

Appendix: Damage Assessment $\mathbf B$

\overline{C}

Model log (1D) $C.1$

JBA
 Appendix: Model Log

Model log (1D)

Mel log for the 1D domain below shows the 1D .dat file (geometry file), 1D event The model log for the 1D domain below shows the 1D .dat file (geometry file), 1D event data file, 1D initial conditions file, 1D run file (simulation file), cumulative mass balance error and non-convergence outputs for the 71 model runs.

$C.2$ Model log (2D)

The model log for the 2D domain below lists the 71 runs and shows that the same Tuflow Control file (.tcf) is used for all runs, which is control file NAI ~e2~ ~e1~ ~s1~ 9 except for the 200-year (N+20) fluvial run, that uses the .tcf NAI_~e2~_~e1~_~s1~_9b.

Appendix: further model checks

Negative depths

The model runs have a negative depth error outside the default tolerance range D

$D.1$ **Negative depths**

None of the model runs have a negative depth error outside the default tolerance range apart from the observed 1997 (DM) run which has a singular negative depth occurrence in the vicinity of the harbour. This occurs at the beginning of the model run for one timestep only and occurs due to the tide level at the beginning of the model run (which is -0.7 m AOD, as taken from TotalTide software, i.e. an estimate of the tidal level during the historic observed event, section 2.6) flowing in to the Harbour. The base of the Harbour walls are approximately -1.2 mAOD from survey data. As the negative depth only occurs for a singular timestep, it does not have any impact on results.

Mass balance

The 1D and 2D mass balance error outputs are shown in the model log (Appendix C). A cumulative mass error value of ±1% is the desired range. The outputs show <1% on mass balance error for the 2D outputs for all runs (regarding both the peak of the event and the mass balance error at the end of the model run, the latter of which is the value shown in the model log). For the 1D outputs, the mass balance error is slightly larger regarding the mass balance at the peak of the event (which is the value shown in the model log) though generally <1% at the end of the model run. negative depth only occurs for a singular timestep, it does not have any impact on
results.
D.2 Mass balance
The 1D and 2D mass balance error outputs are shown in the model log (Appendix C).
A cumulative mass error value o

Model convergence

Model convergence is acceptable (within tolerable rates) for all fluvial present day events and scenarios with the exception of the 200-year (N+20) fluvial run, during beginning of the model run. This is short-lived and the run is generally stable, as shown in Figure D-2 below. Figure D-1 shows good convergence for the DN 200-year fluvial run. Convergence is good and well within tolerable rates all of the tidal runs regarding all events and scenarios including climate change events. and the mass balance error at the end of the model run, the latter of which is the value
shown in the model log). For the 1D outputs, the mass balance error is slightly larger
regarding the mass balance at the peak of the

It's noted that during the fluvial climate change events, model convergence is within the default tolerable range but oscillation / poor convergence does occur at several points

Fluvial climate change runs

A stability patch is used for the 1000-year and both climate change fluvial runs (i.e. the 'large fluvial events'). This small stability patch is at the harbour wall and also covers a small area downstream of the A96 road bridge on the right bank. Manning's 'n' is set to 0.15 in these areas, to help slow water down. The location of the stability patch is shown in the figure below.

Figure D-4: Stability patch as used for large fluvial model runs.

It is noted that there is some instability on water levels near the downstream boundary during the Climate Change scenario 1 event. This occurs around the peak of the event and causes oscillation of water levels between NAI01_00596 and NAI01_00182 (approximately a 400 m long reach, with oscillations causing water levels to have a $\frac{d}{dt}$ (a) $\frac{d}{dt}$ (b) $\frac{d}{dt}$ (a) $\frac{d}{dt}$ (noted when viewing the results output on the Longitudinal section. This section of the reach is fluvially dominated for Climate Change scenario 1 i.e. the maximum water levels are a result of the fluvial Climate Change scenario 1 run as opposed to the tidal Climate Change scenario 1. For the Climate Change scenario 2 event, a similar oscillation occurs on the fluvial run, but the oscillations do not affect the maximum water levels. In addition, the reach between NAI01 00596 and NAI01 00182 is tidally dominated for Climate Change scenario 2, i.e. the maximum water levels are a result of the tidal Climate Change scenario 2 run as opposed to the fluvial Climate Change scenario 2. (approximately a 400 m long reach, with oscillations causing water levels to have a
difference between the peak and trough of the oscillation of approximately +0.4m) as
onted when wively the results output on the Longitudi difference between the peak and trough of the oscillation of approximately +0.4m) as
noted when viewing the results output on the Longitudinal section. This section of the
reach is fluvially dominated for Climate Change sc

A normal depth downstream boundary was tested for the Fluvial Climate Change Scenario 1 runs and showed this greatly improved the stability, as such, it is understood that the oscillations are caused by the Tidal Climate Change scenario 1 water level at the downstream boundary being significantly higher than normal depth (i.e. the normal depth was calculated in the model run as being about 1.5 mAOD, respectively, were 4.21 mAOD and 4.28 mAOD). However, in line with the scope, a

Tidal climate change runs

Figure D-4 below shows a large inflow into the model at circa 18 hours for the 200-year Climate Change Scenario 1 event in the tidal scenario, this is larger than the peak river flow which peaks at 31.25 hours. This phenomenon only occurs for the tidal climate change events (scenarios 1 and 2). While this initially looks like an error, on closer inspection it occurs at the peak of the first high tide (the 'climate change' events include two tidal cycles at the downstream boundary in the model run, section 2.7). At this time, the river flow is very low and the tide very high. The large inflow is thus representing the large inflow of coastal water through the pier (estuary). The largest high tide which is the second high tide is aligned with the peak of the fluvial flood flow, by this point the river channel is full and resists the coastal flow up the channel so the same extreme sudden inflow does not occur.

Figure D-4: Model convergence 200-year + Climate Change 1 scenario (DN) coastal run

Downstream boundary

The full tidal curve was initially directly applied to NAI01_00000, including minimum Tigure D-4: Model convergence 200-year + Climate Change 1 scenario (DN) coastal

run

D.6 Downstream boundary

The full tidal curve was initially directly applied to NAI01_00000, including minimum

tidal levels that were o fluctuating water levels at the downstream boundary, and a steep slope on water level **Eigure D-4:** Model convergence 200-year + Climate Change 1 scenario (DN) coastal
run
munder and the constream boundary
The full tidal curve was initially directly applied to NAI01_00000, including minimum
tidal levels tha instability at the downstream boundary, particularly for the larger fluvial events. Figure Figure D-4: Model convergence 200-year + Climate Change 1 scenario (DN) coastal
run
D.6 Downstream boundary
The full tidal curve was initially directly applied to NAl01_00000, including minimum
fluctuating water levels at this initial set-up. Figure D-4: Model convergence 200-year + Climate Change 1 scenario (DN) coastal
run
m
The full tidal curve was initially directly applied to NAi01_00000, including minimum
tidal levels that were of the order of -1.0 mAOD. Figure D-4: Model convergence 200-year + Climate Change 1 scenario (DN) coastal

un

10.6 Downstream boundary

The full tidal curve was initially directly applied to NAl01_00000, including minimum

tidal levels that were o Figure D-4: Model convergence 200-year + Climate Change 1 scenario (DN) coastal
run
m
The full tidal curve was initially directly applied to NAl01_00000, including minimum
ditial levels hat were of the order of -1.0 mAOD.

to reach the water level of 1.5 mAOD. It was decided that either a higher minimum water level or extending the channel further out to sea would help with stability. This latter approach was more successful, and involved adding cross section NAI01_-0100, a duplicate of NAI01_00000 but widened to represent the open sea. There is a relatively steep slope between NAI01_00029 and NAI01_00000. This means there are times in the run when the water surface at the downstream boundary looks unusual, as water levels drop slightly below 1.5m at NAI01_00000 (mirroring the bed slope), but then is forced to rise slightly again at the downstream boundary (NAI01 -0100) that never drops below 1.5 mAOD. This area does not affect water levels upstream of the pier walls (as cross section NAI01_00029 is mid-way along the pier and the flux in water level does not affect any reach upstream of this cross section) and if anything, gives conservative water levels at the pier ends.

Figure D-5: 200-year fluvial event using a tidal curve with minimum value of -1.0 mAOD, from the initial model build. The water level at NAI01 00000 is unrealistically forced steeply downwards at the downstream boundary. Note that the model was run 1D-only at this stage in the project, hence the very high water levels.

Culvert stability

The purpose of the spill unit OL 00508 (OL representing outlet) at the Granny Barbour Road culvert (CUL 00518) is to give stability at the outlet from this structure, which gave significant instability when it was first implemented in the model. The spill is in mode 2 for most of the run (when flows are high), this mode means that the spill is 'drowned out' but downstream water levels can still affect the culvert (i.e. the spill doesn't disconnect the culvert from the downstream reach)⁴⁷. The model can run without the spill unit OL 00508 in the model, but non-convergence increases. As such, it has been left it in the model to help with stability. Figure U-3. 200-year licular been trusting a diact clive with imminimum value of -1.0

mAOD, from the initial model build. The water level at NAl01_00000 is unrealistically

forced steeply downwards at the downstream boun D.7 Culvert stability
The purpose of the spill unit OL_00508 (OL representing outlet) at the Granny Barbour
Road culvert (CUL_00518) is to give stability at the outlet from this structure, which
gave significant instabili

2D domain boundary

whether they would be within the flood extents from the model. The lowest elevation of these properties, as taken from LiDAR data is understood to be of the order of 5.6 event (i.e. largest event run in the model) is around 5.3 mAOD near the model's boundary. As such, it is likely that this property would be outside of, but very close to, the largest flood extent output from the model. 47 Spill technical reference, Flood Modeller (Jacobs 2023), https://help.floodmodeller.com/docs/spillimode. The model control without the spill is 'drowned out' but downstream water levels can still affect the culvert (i.

JBA

Excavated land

It is noted that there is some lowered topography near the gauge on the left bank, that is evident in the flood maps (i.e. there are greater depths in this area). This lowered topography is evident in both Phase 1 and Phase 2 Lidar data and appears to be reworked / excavated ground and is approximately 0.3 m lower than the fields to the north. Google imagery would suggest it is rough open land. It creates an artificial straight edge and forms an approximate triangular shape at the transition as shown in Figure D-7.

grid outputs

$E.1$ Longitudinal sections

The 200-year climate change scenario 1 and 1000-year climate change scenario 1 has been included in the sensitivity testing. The below longitudinal sections show comparison between the sensitivity tests, for these events. The S_DEF water levels were almost identical to the baseline, as such the latter has been omitted. Tabular results from cross sections are provided in Appendix F.

Figure E-1: Comparison for the 200-year climate change scenario 1

Figure E-2: Comparison for the 1000-year climate change scenario 1

Page CXXVIII

JBA consulting

Greatest change in flood extent

The flood extent between the S_DEF and DN (baseline) scenario is very similar for the 1000-year climate change scenario 1 event, hence further analysis on comparison has not been undertaken. The figures below show example areas of greatest change in E.2 Greatest change in flood extent
The flood extent between the S_DEF and DN (baseline) scenario is very similar for the
1000-year climate change scenario 1 event, hence further analysis on comparison has
not been underta the 1000-year climate change scenario 1 event. In general, there was very little difference in flood extent between these scenarios regarding this event, particularly upstream of the A96 road bridge. The greatest difference in extent is seen on the left and right banks, immediately downstream of the road bridge, as shown in the figures below.

Bridge blockage scenario

The bridges were modelled as being 'washed away' for the 1000-year event and climate change scenario events. As such, it was not possible to block the Merryton footbridge in the climate change scenario events as this bridge was not included in the model. Instead, the railway bridge piers were increased. This resulted in only a very small increase in flood extent, in the vicinity of Nairn cemetery on the right bank, upstream of the railway bridge, regarding comparison between the climate change scenario events respectively.

de
Appendix - Tabulated Model Results
Appendix - Tabulated Model Results F.

Appendix: External model methodology G review

 $\label{eq:1} \mathbf{S} = \mathbf{S} \mathbf{S} + \mathbf{S} \mathbf{S$

H Appendix: Internal model review

JBA

d
Silici Para Monding Collabor for Proposal Francisco (S.V.)
Tube manual

JBA

consulting

Offices at

Bristol

Coleshill

Doncaster

Dublin Bristol Coleshill **Doncaster Dublin** Edinburgh Exeter Glasgow Haywards Heath Leeds Limerick Newcastle upon Tyne Newport Peterborough Portsmouth **Saltaire Skipton Tadcaster** Thirsk **Wallingford** Warrington

Registered Office 1 Broughton Park Old Lane North Broughton **SKIPTON** North Yorkshire BD23 3FD United Kingdom

+44(0)1756 799919 info@jbaconsulting.com www.jbaconsulting.com Follow us: **V** In

Jeremy Benn Associates Limited

Registered in England 3246693

JBA Group Ltd is certified to: ISO 9001:2015 ISO 14001:2015 ISO 27001:2013 ISO 45001:2018