industry standard.

6. Flood planning controls and flood notations will apply to properties identified as flood-affected in accordance with the outcomes of the adopted flood study.

As outlined in Item 5, the methodology used for the draft study is appropriate for determining flood planning levels and property classifications at a catchment scale.

Please note that during major flood events, underground drainage infrastructure such as small residential pipes typically exceed their hydraulic capacity and surcharge. Once capacity is exceeded, floodwaters are conveyed predominantly by overland flow, following natural surface flow paths governed by topography rather than pipe networks.

Answer published in the business paper.

## ATTACHMENTS

Nil

**Item:** CQR017-26 Draft Penshurst Town Centre Public Domain Plan

**Author:** Councillor Jamieson

**Directorate:** Office of the General Manager

**Matter Type:** Councillor Questions on Agenda Items

**COUNCILLOR QUESTION RELATING TO:**

**AGENDA ITEM NO.**

CCL021-26/ASS013-26

**ITEM TITLE:**

Draft Penshurst Town Centre Public Domain Plain

**COUNCILLOR QUESTION**

1. Are we able to have at least one consultation process where we can video the explanation that was provided at the key stakeholder meeting?

While the presentation has a lot of details, it does not give the opportunity to ask questions to understand the planning principles. It is an exceptional plan that has not been seen before in our LGA. The people of Penshurst are very keen to participate in this massive change and it would be great to have that opportunity to understand.

2. If we assume that Penshurst Town Centre Domain is accepted, how long will the project take?
3. Will it be possible to address the safety issues raised of poorly lit laneways and are we able to have small wins if the big wins will take some time?

**OFFICER RESPONSE**

1. The focus group consultation was conducted as a meeting that proved valuable for both Council and primary stakeholders allowing information to be heard and addressed immediately. Community consultation will be guided by the communication toolkit and engagement plan currently being developed. All forms of communication and consultation undertaken for this project will include contact details for relevant officers should community members have any additional questions.
2. Delivery of the current draft Penshurst Public Domain Plan, including design work for short-medium term actions could be achieved within a 5-year timeframe, pending suitable funding allocation and relevant approvals from Transport for NSW (TfNSW).
3. Council recognises the current safety concerns in the town centre and will note concerns related to lighting in the existing laneways. As part of the Penshurst Public Domain Plan, an action plan will be developed to guide staged delivery.

Answer published in the business paper.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Nil

**Item:** CQR018-26 Road Safety Concerns - Kingsway and Maluka Place, Beverly Hills

**Author:** Councillor Jamieson

**Directorate:** Office of the General Manager

**Matter Type:** Councillor Questions on Agenda Items

**COUNCILLOR QUESTION RELATING TO:**

**AGENDA ITEM NO.**

NM026-26

**ITEM TITLE:**

Road Safety Concerns – Kingsway and Maluka Place, Beverly Hills

**COUNCILLOR QUESTION**

1. What is the usual process and how does this location rate regarding safety in comparison to other streets?
2. What is the process for roundabouts, and will the statistics support a roundabout?
3. Will the changes that are currently being made help stop accidents?
4. Would a roundabout be the most suitable solution considering that there are pedestrian safety issues?
5. Is it possible that there are better measures that we can implement all around our LGA to stop all these accidents?

**OFFICER RESPONSE**

1. Council regularly monitors roads across our LGA by undertaking pneumatic tube counts to determine traffic speed and volumes. Additionally, Council receives regular crash data from Transport for NSW (TfNSW), however, due to the collation of data this is received typically 12 to 18 months after an incident has occurred. Council's Traffic and Transport team assess and look for trends and hotspots in available data to inform decisions. This combined with residents' requests can assist in informing decisions. For the intersection of Kingsway and Maluka Place, there are two crashes shown in the system both occurring in 2022. The available data at this intersection does not immediately highlight it as a significant safety issue and would require minor intervention to improve safety, which was recently proposed to Council in the form of line marking changes.
2. To consider the installation of a roundabout is evidence-based and site-specific. A review of traffic volumes, vehicle speeds, turning movements and recorded crash history is required. Depending on the results, Council may then investigate additional matters such as available road space, intersection geometry and topography, stormwater and drainage, pedestrian and cyclist movements, bus and emergency vehicle access, underground services and compliance with relevant standards and guidelines. There are also non-technical considerations such as relevant approvals, community consultation and funding availability.

In general, roundabouts can improve safety by slowing vehicle speeds and reducing the types of high-severity conflicts that occur at traditional intersections, but a full assessment is needed before Council can determine whether it is the most suitable treatment for a

location. Ideally traffic volumes on all approaches should be relatively equal to provide adequate right of way and improve safety benefits. When this is not achieved driver behaviour can alter and create a more dangerous environment where vehicles are not slowing to suitable entry speeds.

3. The adopted changes related to linemarking works that are designed to improve driver guidance and reduce crash risk at the intersection of Kingsway and Maluka Place. Further investigations are ongoing relating to further treatment options, which include consideration of a roundabout. Any additional works would be subject to detailed assessment, community consultation and Council approval.
4. As mentioned in point 2, the suitability of a roundabout is dependent on several factors. Traffic devices can be designed to incorporate several factors, and pedestrian safety can be appropriately incorporated into a potential roundabout design if suitable for this site.
5. Road safety treatments are site specific; each location has different traffic conditions, risks and constraints. For that reason, there is no single treatment that is suitable for every location across the LGA.

Answer published in the business paper.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

Nil

**Item:** CQR019-26 Removal of Palm Trees on King Georges Road, Beverly Hills

**Author:** Councillor Jamieson

**Directorate:** Office of the General Manager

**Matter Type:** Councillor Questions on Agenda Items

**COUNCILLOR QUESTION RELATING TO:**

**AGENDA ITEM NO.**

NM017-26

**ITEM TITLE:**

Removal of Palm Trees on King Georges Road, Beverly Hills

**COUNCILLOR QUESTION**

1. Who is responsible for this road? Is it Council or the state government?
2. Who is able to replace the trees?
3. Is Council permitted to plant plants without the state government permission?
4. Would it be fair to expect that the state government replace the plants?
5. Is it accurate stating that Riverwood can build 12 storeys next to the pipeline but not Beverly Hills? I understood that there are no height restrictions next to the gas pipeline.
6. Has Beverly Hills been overlooked in terms of the flood study and/or the Master Plan?

**OFFICER RESPONSE**

1. King Georges Road is a classified state road under the care and control of Transport for NSW (TfNSW).
2. Council has contacted TfNSW to clarify the agreement between both parties regarding maintenance and ongoing works.
3. Given the location on a state road, any planting would be done in consultation with TfNSW if it was undertaken by Council to ensure appropriate approval was granted and potential conflicts did not occur.
4. The plantings act as a beautification of the area with the primary function to enhance the streetscape. TfNSW have the primary goal of ensuring safe, efficient and reliable travel on the state road network and any beautification works are secondary to those goals. The outcome of discussions with TfNSW around ownership and maintenance of the planter boxes on the median island of King Georges Road will guide a stance on this matter.
5. ENV038-25 Repurpose of Moomba to Sydney Ethane Pipeline Hazard Analysis was reported to the 10 November 2025 Environment and Planning Committee. This report stated (emphasis added):

*19. Based on the societal risk area map, any location within 200m of the pipeline can be considered for population intensification.*

*20. The maximum uniform population density that can be accommodated without exceeding societal risk criteria is 65,000 persons/km<sup>2</sup> (average). This is above the expected density for the centres along the pipeline. For reference, the Hurstville City Centre's estimated population density is 22,746 persons/km<sup>2</sup> (source .id).*

*21. The revised MSE pipeline recommendations will therefore not inhibit the consideration of up zonings that may or may not occur with both the Beverly Hills and Riverwood Master Plans. Other factors such as infrastructure provision, built form and scale, and community sentiment will restrict densities to a level far below those set by the societal risk criteria.*

The updated Beverly Hills Master Plan will be reported to Council for endorsement and made public as part of the exhibition process in the coming months.

6. Council prepared the Overland Flow Floodplain Risk Management Study and Plan, which was adopted in 2023. The Study was prepared in accordance with the NSW Government Flood Prone Land Policy and was overseen by Council's Floodplain Risk Management Committee. The Study covers the Hurstville, Mortdale and Peakhurst Ward catchments and includes the Beverly Hills area.

In recognition of the flooding constraints identified for Beverly Hills, a Flood Impact and Risk Assessment (FIRA) was specifically required to inform the draft Beverly Hills Master Plan. This requirement was identified through consultation with the NSW State Emergency Service (SES), the Biodiversity, Conservation and Science (BCS) Group within the Department of Climate Change, Energy and Water and Council staff.

Flood risk considerations, as identified within the FIRA, have been a central and determinative factor in the preparation of the draft Master Plan, rather than an omission.

Answer published in the business paper.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

Nil

**Item:** CQR020-26 Draft 2026/27 Operational Plan, 2025-29 Delivery Program and Updated Resourcing Strategy

**Author:** Councillor Jamieson

**Directorate:** Office of the General Manager

**Matter Type:** Councillor Questions on Agenda Items

**COUNCILLOR QUESTION RELATING TO:**

**AGENDA ITEM NO.**

CCL028-26

**ITEM TITLE:**

Draft 2026/27 Operational Plan, 2025/29 Delivery Program and Updated Resourcing Strategy

**COUNCILLOR QUESTION**

1. Can you advise whether Pole Depot Park and Penshurst Domain are included in the 2026/27 budget?
2. If not, how do we include these projects in the budget?

**OFFICER RESPONSE**

1. No specific playground upgrades have been allocated in the draft budget because Council officers are currently finalising the Playground Strategy. This Strategy will define the service level for playgrounds across the LGA and prioritise replacements and upgrades. This draft Strategy will be presented to Council at the June Assets and Infrastructure Committee Meeting recommending public exhibition. There is \$1.5M allocated to 'Playspace Strategy Implementation' in the draft 2026/27 budget. This budget will be allocated to specific playground upgrades as part of the recommendations and subsequent resolution of the June committee report on the playspace strategy.

Penshurst Public Domain has not yet been adopted by Council and is still in draft format, with a recommendation to proceed to Public Exhibition on the draft plans. On this basis no budget has been allocated for implementation works in the 2026/27 budget.

2. The \$1.5M included in the draft 2026/27 budget for delivery of the recommendations of the playspace strategy has not been allocated to specific upgrades. At the June Council meeting, Council will consider recommendations from the playspace strategy report and can choose to resolve how they see appropriate in terms of allocating that budget to specific projects for 2026/27.

Council will continue to develop the draft Penshurst Public Domain Plan following community consultation, input from Transport for NSW (TfNSW) and further investigations. A final Penshurst Public Domain Plan, incorporating further changes and feedback, will then be publicly exhibited prior to being presented to Council for adoption. The finalised Penshurst Public Domain Plan will include details on proposed staging and the timing of different elements of the changes and works. It is likely that suitable high-level interventions can be considered for inclusion in a future Capital Works budget following the Project Review Committee (PRC) process for inclusion in the 2027/28 budget, which allows for Council to formally adopt the plans.

Answer published in the business paper.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Nil