

29 May 2026

NSW Department of Planning, Housing & Infrastructure
Attn: Stuart Withington
By email

Dear Stuart,

RE: SSD-66876472 | BERRIMA HOTEL (The Berrima Quarter) – Response to Submissions – Flooding Comments

1 Introduction

Martens and Associates (**MA**) have prepared this response to assist Blue Sox Group (**client**) in addressing flood comments raised in relation to the State Significant Development (**SSD**) application for The Berrima Quarter, 2-4 Argyle Street, Berrima NSW (the **site**). Comments were received via a request for further information (**RFI**) from the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure (**DPHI**), NSW State Emergency Service (**NSW SES**), Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water, Conservation Programs, Heritage and Regulation (**DCCEEW CPHR**) and WaterNSW. Additional flood related comments from Wingecarribee Shire Council (**Council**) were also received in the form of a public exhibition submission.

Our 'Response To Submissions' package contains the following documents:

- Flood Impact and Risk Assessment (**FIRA**) [Author: MA. REF: P2410244JR01V02. 29 May 2026] (updated from original submission)
- Flood Emergency Response Plan (**FERP**) [Author: MA. REF: P2410244JR04V01. 29 May 2026] (see Attachment F of FIRA)
- Flood Protection Measures Plan [Author: MA. DWG: PS03-A300 rev.B. 29 May 2026] (see Attachment D in FIRA)
- Email Correspondence from NSW SES (see Attachment E of FIRA)

2 Overview of Flood Mitigation Measures

The following areas of the site are naturally above the PMF level:

- Venues inside the main gaol (function centre, restaurant, accommodation suites, wellness centre).
- Governor's & Deputy Governor's residences (i.e. the entire eastern side of the site).

- The entire north-eastern portion of the site.
- Evacuation routes to Argyle Street and Wilshire Street.

By design these areas of the proposal are also above the PMF level:

- Lower ground level suites (& floors above) in the hotel accommodation building external to the gaol.
- Upper carpark (open air) deck level.

We note the updated site design introduces a range of design changes to further mitigate flood affectation and flood risk to life. These are detailed in Section 2.6.4 of the FIRA and Sections 2, 3 and 4.4 of the FERP, and are summarised below:

- A self-erecting flood barrier allowing flood protection to the 1 in 13,000 – 1 in 1.6 million annual exceedance probability (**AEP**) event.
- Flood doors to service rooms allowing flood protection to the Probable Maximum Flood (**PMF**) event.
- Flood protection of mechanical and electrical components to the flood planning level (**FPL**, the 1% AEP + 0.5 m freeboard).

We note the passive flood barrier will enable basement flood protection to the 1 in 13,000 – 1 in 1.6 million AEP event. This exceeds the Wingecarribee Shire Council requirements for the basement carpark level of 1% AEP. We further note the NSW 2022 Flood Inquiry references the NSW Flood Prone Land Policy as stating ‘with few exceptions, it is neither feasible nor socially or economically justifiable to use the PMF as a basis for determining FPLs’. We understand that NSW SES would prefer that the basement be protected to the PMF level. However, this is not feasible or practical due to the PMF depths of up to approximately 3.5 m at the basement ramp entrance. The client has also advised it is not feasible or practical to relocate the basement entrance to a location which can be flood proofed to the PMF level as it would result in an extensive loss of car parking provision. We consider that the proposed basement design exceeds the prescriptive requirements and, together with the FERP procedures, enables flood risk to life to be appropriately mitigated. The basement flood barrier design is therefore considered acceptable.

Further, the FERP has been prepared to address the PMF, which would occur in the order of once every 4.44 million years for the catchment arriving at the site, and is therefore conservative (in accordance with *Australian Rainfall and Runoff* Book 8, Section 3.4.2, 2019). For context, we also note that largest event on record in the area was the 1978 flood, which is estimated as being a 1 in 58 to 1 in 91 AEP event (*Wingecarribee River Flood Study Update*, 2022).

3 Response to Agency Comments

Flood related agency comments received via the RFI and public exhibition are summarised in Table 1. MA's responses in the table address each of the comments and demonstrate that the concerns raised have been adequately addressed.

Note that this response table is also reproduced within the FIRA at Section 6.

Table 1: MA response to flood specific comments raised by relevant agencies.

Agency Flooding Comment	MA Responses
DCCEEW CPHR, 7 November 2025	
<i>Attachment A: Detailed Comments</i>	
<i>The EIS does address the Secretary's requirements for flooding, however the Flood Impact Assessment Report (FIRA) noted that the two basement levels i.e. lower basement (services and storage/linen rooms) and upper basement (several hotel suites) would potentially become inundated by floodwaters in the Probable Maximum Flood (PMF) event, which creates a public safety risk to the occupants in those suites.</i>	(1) As detailed in Section 2.6.4 of the FIRA, and Sections 2, 3 and 4.4 of the FERP, and Section 2 of this document, the proposed flood mitigation measures protect: a. The basement level to approximately a 1 in 13,000 – 1 in 1.6 million AEP event. b. The upper basement level hotel suites (10 individual suites) to approximately a 1 in 384,000 – 1 in 3.25 million AEP event. c. The open carpark to the PMF. (2) These are considered appropriately rare events and therefore represent an acceptably low risk to life, particularly when combined with the FERP procedures.
<i>As the site is impacted by long duration flood events from the adjacent Wingecarribee River, the FIRA proposes for a combination of closure, evacuation and shelter-in-place through a preliminary Flood Emergency Response Plan (FERP) to manage risk to life in the event of a PMF. Given the potential risk to public safety associated with flood inundation, consultation should occur with the NSW SES, the lead agency for emergency management planning on the adequacy of any proposed flood emergency response measures and alignment with local emergency response planning.</i>	(3) As discussed at (1) and (2). The FERP has been prepared in accordance with the Flood Risk Management Manual (FRMM, 2023) and Wingecarribee Shire Local Flood Emergency Sub Plan (SES Sub Plan, 2024), addressing flood emergency response procedures including pre-emptive closure, evacuation and Shelter-in-Place (SIP). (4) SES have advised it 'does not have the authority to endorse or approve FERPs', but can provide advice to DPHI on the FERP (FIRA Attachment F). We understand that the updated FIRA and the FERP can be provided to SES for comment if required.
<i>The FIRA should address any issues raised by the NSW SES to establish that public safety risks due to flooding can be effectively managed, including ensuring that the building impacted by floodwaters will be constructed with suitable structural requirements to be able to withstand the flood forces. Further information on detail required to meet the SEARs is outlined at Attachment B overleaf.</i>	(5) Response to the SES comments is provided at (14). (6) Structural design requirements to withstand flood forces up to the PMF level are to be confirmed by a certified structural engineer at detailed design stage and should be required as a condition of consent.
<i>Attachment B: Key Issues</i>	
<i>Recommended action:</i>	
<i>Prior to approval, the applicant is to consult with the NSW SES to ensure adequacy of the Flood Emergency Response Plan. It is recommended that of the satisfaction of the NSW SES is provided to the Certified consent authority in writing.</i>	(7) As discussed at (4) and (14). (8) The FERP has been prepared in accordance with the FRMM and SES Sub Plan, and can be provided to the NSW SES for review.
<i>Attachment C: Recommended Conditions of Consent</i>	
<i>The proponent must consult with the NSW State Emergency Service regarding public safety associated with flood inundation to assess whether the potential risk identified in the Flood Impact Risk Assessment is acceptable.</i>	
<i>• Prior to the issue of Construction Certificate, written</i>	(9) As discussed at (4) and (14).

Agency Flooding Comment	MA Responses
evidence of the endorsement of NSW SES of the proposed Flood Emergency Response Plan is to be provided to the Certified consent authority	
WaterNSW, 24 November 2025	
The site is largely separated from the Wingecarribee River riparian corridor by adjoining Crown land. However, the south-west corner of the site, particularly a portion of the adjoining Wingecarribee Street, is within the 1% flood zone. The EIS notes Wingecarribee Street will be upgraded as part of the proposal to provide access to the proposed basement carpark, however, no details of any works associated with the portion of the road within the flood zone are provided.	(10) Refer to FIRA Attachment C Map 14 and Map 15. No part of the site is affected by the 1% AEP flood. Only a small portion of the proposed access to the basement is affected by shallow flooding (<20mm) in the 1% AEP flood event. Details of the grading are provided in MA PlanSet P2410244PS01-C100 (not attached to this letter). The proposed regrading works within Wingecarribee Street have been considered by the proposed condition model, which demonstrates no offsite flood impacts.
Council, 26 November 2025	
The site and proposed works are essentially unaffected by flooding up to the 0.2% AEP flood event in the Wingecarribee River, and the flood impacts are considered to be acceptable.	(11) Agreed.
In flood events larger than the 0.2% AEP, large amounts of water will flow down the basement car park entry ramp and produce high hazard flooding within the basement. While the proposal technically meets the requirements of the Berrima DCP, the residual risk for flooding of the basement in extreme events is a concern and should preferably be mitigated.	(12) As discussed at (1) and (2). Flood protection measures have been incorporated into the design to mitigate the risk of flooding to the basement car park in extreme events, increasing the flood immunity of the basement from approximately a 1 in 500 AEP event to approximately a 1 in 13,000 – 1 in 1.6 million AEP event. This is considered an appropriately rare event and therefore represents an acceptably low risk to life, particularly when combined with the FERP procedures.
Council requests that the proponent provide further mitigation measures to manage the risk of flooding to the basement car parks.	(13) As discussed at (1) and (2).
NSW SES, 8 December 2025	
In summary, NSW SES does not have significant concerns regarding this proposal, however: Recommend designing openings to the basement (ramp, vents, etc) to be situated above the Probable Maximum Flood (PMF) or 1% AEP plus freeboard, whichever is higher, if possible. If this is not feasible reconsider basement carparking as any openings to the basement are below the PMF will pose risk to life and property.	(14) As discussed at (1) and (2). Designing all basement openings above the PMF was investigated but found to not be practical given the configuration of the site, noting that the PMF level at this location is significantly higher than the 1% AEP plus freeboard. Instead, a combination of engineering controls have been incorporated to increase the flood immunity of the basement to an extremely rare event in the order of a 1 in 13,000 – 1 in 1.6 million AEP event. The residual risk to life and property is managed through the FERP, which can be provided to the NSW SES for review.
DPHI, 16 December 2025	
The Department has concerns in relation to the basement carpark design and requires additional assessment in relation to best practice basement flood -mitigation	(15) Responses to Council, DCCEEW CPHR and SES are provided throughout this table.

Agency Flooding Comment	MA Responses
<i>measures. Address comments/recommendations in advice from Council, DCCEEW CPHR and SES regarding flood emergency evacuation response and basement carpark design.</i>	

4 Summary

Flood related concerns raised by the relevant agencies have been addressed by the FIRA and FERP, and are responded to in detail in Table 1 of this letter. The key findings are summarised below:

1. The proposed flood protection measures, including a passive self-erecting flood barrier, flood protection doors and kerbing to the open carpark, effectively increase the flood immunity of the basement to an extremely rare event in the order of a 1 in 13,000 – 1 in 1.6 million AEP event, representing an acceptably low risk to life.
2. The FERP addresses the flood emergency response strategy for the site and has been prepared in accordance with the FRMM and SES Sub Plan. With the implementation of the FERP procedures, the residual flood risk to life at the site is reduced to acceptable levels.
3. The FERP can be provided to the NSW SES for review if required by DPHI.

All outstanding flood related concerns raised by the relevant agencies are considered resolved and the proposed development is supportable from a flood risk perspective.

If you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact our offices.

For and on behalf of

Martens & Associates Pty Ltd



Daniel Dhiacou

MEngSc, BEng (Hons1), DipEngProc

Principal Civil Engineer, Flooding Lead