



Stormwater Letter

Revision	Date	Issue Description	Issued by	Approved by	Signed
P01	28.05.2026	Preliminary Issue	OS	SELH	
P02	02.06.2026	Amended per Client Comments	OS	SELH	
P03	24.06.2026	Amended per Client Comments	OS	SELH	

Reference: 20250242-L02 Flood Statement.docx

Date: June 25, 2026

Client: The Trustee for IPG Dev 2 Unit Trust & GOP AFF 1 Unit Trust & IPG AFF 1 Unit Trust
Attention: Andoni Ribes

Dear Sir,

**RE: 35-39 DARLEY STREET, MONA VALE
CORRESPONDENCE RELATING TO FLOOD RISK**

Northern Beaches Council – Flood Information Report (03/02/2026)

Reference: McCarrs Creek, Mona Vale and Bayview Flood Study Review 2017 by Royal HaskoningDHV

Property

- Please note that if a development on the property is proposed completely outside of the Flood Planning Area (Medium Flood Risk Precinct), a formal Flood Management Report would not need to be submitted to council with a Development Application for Residential Development. If the proposed development is determined to potentially increase the flood risk of the site, or surrounding properties however, further information may be requested.
- Please note that the site is outside the Flood Planning Area (Medium Flood Risk Precinct). Therefore, there are no flood prone land development controls for standard residential or commercial developments.

SGC: According to the Northern Beaches Council Flood Information Report, 35-39 Darley Street Mona Vale is not part of the Flood Planning Area. Flood Risk Management Report is not applicable for the proposed development.

Northern Beaches Council – Pre Lodgement Meeting Comments (30/04/2026)

Application No: PLM2026/0058



Flood comments

The proposed residential development is outside of the high/medium flood risk precinct and does not appear to have a significant impact on the low flood risk precinct (Probable Maximum Flood - PMF). Subject to not having a significant impact on the PMF, the proposal is supported. A flood management report is not required.

SGC: Further clarifying the flood information report. The comments on flooding shown above, indicates low flood risk and minimal impact on the PMF and 1%AEP + Climate Change. Hence no Flood Risk Management Report is required for this site.

Conclusion

Therefore, the stormwater design is consistent with the flooding requirements set by the excerpts above from Northern Beaches Council. Furthermore, Item 19 'Flood Risk' of the Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SSD-113872990) is satisfied, noting that a Flood Impact and Risk Assessment Report is not required.

Yours faithfully,

For & on behalf of S&G Consultants Pty Ltd

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Sam Haddad', is written over a faint, light blue circular stamp or watermark.

Sam Haddad
Director (Civil)
MIEAust CPEng NER

APPENDIX A1

Northern Beaches Council – Flood Information Report



COMPREHENSIVE FLOOD INFORMATION REPORT

Property: 35 Darley Street East MONA VALE NSW 2103

Lot DP: Lot 5 S/P 18919

Issue Date: 03/02/2026

Flood Study Reference: McCarrs Creek, Mona Vale and Bayview Flood Study Review 2017, Royal HaskoningDHV

Flood Information¹:

Map A - Flood Risk Precincts

Maximum Flood Planning Level (FPL) ^{2, 3, 4}: 16.65 m AHD

Map B - 1% AEP Flood & Key Points

1% AEP Maximum Water Level ^{2, 3}: 16.15 m AHD

1% AEP Maximum Depth from natural ground level³: 0.34 m

1% AEP Maximum Velocity: 0.40 m/s

Map C - 1% AEP Hydraulic Categorisation

1% AEP Hydraulic Categorisation: N/A

Map D - Probable Maximum Flood

PMF Maximum Water Level (PMF) ⁴: 17.12 m AHD

PMF Maximum Depth from natural ground level: 0.50 m

PMF Maximum Velocity: 1.18 m/s

Map E - Flooding with Climate Change

1% AEP Maximum Water Level with Climate change ³: 16.15 m AHD

1% AEP Maximum Depth with Climate Change³: 0.35 m

Map F - Flood Life Hazard Category in PMF

H2-H1

Map G - Indicative Ground Surface Spot Heights

- (1) The provided flood information does not account for any local overland flow issues nor private stormwater drainage systems.
- (2) Overland flow/mainstream water levels may vary across a sloping site, resulting in variable minimum floor/ flood planning levels across the site. The maximum Flood Planning Level may be in a different location to the maximum 1% AEP flood level.
- (3) Intensification of development in the former Pittwater LGA requires the consideration of climate change impacts which may result in higher minimum floor levels.
- (4) Vulnerable/critical developments require higher minimum floor levels using the higher of the PMF or FPL

Notes

General

- All levels are based on Australian Height Datum (AHD) unless otherwise noted.
- This is currently the best available information on flooding; it may be subject to change in the future.
- Council recommends that you obtain a detailed survey of the above property and surrounds to AHD by a registered surveyor to determine any features that may influence the predicted extent or frequency of flooding. It is recommended you compare the flood level to the ground and floor levels to determine the level of risk the property may experience should flooding occur.
- Development approval is dependent on a range of issues, including compliance with all relevant provisions of Northern Beaches Council's Local Environmental Plans and Development Control Plans.
- Please note that the information contained within this letter is general advice only as a detail survey of the property as well as other information is not available. Council recommends that you engage a suitably experienced consultant to provide site specific flooding advice prior to making any decisions relating to the purchase or development of this property.
- The Flood Studies on which Council's flood information is based are available on Council's online [Flood Study Reports](#) webpage.
- If the FPL is higher than the PMF level, then the FPL should still be used as the FPL, as it includes freeboard which the PMF does not.
- If the property is affected by an Estuarine Planning Level (EPL) which is higher than the FPL, then the EPL should be used as the FPL.
- Areas affected by an EPL in the former Pittwater LGA are mapped on Council's online [Estuarine Hazard Map](#). Note that areas in the former Manly LGA affected by an EPL have been identified and will be soon added to this map.
- Council's drainage infrastructure is mapped on Council's [Stormwater Map](#). Note that locations are indicative only and may not be exactly as shown.

Property

- Please note that if a development on the property is proposed completely outside of the Flood Planning Area (Medium Flood Risk Precinct), a formal Flood Management Report would not need to be submitted to council with a Development Application for Residential Development. If the proposed development is determined to potentially increase the flood risk of the site, or surrounding properties however, further information may be requested.
- Please note that the site is outside the Flood Planning Area (Medium Flood Risk Precinct). Therefore, there are no flood prone land development controls for standard residential or commercial developments.

APPENDIX A2

Northern Beaches Council – Pre Lodgement Meeting Notes



Pre-lodgement Meeting Notes

Application No:	PLM2026/0058
Meeting Date:	30 April 2026
Property Address:	35 Darley Street East MONA VALE
Proposal:	State Significant Development (SSD) for an 8-storey residential flat building containing 53 apartments
Attendees for Council:	Tom Prosser, Rod Piggott, John Coldwell and Dominic Chung
Attendees for applicant:	Charlotte Startari, Josh Thompson, Andoni Ribes and John Walsh

General Comments/Limitations of these Notes

These notes have been prepared by Council's Development Advisory Services Team based on information provided by the applicant and a consultation meeting with Council staff. Council provides this service for guidance purposes only.

These notes are an account of the advice on the specific issues nominated by the Applicant and the discussions and conclusions reached at the meeting.

These notes are not a complete set of planning and related comments for the proposed development. Matters discussed and comments offered by Council will in no way fetter Council's discretion as the Consent Authority.

A determination can only be made following the lodgement and full assessment of the application.

In addition to the comments made within these Notes, it is a requirement of the applicant to address the relevant areas of legislation, including (but not limited to) any State Environmental Planning Policy (SEPP) and any applicable sections of the Pittwater Local Environmental Plan 2014 and Pittwater 21 Development Control Plan, within the supporting documentation including a Statement of Environmental Effects, Modification Report or Review of Determination Report.

You are advised to carefully review these notes. If specific concerns have been raised, or non-compliances identified that cannot be supported, you are strongly advised to review your proposal and consider amendments to the design of your development prior to the lodgement of any development application.



Specialist Advice

- with vegetation in the front setbacks commensurate to the bulk and scale of the adjacent built form.
- Side eastern setback
 - On structure landscaped areas and soil volumes shall be maximised if deep soil isn't provided to allow the establishment of vegetation that can offer some visual amenity between neighbouring properties.
 - Side western setback
 - On structure landscaped areas and soil volumes shall be maximised if deep soil isn't provided to allow the establishment of vegetation that can offer some visual amenity between neighbouring properties.
 - Insignificant landscaped areas are provided adjacent to units 00.04 and 00.05 and the elongated bin hold which limits opportunities to soften built form.
 - Deep soil
 - As outlined in the ADG deep soil can be increased by consolidating basement car park design beneath the building footprint.
 - Insufficient deep soil is provided in the front setback.
 - Both the ADG and Tree Canopy Guide for Low and Mid Rise Housing defines deep soil as areas not impeded by structures above or below the ground surface (some minor structures are acceptable) and are areas contiguous with neighbouring deep soil. The proposed retaining walls in the rear setback around tree 30, and in the eastern side setback around tree 28 may diminish the quality of the available deep soil and inhibit contiguous deep soil.
 - Trees
 - Some trees are proposed to be retained, which is supported, and their retention shall be supported by an Arboricultural Impact Assessment.
 - Impact to neighbouring trees (i.e. tree 31 and 34) is not permissible.
 - Retention of prescribed trees can be included in the tree canopy calculations.
 - Landscape plans should show replacement tree planting to offset any canopy loss of the proposed tree removals, and in accordance with the Tree Canopy Guide for Low and Mid Rise Housing.
 - At a minimum 5 large trees or 10 medium trees planted in deep soil are to be provided. As outlined in the Tree Canopy Guide for Low and Mid Rise Housing, the *"guide should not be used to justify tree removal or a reduction in canopy cover"*. Final tree planting rates shall be determined once all tree removals are quantified.
 - Furthermore, sufficient deep soil shall be provided to satisfy the objective of the Tree Canopy Guide for Low and Mid Rise Housing *"Provide sufficient deep soil to support healthy root system development and ensure canopy trees reach maturity"*.
 - Landscape plans shall be submitted, prepared by a suitably qualified professional (i.e. Landscape Architect or Landscape Designer).

Flood comments

The proposed residential development is outside of the high/medium flood risk precinct and does not appear to have a significant impact on the low flood risk precinct (Probable Maximum Flood - PMF). Subject to not having a significant impact on the PMF, the proposal is supported. A flood management report is not required.