REPORT

Review of Coastal Hazard at North Byron Bay using a Probabilistic Approach

Presentation of Results

Client: North Byron Bay Resort Pty Ltd

Reference: PA1998-GWB-PM-RP-0003

Status: Final/P01.01

Date: 29 November 2019





HASKONINGDHV NEDERLAND B.V.

Level 14

56 Berry Street

NSW 2060 North Sydney

Maritime & Aviation

Trade register number: 56515154

+61 2 8854 5000 **T**

+61 2 9929 0960 **F**

project.admin.australia@rhdhv.com E

royalhaskoningdhv.com W

Document title: Review of Coastal Hazard at North Byron Bay using a Probabilistic Approach

Document short title: Presentation of Results

Reference: PA1998-GWB-PM-RP-0003

Status: P01.01/Final

Date: 29 November 2019

Project name: North Byron Bay

Project number: PA1998

Author(s): Greg Britton


Drafted by: Greg Britton

Checked by: Greg Britton

Date / initials: 29.11.19/GWB

Approved by: Greg Britton

Date / initials: 29.11.19/GWB



Disclaimer

No part of these specifications/printed matter may be reproduced and/or published by print, photocopy, microfilm or by any other means, without the prior written permission of HaskoningDHV Nederland B.V.; nor may they be used, without such permission, for any purposes other than that for which they were produced. HaskoningDHV Nederland B.V. accepts no responsibility or liability for these specifications/printed matter to any party other than the persons by whom it was commissioned and as concluded under that Appointment. The integrated QHSE management system of HaskoningDHV Nederland B.V. has been certified in accordance with ISO 9001:2015, ISO 14001:2015 and ISO 45001:2018.

29 November 2019 PRESENTATION OF RESULTS



Table of Contents

1	Intro	duction	1
	1.1	Background	1
	1.2	Structure of the Report	3
2	Sumr	mary of Adopted Values for Key Parameters	4
	2.1	General	4
	2.2	Underlying Recession	4
	2.3	Recession Due to Sea Level Rise	5
		2.3.1 Projected Sea Level Rise	5
		2.3.2 Bruun slope factor	8
	2.4	Storm Demand	8
	2.5	Influence of Potential Sequestration of Sand into Belongil Creek un	•
		Sea Level	8
3	Notes	s on Interpretation of Coastal Hazard Information	10
	3.1	General	10
	3.2	Delineation of the Hazard Line	10
	3.3	Planning Period versus Design Life of Building Structures	10
	3.4	Probability of Exceedance Level for the Hazard Line	10
4	Resu	Its of the Probabilistic Analysis	12
5	Refer	rences	24



Table of Figures

Figure 1-1	Location of land subject to the Planning Proposal	1
Figure 2-1	Sea level rise projections based on DECCW (2009), IPCC (2013) – RHDHV, and IPCC (2013) – Kinsela et al (2017)	7
Figure 4-1	Immediate coastal hazard (ZSA), 1% exceedance level	12
Figure 4-2	Year 20 (2040) coastal hazard (ZSA), 1% exceedance level	13
Figure 4-3	Year 50 (2070) coastal hazard (ZSA), 1% exceedance level	14
Figure 4-4	Year 100 (2120) coastal hazard (ZSA), 1% exceedance level	15
Figure 4-5	Immediate coastal hazard (ZSA), 5% exceedance level	16
Figure 4-6	Year 20 (2040) coastal hazard (ZSA), 5% exceedance level	17
Figure 4-7	Year 50 (2070) coastal hazard (ZSA), 5% exceedance level	18
Figure 4-8	Year 100 (2120) coastal hazard (ZSA), 5% exceedance level	19
Figure 4-9	Year 30 (2050) coastal hazard (ZSA) comparison	20
Figure 4-10	Year 80 (2100) coastal hazard (ZSA) comparison	21
Figure 4-11	Year 50 (2070) coastal hazard (ZSA) at the 1% and 5% exceedance levels	22
Figure 4-12	Year 100 (2120) coastal hazard (ZSA) at the 1% and 5% exceedance levels	23

Attachments

Attachment 1 – RHDHV Report (3 October 2019)

Attachment 2 – Comments Register



1 Introduction

1.1 Background

Planners North are developing a Planning Proposal on behalf of North Byron Bay Resort Pty Ltd for submission to Byron Shire Council in relation to land at North Byron Beach identified as: Lots 1 & 2 DP1215893; Lots 12 & 13 DP243218; and Lot 449 DP812102. The location of the subject land is shown in **Figure 1-1**.



Figure 1-1 Location of land subject to the Planning Proposal



An issue in finalising the Planning Proposal is the extent to which the identified land is subject to coastal hazard. Two assessments of coastal hazard undertaken to date that include coverage of the subject land are:

- the 1978 Byron Bay Hastings Point Erosion Study prepared by the then NSW Department of Public Works (Department of Public Works, 1978). The findings of this study formed the basis of the hazard lines prepared in 1986 and included in Chapter 1 Part J of the Byron Development Control Plan 2010 (BDCP10); and
- the 2013 Byron Shire Coastline Hazards Assessment Update prepared by BMT WBM Pty Ltd for Byron Shire Council (BMT WBM, 2013). The findings of this study have not as yet been included in any updated coastal hazard planning controls for Byron Shire.

Since completion of the BMT WBM (2013) study, additional dates of vertical aerial photography were also available for interpretation to assess shoreline change, covering the period 2013 to 2019.

A meeting was held at Byron Shire Council (Mullumbimby) on 1 August 2019 to discuss preparation of a further update on the coastal hazard at the subject land, attended by officers of Byron Shire Council, the Department of Industry, Planning and Environment (DPIE) and the former Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH, now part of DPIE).

It was agreed at the meeting that the further update of coastal hazard should adopt a probabilistic approach whereby uncertainty can be better assessed, as noted in the NSW Coastal Management Manual Part B: Stage 2 – Determine risks, vulnerabilities and opportunities (State of New South Wales and Office of Environment and Heritage, 2019).

Royal HaskoningDHV (RHDHV) have applied a probabilistic approach for determination of coastal hazard at a number of sites in New South Wales. It was agreed that in the first instance RHDHV would prepare a short report outlining the proposed methodology for the probabilistic assessment and the proposed values for key parameters to input into probabilistic analysis, for review and agreement by parties at the meeting.

A report was subsequently prepared for review, dated 3 October 2019. Comments on this report were supplied to RHDHV by DPIE (Mr Ben Fitzgibbon) on 25 October 2019 and comprised a number of marked-up comments within the report and a number of comments included in the cover email.

The comments from DPIE were summarised by RHDHV in a Comments Register together with a response to each comment. The Comments Register was supplied to Planners North on 12 November 2019 for distribution to DPIE and Byron Shire Council.

A copy of the RHDHV report dated 3 October 2019 is included in this report in full as Attachment 1. It includes two Appendices:

- Appendix A Technical Note Outlining Probabilistic Methodology; and
- Appendix B a copy of a letter from RHDHV to Planners North dated 1 February 2019, which in particular sets out a review of the two previous assessments of coastal hazard undertaken at the site; namely Department of Public Works (1978) and BMT WBM (2013).

A copy of the Comments Register is included in Attachment 2.



This report presents the results of the probabilistic assessment of the coastal hazard at North Byron Bay. The report will inform the Planning Proposal being developed by Planners North.

The report assumes the reader is familiar with the RHDHV report dated 3 October 2019 (Attachment 1) and the Comments Register (Attachment 2), which should be read as background to this current report, and has a reasonable knowledge of Byron Bay and the terminology used in the assessment of coastal hazards.

1.2 Structure of the Report

The report is structured in the following way:

- Section 2 summarises the adopted values for the key parameters in the probabilistic analysis;
- Section 3 provides some notes on interpretation of the coastal hazard information; and
- Section 4 presents the results of the probabilistic analysis in graphical form. The information can also be made available in electronic form where required.

PRESENTATION OF RESULTS



2 Summary of Adopted Values for Key Parameters

2.1 General

The key parameters for input to the probabilistic analysis are:

- underlying recession;
- recession due to sea level rise (includes projected amount of sea level rise and Bruun slope factor); and
- storm demand.

The adopted values are summarised in the following Sections 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4, together with brief discussion where relevant.

The pre-storm profile adopted in the analysis, as discussed in RHDHV (October 2019), is March 2019¹.

The planning periods adopted were as follows, in accordance with recommendations in the NSW Coastal Management Manual:

- immediate;
- 20 years (2040);
- 50 years (2070); and
- 100 years (2120).

The DPIE comments on the RHDHV October 2019 report made reference to the influence on coastal hazard of potential sequestration of sand into Belongil Creek under rising sea level (refer to Comments Register in Attachment 2). This particular matter is discussed below in Section 2.5.

2.2 Underlying Recession

A triangular distribution was adopted with the following bounding parameters:

- peak/modal value (best estimate): 0.5m/yr;
- minimum: 0.4m/yr (-20%); and
- maximum: 0.6m/yr (+20%).

It is noted that the above values are based largely on BMT WBM (2013). The following further points are made:

- the values apply to so-called 'Scenario 1' in BMT WBM (2013) which assumes the retention and maintenance of all existing coastal protection works and interim beach access stabilisation works along the Byron Bay Embayment. This is a conservative assumption for future underlying recession at North Byron Bay; and
- the peak/modal value (best estimate) set out BMT WBM (2013) actually reduced from 0.5m/yr to 0.45m/yr after 2050, ie. after a period of 30 years. This has not been considered in the current

29 November 2019 PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

¹ As noted in RHDHV (October 2019), the 2019 profile is less accreted than the 2018 profile, by some 50-60m³/m above 0m AHD, hence adoption of the 2019 profile is likely to introduce some conservatism when combined with the adopted storm demand.



probabilistic analysis, thereby introducing some conservatism for the position of the coastal hazard beyond 2050.

2.3 Recession Due to Sea Level Rise

2.3.1 Projected Sea Level Rise

General

Three approaches have been taken:

- Approach 1 adoption of the current Byron Shire Council sea level rise policy which is based on the DECCW Sea Level Rise Policy Statement 2009, but with adjustment of the sea level rise trajectory to account for the estimated actual sea level rise over the period 1990-2020 plus extension of the trajectory to 2120, refer Figure 3-5 of RHDHV (October 2019)² in Attachment 1; and
- Approach 2 adoption of selected sea level rise trajectories set out in IPCC (2013), as indicated below, increased by 10% to account for local variation in sea level rise along the east coast of Australia relative to the global mean plus extension of the trajectories to 2120, refer Figure 3-6 of RHDHV (October 2019) in Attachment 1:
 - peak/modal trajectory: RCP 6.0 (high),
 - minimum trajectory: RCP 2.6 (low);
 - maximum trajectory: RCP 8.5 (high); and
- Approach 3 adoption of sea level rise projections included in Kinsela et al (2017) which are also based on IPCC (2013).

In all cases the projections are 'normalised' to a zero sea level rise value at the start of the planning period of 2020.

The first approach based on the current Byron Shire Council sea level rise policy requires little further explanation.

It is useful, however, to briefly discuss the second and third approaches.

Approach 2 - based on IPCC (2013) - Figure 3-6 of RHDHV (October 2019)

In this approach the 'low' and 'high' descriptors above are considered by RHDHV to correspond to the 5th and 95th percentile values of sea level rise in IPCC (2013) which define the *likely* range within which sea level rise is predicted to lie for the particular scenario, eg. RCP 2.6, RCP 4.5, RCP 6.0, etc.

DPIE made several comments in relation to the proposed RHDHV approach based on IPCC (2013):

² Council's current sea level rise policy can be found at: http://www.byron.nsw.gov.au/Services/Environment/Climate-change/Adaption/Climate-Change-Strategic-Planning-Policy.

Benchmarks for future sea level rise are 0.4m at 2050 and 0.9m at 2100 relative to 1990. The Policy notes at Section 3.10 that Climate Change Parameters will be reviewed and/or updated upon receipt of more current scientific analysis.



- increasing the IPCC global estimates by 10% does not represent a formal position by the NSW Government;
- the values proposed are considered to cover only the 17th to 83rd percentile range (not the 5th to 95th percentile range); and
- consideration should be given to the 0th to 100th percentile ranges.

Application of an increase of 10% to the global values is considered a reasonable approach based on the information in IPCC (2013) and introduces some conservatism. It is an approach adopted in coastal management studies undertaken within the Local Government Areas of Eurobodalla Shire Council, Shoalhaven City Council and Sutherland Shire Council.

While RHDHV is prepared to be corrected, our reading of IPCC (2013) is that, firstly, the values adopted are for the 'likely' range of sea level rise which correspond to the 5th and 95th percentile values (not 17th and 83rd percentile values) and that, secondly, the IPCC have not quantified 0th to 100th percentile values. IPCC (2013) notes that 'we are not able to assess a *very likely* range because there is no assessment available of the *very likely* range for global mean SAT³ change, and because we cannot robustly quantify the ice-sheet dynamical change which would give rise to larger values' (IPCC, 2013; p.1186).

The values adopted by RHDHV based on IPCC (2013) are considered reasonable, particularly when it is noted that:

- the peak/modal trajectory adopts the 'high' (95th percentile) projection for RCP 6.0 and not the mean (50th percentile)⁴; and
- projections have been increased by 10% relative to the global mean, as noted earlier.

Having said the above, for completeness, a third approach was considered in which projected sea level rise values at 2050 and 2100 are taken directly from Kinsela et al (2017).

Approach 3 - based on IPCC (2013) - Kinsela et al (2017)

Kinsela et al (2017) considered the *likely* range in IPCC (2013) to correspond to the 17th and 83rd percentiles (not the 5th and 95th percentiles). They then estimated the 0th and 100th percentile values for sea level rise at 2050 and 2100, by linear extrapolation, and adopted these values for probabilistic modelling. Consideration was given to the three emission pathways; RCP 2.6, RCP 4.5 and RCP 8.5.

It is not clear if the global sea level rise values were increased by 10% to account for local variation in sea level rise along the east coast of Australia.

Kinsela et al (2017) adopted a triangular distribution to describe the probability distribution for sea level rise at 2050 and at 2050 with the following bounding parameters⁵:

- at year 2050:
 - peak/modal value (best estimate): 0.22m,
 - minimum: 0.10m,

³ SAT is surface air temperature.

⁴ This corresponds to an increase of approximately 0.2m in the projected sea level rise at 2100 taken to be the peak/modal (best estimate) trajectory.

⁵ These parameters are estimated in this report from Figure 7 in Kinsela et al (2017).



- maximum: 0.40m,

at year 2100:

- peak/modal value (best estimate): 0.66m,

- minimum: 0.15m, - maximum: 1.2m.

RHDHV has fitted a curve (trajectory) to the above values by adding a set of values at 2010 using the same approach as that in Kinsela et al (2017). The trajectory has also been extended to 2120.

Summary

For illustration purposes the sea level rise trajectories for the three separate approaches have been plotted on the same graph as shown in **Figure 2-1**.




Figure 2-1 Sea level rise projections based on DECCW (2009), IPCC (2013) – RHDHV, and IPCC (2013) – Kinsela et al (2017)



2.3.2 Bruun slope factor

A triangular distribution was adopted with the following bounding parameters, which are based on a dune crest level of typically 8m AHD:

peak/modal value (best estimate); 40:1;

minimum: 32:1 (-20%); andmaximum: 54:1 (+35%).

2.4 Storm Demand

Storm demand was based on the relationship developed by Gordon (1987), being a linear relationship between storm demand and the logarithm of ARI (read as AEP), for high demand (rip head) areas, adjusted such that the 100 year ARI event is set at 250m³/m (increased from 220m³/m), and extended to cover both more frequent events (1 year ARI) and rarer events (1000 year ARI), refer **Figure 3-7** of RHDHV (October 2019).

It is noted that the distribution adopted for storm demand is <u>not</u> a triangular distribution. It is similar to the gamma distribution described by Kinsela et al (2017) and referred to by DPIE (refer to Comments Register in Attachment 2).

2.5 Influence of Potential Sequestration of Sand into Belongil Creek under Rising Sea Level

DPIE raised the influence on coastal hazard of potential sequestration of sand into Belongil Creek under rising sea level based on the work of Kinsela et al (2017).

Kinsela et al (2017) considered that, under rising sea level, vertical growth (aggradation) of flood tide delta deposits in tidal inlets and estuaries could occur with sand sequestered from the adjacent beach and shoreface. This sand would represent a permanent loss to the beach and contribute to beach recession. The sand loss was noted to be a product of the sea level rise (S) over the particular planning period and the surface area of the submerged active flood tide delta deposits (A_D). The potential sand loss would be distributed along the length (I) of sandy shoreline within the sediment compartment.

Based on the above, the volumetric loss to the estuarine flood tide delta (V_E) per metre length of the compartment would be:

$$V_E = \frac{A_D \times S}{I}$$

It was noted that the likely rates of flood tide delta response to sea level rise are uncertain and may be site specific. The implication is that the flood tide delta response to sea level rise may be slower (not instantaneous).

It is useful to put some dimensions to V_E to assess how significant the influence on coastal hazard of potential sequestration of sand into Belongil Creek under rising sea level could be.



Belongil Creek is a small estuarine system and the area of the submerged active flood tide delta deposit (A_D) would be unlikely to exceed $40,000\text{m}^2$. Taking a sea level rise value (S) of say 0.8m, corresponding to 80 years into the future at 2100, the product of A_D and S would be a sand loss of $32,000\text{m}^3$ over 80 years.

Assuming the above sand loss is distributed over the active beach profile along a beach length of say 5km, the average shoreline recession would be less than 0.01m/yr. This may be compared to the best estimate of the underlying recession of 0.5m/yr (some 50 times higher).

Accordingly, the contribution to coastal hazard of the potential sequestration of sand into Belongil Creek under rising sea level is not considered significant. This contribution would be absorbed by the conservatisms in the probabilistic analysis introduced by:

- selection of the 2019 beach profile rather than the 2018 beach profile as the pre-storm profile, while maintaining a 100 year ARI storm demand at 250m³/m (refer Footnote 1);
- adoption of a constant underlying recession of 0.5m/yr rather than reducing it to 0.45m/yr after 2050 (refer Section 2.2); and
- adoption of the 'high' (95th percentile) projection for RCP 6.0 and not the mean (50th percentile) projection as the peak/modal trajectory in the RHDHV approach (refer Section 2.3.1).

On the basis of the above, it is not considered necessary to make separate allowance for influence on coastal hazard of the potential sequestration of sand into Belongil Creek under rising sea level.

29 November 2019 PRESENTATION OF RESULTS



3 **Notes on Interpretation of Coastal Hazard Information**

3.1 General

There are several factors which should be taken into account in the interpretation of the coastal hazard lines presented in Section 4, namely:

- delineation of the hazard line;
- planning period versus design life of building structures; and
- probability of exceedance level for the hazard line.

These factors are discussed in the following sections.

3.2 **Delineation of the Hazard Line**

The means of delineation of the hazard line at a particular point in time, eg. the Zone of Wave Impact (ZWI), Zone of Slope Adjustment (ZSA) or Zone of Reduced Foundation Capacity (ZRFC), affects the position of the hazard line 'on the ground'.

The hazard lines presented in Section 4 correspond to the landward edge of the ZSA, so as to be consistent with the approaches in Department of Public Works (1978) and BMT WBM (2013).

3.3 Planning Period versus Design Life of Building Structures

The hazard lines are presented for four different planning periods:

- immediate;
- 20 years (2040);
- 50 years (2070); and
- 100 years (2120).

Consideration of design life is important in the siting and design of building structures. Horton and Britton et al (2014) have considered, based on a range of factors, that a design life of 60 years was reasonable for residential structures in a developed area.

Probability of Exceedance Level for the Hazard Line

The hazard lines have been determined probabilistically, hence an exceedance level can be assigned to the hazard lines as drawn. Two exceedance levels have been considered:

1% exceedance, meaning that there is a 1% chance the hazard line as drawn could be further landward for the given planning period (or, put another way, there is 99% certainty the hazard line is not further landward); and



• 5% exceedance, meaning there is a 5% chance the hazard line as drawn could be further landward for the given planning period (again, put another way, there is 95% certainty the hazard line is not further landward).

29 November 2019 PRESENTATION OF RESULTS PA1998-GWB-PM-RP-0003

11



Results of the Probabilistic Analysis

The results of the probabilistic analysis are presented in a series of Figures from Figure 4-1 to Figure 4-12. The results proposed for adoption in the Planning Proposal are those shown in Figures 4-11 and 4-12:

Figures 4-1, 4-2, 4-3 and 4-4: showing the Immediate, 20 years (2040), 50 years (2070) and 100 years (2120) coastal hazard (position of ZSA) respectively, at the 1% exceedance level, including each of the three approaches to consideration of projected sea level rise⁶;



Immediate coastal hazard (ZSA), 1% exceedance level Figure 4-1

⁶ In all Figures the various approaches are referred to as follows:

Approach 1 – 'SLR based on DECCW (2009) – RHDHV (2019)'

Approach 2 - 'SLR based on IPCC (2013) - RHDHV (2019)'

Approach 3 – 'SLR based on IPCC (2013) – Kinsela et al (2017)' Where SLR means sea level rise.





Figure 4-2 Year 20 (2040) coastal hazard (ZSA), 1% exceedance level






Figure 4-3 Year 50 (2070) coastal hazard (ZSA), 1% exceedance level





Figure 4-4 Year 100 (2120) coastal hazard (ZSA), 1% exceedance level




• Figures 4-5, 4-6, 4-7 and 4-8: as above for Figures 4-1 to 4-4 but at the 5% exceedance level;



Figure 4-5 Immediate coastal hazard (ZSA), 5% exceedance level





Year 20 (2040) coastal hazard (ZSA), 5% exceedance level Figure 4-6






Figure 4-7 Year 50 (2070) coastal hazard (ZSA), 5% exceedance level





Figure 4-8 Year 100 (2120) coastal hazard (ZSA), 5% exceedance level

The following comment can be made at this point on the basis of the results shown in Figures 4-1 to 4-8:

the coastal hazard at 20 years (2040), 50 years (2070) and 100 years (2120) are in a similar position irrespective of whether Approach 1, Approach 2 or Approach 3 is adopted for projected sea level rise, at both the 1% and 5% exceedance levels.

This is useful in that the coastal hazard is relatively insensitive to any decision on projected sea level within the realms of Approach 1, Approach 2 and Approach 3.



Figure 4-9:

showing the coastal hazard (position of ZSA) at 2050 at the 1% and 5% exceedance levels for comparison to the 2050 hazard line in BMT WBM (2013)⁷. To avoid clutter, a single hazard line at 2050 for the 1% and 5% exceedance levels is drawn, corresponding to Approach 2 for projected sea level rise;




Figure 4-9 Year 30 (2050) coastal hazard (ZSA) comparison

PRESENTATION OF RESULTS 29 November 2019

⁷ The 2050 and 2100 hazard lines in BMT WBM (2013), for Scenario 1 (refer Section 2.2), were kindly supplied in electronic, georeferenced form, by Byron Shire Council.



• Figure 4-10:

showing the coastal hazard (position of ZSA) at 2100 at the 1% and 5% exceedance levels for comparison to the 2100 hazard line in BMT WBM (2013)⁷. Again, a single hazard line at 2100 for the 1% and 5% exceedance levels is drawn, corresponding to Approach 2 for projected sea level rise.




Figure 4-10 Year 80 (2100) coastal hazard (ZSA) comparison

The following comments can be made on the basis of the results shown in Figures 4-9 and 4-10:

- the coastal hazard at 2050, based on the probabilistic analysis, is generally slightly more landward (conservative) than the best estimate in BMT WBM (2013); and
- the coastal hazard at 2100, based on the probabilistic analysis, is similar to the best estimate in BMT WBM (2013).



• Figure 4-11:

Proposed for adoption in the Planning Proposal, being the coastal hazard (position of ZSA) at 50 years (2070) at the 1% and 5% exceedance levels, using Approach 1 for projected sea level rise. While the coastal hazard is similar irrespective of whether Approach 1, Approach 2 or Approach 3 is adopted for projected sea level rise, as noted earlier, Approach 1 is most aligned with Council's current sea level rise policy and has been selected for this reason. Both the 1% and 5% exceedance levels results are shown to inform the decision making.



Figure 4-11 Year 50 (2070) coastal hazard (ZSA) at the 1% and 5% exceedance levels



Figure 4-12: Proposed for adoption in the Planning Proposal, as above for Figure 4-11 but at 100 years (2120).



Figure 4-12 Year 100 (2120) coastal hazard (ZSA) at the 1% and 5% exceedance levels

29 November 2019 PRESENTATION OF RESULTS



5 References

BMT WBM (2013), 'Byron Shire Coastline Hazards Assessment Update', prepared for Byron Shire Council, Final Report, R.B19093.001.03.docx, September 2013

Department of Public Works (1978), 'Byron Bay – Hastings Point Erosion Study', Coastal Engineering Branch, Report No PWD 78026, November 1978

Gordon, AD (1987), 'Beach Fluctuations and Shoreline Change – NSW', Preprints of Papers, 8th Australasian Conference on Coastal and Ocean Engineering, Launceston, 30 November to 4 December, Institution of Engineers Australia National Conference Publication No 87/17, pp. 103-167

Horton, Peter; Britton, Greg; Gordon, Angus; Walker, Bruce; Moratti, Mark; and Cameron, Daylan (2014), 'Drawing a Line in the Sand – Defining Beachfront Setbacks based on Acceptable Risk', 23rd NSW Coastal Conference.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (2013), 'Climate Change 2013, The Physical Science Basis, Working Group/Contribution to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change', [Stocker, TF; Qin, D; Plattner, G-K; Tignor, M; Allen, SK; Boschung, J; Nauels, A; Xia, Y; Bex, V and PM Midgley (editors)], Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, New York, USA

Kinsela, Michael; Morris, Bradley; Linklater, Michelle; and Hanslow, David (2017), 'Second-Pass Assessment of Potential Exposure to Shoreline Change in New South Wales, Australia, using a Sediment Compartments Framework', Journal of Marine Science and Engineering, 2017, 5, 61.



Attachment 1 – RHDHV Report (3 October 2019)

29 November 2019 PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

REPORT

Review of Coastal Hazard at North Byron Bay using a Probabilistic Approach

Methodology and Selection of Key Parameters

Client: North Byron Bay Resort Pty Ltd

Reference: PA1998-RHD-ZZ-XX-RP-Z-0001

Status: Final/P01.01

Date: 03 October 2019





HASKONINGDHV NEDERLAND B.V.

Level 14

56 Berry Street

NSW 2060 North Sydney

Maritime & Aviation

Trade register number: 56515154

+61 2 8854 5000 **T**

+61 2 9929 0960 **F**

project.admin.australia@rhdhv.com E

royalhaskoningdhv.com W

Document title: Review of Coastal Hazard at North Byron Bay using a Probabilistic Approach

Document short title: Review of coastal hazard

Reference: PA1998-RHD-ZZ-XX-RP-Z-0001

Status: P01.01/Final
Date: 03 October 2019
Project name: North Byron Bay

Project number: PA1998
Author(s): Greg Britton


Drafted by: Greg Britton

Checked by: Greg Britton

Date / initials: 03.10.19/GWB

Approved by: Greg Britton

Date / initials: 03.10.19/GWB



Disclaimer

No part of these specifications/printed matter may be reproduced and/or published by print, photocopy, microfilm or by any other means, without the prior written permission of HaskoningDHV Nederland B.V.; nor may they be used, without such permission, for any purposes other than that for which they were produced. HaskoningDHV Nederland B.V. accepts no responsibility or liability for these specifications/printed matter to any party other than the persons by whom it was commissioned and as concluded under that Appointment. The integrated QHSE management system of HaskoningDHV Nederland B.V. has been certified in accordance with ISO 9001:2015, ISO 14001:2015 and ISO 45001:2018.



Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Background	1
1.2	Structure of the Report	2
2	Methodology for Probabilistic Assessment of Coastal Hazard	3
3	Proposed Values for Key Parameters	6
3.1	General	6
3.2	Pre-Storm Profile	6
3.3	Planning Period	8
3.4	Underlying Recession	8
3.5	Recession due to Sea Level Rise	9
3.6	Storm Demand	13
4	References	15
Tabl	e of Figures	
Figure	e 1-1 Location of land subject to the Planning Proposal	1
Figure	2-1 The probability density function of a triangular distribution	4
Figure	2-2 Flow chart for the probabilistic assessment of coastal hazard	5
Figure	e 3-1 Beach profiles at Profile 18 for the period 2012-2019	7
Figure	e 3-2 Beach profiles at Profile 21 for the period 2012-2019	7
Figure	e 3-3 Profile locations in Block C, Byron Bay adjacent to subject site	8
Figure	e 3-4 Sea level rise projections adopted by BMT WBM (2013)	10
•	e 3-5 Original sea level rise projection in DECCW (2009) and curve of best fit projection nting for estimated actual sea level rise over the period 1990-2020, relative to 1990	11
Figure	e 3-6 Sea level rise projections based on DECCW (2009) and IPCC (2013)	13
Figure	e 3-7 Relationship between storm demand and ARI/AEP	14

Appendices

Appendix A – Technical Note Outlining Probabilistic Methodology

Appendix B - Copy of Letter from RHDHV to Planners North dated 1 February 2019



1 Introduction

1.1 Background

Planners North are developing a Planning Proposal on behalf of North Byron Bay Resort Pty Ltd for submission to Byron Shire Council in relation to land at North Byron Beach identified as: Lots 1 & 2 DP1215893; Lots 12 & 13 DP243218; and Lot 449 DP812102. The location of the subject land is shown in **Figure 1-1**.



Figure 1-1 Location of land subject to the Planning Proposal



An issue in finalising the Planning Proposal is the extent to which the identified land is subject to coastal hazard. Two assessments of coastal hazard undertaken to date that include coverage of the subject land are:

- the 1998 Byron Bay Hastings Point Erosion Study prepared by the then NSW Department of Public Works (Department of Public Works, 1978). The findings of this study formed the basis of the hazard lines prepared in 1986 and included in Chapter 1 Part J of the Byron Development Control Plan 2010 (BDCP10); and
- the 2013 Byron Shire Coastline Hazards Assessment Update prepared by BMT WBM Pty Ltd for Byron Shire Council (BMT WBM, 2013). The findings of this study have not as yet been included in any updated coastal hazard planning controls for Byron Shire.

Since completion of the BMT WBM (2013) study, additional dates of vertical aerial photography are now also available for interpretation to assess shoreline change, covering the period 2013 to 2019.

A meeting was held at Byron Shire Council (Mullumbimby) on 1 August 2019 to discuss preparation of a further update on the coastal hazard at the subject land, attended by officers of Byron Shire Council, the Department of Industry, Planning and Environment (DPIE) and the former Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH, now part of DPIE).

It was agreed at the meeting that the further update of coastal hazard should adopt a probabilistic approach whereby uncertainty can be better assessed, as noted in the *NSW Coastal Management Manual Part B: Stage 2 – Determine risks, vulnerabilities and opportunities* (State of New South Wales and Office of Environment and Heritage, 2019).

Royal HaskoningDHV (RHDHV) have applied a probabilistic approach for determination of coastal hazard at a number of sites in New South Wales. It was agreed that in the first instance RHDHV would prepare a short report outlining the proposed methodology for the probabilistic assessment and the proposed values for key parameters to input into probabilistic analysis, for review and agreement by parties at the meeting.

1.2 Structure of the Report

The report is structured in the following way:

- Section 2 summarises the key steps in the proposed probabilistic methodology. It includes reference to a more detailed technical note outlining the methodology included in **Appendix A**; and
- Section 3 summarises the proposed values for key parameters to be adopted in the probabilistic analysis. It includes reference to a more detailed discussion by RHDHV of parameter values previously considered in Department of Public Works (1978) and BMT WBM (2013), set out in a letter from RHDHV to Ms Kate Singleton of Planners North dated 1 February 2019, included in Appendix B.

The report assumes the reader has a reasonable knowledge of Byron Bay and the terminology used in the assessment of coastal hazards.



2 Methodology for Probabilistic Assessment of Coastal Hazard

Traditionally, coastal hazard assessments in NSW have been undertaken using a deterministic approach. In this approach, each parameter that is an input to calculation of the hazard, eg. design storm demand, sea level rise (SLR) projection, etc. is assigned a single value. The single value is typically a conservative estimate for the parameter.

In the probabilistic approach, each input parameter is allowed to vary randomly according to an appropriate probability distribution function. The randomly sampled parameters are then repeatedly combined in a process known as Monte Carlo simulation. All outputs of the Monte Carlo simulation are collected to develop a probability curve for the shoreline position at the end of a particular adopted planning period.

In the probabilistic approach applied by RHDHV, the Monte Carlo simulation involves one million values of a parameter for each year of the planning period.

The three key input parameters to the probabilistic analysis are:

- shoreline recession due to net sediment loss (sediment budget differential), sometimes referred to as 'underlying recession';
- sea level rise and the recession in response to sea level rise; and
- event based erosion due to storm activity referred to as 'storm demand'.

The methodology for the probabilistic approach is set out in a technical note in Appendix A. Some general points are noted below:

- where an input parameter can vary randomly but has a distribution that is not fully known, a
 triangular distribution is typically assigned for the parameter. The triangular distribution is defined
 by a minimal value, a maximum value, and a peak/modal value (most likely or best estimate
 value). The peak/modal value does not need to be equidistant between the minimum and
 maximum values hence a skewness can be assigned to the probability distribution. The triangular
 distribution is depicted in Figure 2-1;
- recession due to sea level rise is estimated based on application of the Bruun rule, which requires
 an estimate of the magnitude of sea level rise and the inverse of the average beach slope
 extending to the depth of closure. For the Monte Carlo simulations, both of these parameters (sea
 level rise and inverse beach slope) are defined by separate triangular probability distributions;
- in the case of sea level rise, the minimum, maximum and modal values in successive years over a
 given planning period are set so that they follow a specified trajectory, eg. an International Panel
 for Climate Change (IPCC) concentration pathway, hence random sea level rise trajectories are
 generated in the Monte Carlo simulations in the case of sea level rise;
- the total long-term recession at each year is calculated by simply summing the separate Monte Carlo results for underlying recession and for recession due to sea level rise for that year;
- in the case of storm demand, annual exceedance probabilities (AEP values) of storm demand are randomly sampled in each year of the planning period and then converted to a volume using empirical relationships. So-called 'high demand' (rip head) values for storm demand are adopted;
- storm demand volume is then converted to a setback distance using the methodology outlined in Nielsen (1992), allowing separate determination of Zone of Wave Impact (ZWI), Zone of Slope Adjustment (ZSA) and Zone of Reduced Foundation Capacity (ZRFC);



- the total setback for each zone (ZWI, ZSA, ZRFC) is calculated by adding the storm demand setback to the combined long-term recession, randomly, on a year by year basis;
- calculations are performed for each beach profile along a section of shoreline of interest (profiles generally established by a photogrammetric analysis); and
- it is assumed that the beach has recovered from the storm-driven erosion that occurs in a year at the beginning of the subsequent year¹.

A flow chart showing the methodology for the probabilistic assessment of coastal hazard is provided in **Figure 2-2**.




Figure 2-1 The probability density function of a triangular distribution

4

¹ This assumption is made to reduce computational effort, as the actual storm demand is a function of beach state. It would otherwise be necessary to continually track the beach state, including a recovery algorithm, and continually adjust the storm demand in response to beach state, particularly the larger values of storm demand (by reducing these values). Beaches in an eroded state have lower storm demands due to dissipation of wave energy on offshore bars formed during previous erosion events.






Figure 2-2 Flow chart for the probabilistic assessment of coastal hazard



3 Proposed Values for Key Parameters

3.1 General

The following sections set out the proposed values for the key parameters to adopt in the probabilistic analysis. Consideration of the proposed values has been based on the following information:

- the 1998 Byron Bay Hastings Point Erosion Study (Department of Public Works, 1978);
- the 2013 Byron Shire Coastline Hazards Assessment Update (BMT WBM, 2013);
- additional photogrammetric data available since completion of the BMT WBM (2013) study, covering the period 2013 to 2019²; and
- experience of the writer.

As noted in **Section 1.2**, a more detailed discussion of parameter values previously considered in Department of Public Works (1978) and in BMT WBM (2013) is set out in a RHDHV letter to Planners North dated 1 February 2019, included in **Appendix B**. The reader is referred to **Appendix B** for more detail. Only a summary of the parameter values from these previous studies is provided in this section.

It is also necessary to select the pre-storm profile upon which to apply the shoreline recession and storm demand, and to select the planning period(s).

3.2 Pre-Storm Profile

Selection of the pre-storm profile upon which to apply the shoreline recession and storm demand is important as this influences the ultimate position of the future coastal hazard.

In selecting the pre-storm profile the aim should be to adopt a relatively accreted beach profile, typically referred to by the writer as an 'average beach full' profile, as the high storm demands selected in hazard assessments can only be realised in practice if accreted profiles exist (as noted in Footnote 1, in the situation of eroded profiles there are large quantities of sand in offshore bars which dissipate wave energy giving lower storm demands). The selected pre-storm profile should also, ideally, be a 'real' profile (not synthesized) and be contemporary, i.e. recent.

Figure 3-1 and **Figure 3-2** show beach profiles available from the NSW Beach Profile Database at Profile 18 and Profile 21 respectively for the years 2012, 2013, 2016, 2018 and 2019. The locations of the profiles are shown in **Figure 3-3**. The trends evident in **Figure 3-1** and **Figure 3-2** are representative of all the beach profiles 15 to 24 over the period 2012-2019.

Firstly, it is evident that the 2016 beach profile is not suitable for adoption due to the surface 'noise' in the profile³. Selection of a suitable pre-storm profile is between the dates of 2018 and 2019. The 2019 profile is less accreted than the 2018 profile, by some 50-60 m³/m above 0m AHD, hence its adoption would be more conservative. This conservatism could be considered in selection of the storm demand values to adopt in the probabilistic assessment.

² Specifically, this comprises photogrammetric data available from the NSW Beach Profile Database for Block C at Byron Bay, Profiles 15 to 24 north of the influence of Belongil Creek entrance area, for years 2013, 2016, 2018 and 2019. For completeness, profiles from 2012 are also considered.

³ The 2016 profile was derived by LiDAR and it is apparent the laser has reflected off vegetation.



Adoption of the 2019 profile is proposed.




Figure 3-1 Beach profiles at Profile 18 for the period 2012-2019




Figure 3-2 Beach profiles at Profile 21 for the period 2012-2019





Figure 3-3 Profile locations in Block C, Byron Bay adjacent to subject site

3.3 Planning Period

In discussions with officers of Council and DPIE at Mullumbimby on 1 August 2019 it was agreed that planning periods of 50 years and 100 years should be adopted for assessment of coastal hazard. As such, it is proposed the coastal hazard is determined at years 2070 and 2120. It is also possible to determine the hazard at any intermediate date. In terms of the actual development of the land, the accepted typical life of building structures also needs to be considered.

3.4 Underlying Recession

Department of Public Works (1978)

- average annual recession rates over the period 1947 to 1977 were assessed as approximately 1m/yr;
- 50-year and 100-year hazard lines appeared to be based on an adopted average annual recession rate of 2m/yr; and
- the above values can be shown to be unduly conservative.

BMT WBM (2013) (Scenario 14)

⁴ BMT WBM (2013) determined hazard lines for two erosion hazard scenarios:

[•] Scenario 1: Retention and permanent maintenance of all existing coastal protection works and interim beach access stabilisation works along the Bryon Bay Embayment; and

Project related



- 0.5 m/yr for the period 2010 to 2050;
- 0.45 m/yr for the period 2050 to 2100.

The above values were considered by BMT WBM to be 'best estimates'. In recognition of the uncertainty inherent in modelling future shoreline behaviour and/or factors that are difficult to quantify, maximum and minimum values were also determined by applying factors of +20% and -20% respectively to the 'best estimate' values.

Beach profiles 2012-2019

Beach profiles 15 to 24 over the period 2012-2019 show the following characteristics:

- significant landward translation of the face of the frontal dune between 2012 and 2013, up to approximately 13 m at the 5 mAHD level. This is presumably related to the ocean storm event in February 2013 where the offshore significant wave height recorded at the Byron Bay Waverider buoy exceeded 5 m for more than 24 hrs;
- there was little change to the position of the face of the frontal dune from 2013 to 2019; and
- total sand volume above 0 m AHD showed little net change over the period 2012-2019; losses in the upper face of the frontal dune were generally compensated by gain (recovery) in the lower beach berm between 0 m AHD and approximately 3 m AHD.

Based on the beach behaviour observed over the seven-year period 2012-2019 it is not considered necessary to revise the underlying recession rate determined by BMT WBM based on their analysis of the 65-year period 1947-2012 and their predictive modelling.

Proposed values

The following three values are proposed for the underlying recession rate, according to the triangular distribution:

peak/modal value (best estimate): 0.5 m/yr;

minimum: 0.4 m/yr (-20%); andmaximum: 0.6 m/yr (+20%).

3.5 Recession due to Sea Level Rise

Department of Public Works (1978)

Sea level rise was not considered in the 1978 study.

BMT WBM (2013)

• magnitude of sea level rise was adopted as per Council policy which is based on DECCW (2009), namely; 0.4 m at 2050 and 0.9 m at 2100, both relative to 1990. These two values became 0.34m

[•] Scenario 2: Retention of only the Jonson Street protection works and removal of all other coastal erosion protection works and interim beach access protection works along the Byron Bay Embayment.

Future shoreline recession in the subject area would be greater under Scenario 1 than Scenario 2. It is also considered more likely that Scenario 1 would prevail into the foreseeable future. For this reason it has been assumed Scenario 1 would apply, which is conservative for the subject area.



and 0.84m at 2050 and 2100 respectively when applied to the base year of 2010 adopted in BMT WBM (2013), based on advice from OEH at the time that the estimated sea level rise from 1990 to 2010 could be taken as 0.06m. This situation is depicted in **Figure 3-4**;

- best estimate Bruun slope factor was 45:1; lower and upper limits for the slope factor to allow for uncertainty were 36:1 (-20%) and 60:1 (+35%)⁵;
- an EVO-MOD model approach was also used to estimate shoreline recession due to sea level rise and gave 'somewhat higher' recession than the Bruun Rule approach; and
- final allowances for shoreline recession due to sea level rise, relative to the 2010 beach profile, were 19 m at 2050 and 50 m at 2100.




Figure 3-4 Sea level rise projections adopted by BMT WBM (2013)

Beach Profiles 2012-2019

The short period of additional beach profile dates 2012-2019 and short-term variability do not provide additional insight to sea level rise.

Proposed Values

It is understood from discussions with Mr Ben Fitzgibbon of DPIE that Council may continue to adopt a sea level rise policy based on DECCW (2009). If this is the case, it is considered that recognition needs to be given to the estimated actual sea level rise over the period 1990-2020. In addition to sea level rise projections based on DECCW (2009), it is considered that account should also be taken of the latest

⁵ These slope factors were based on a dune crest level of 5 m AHD, which were considered appropriate for the typical exposed coastline parts of northern NSW and south-east Queensland. It was noted that the slope factor would be 'somewhat less' for higher dunes, for example a slope factor of 45:1 would become about 35:1 for 10 m dunes and 40:1 for 8 m dunes. Dunes in the subject area have a crest level in the range 6 m AHD to greater than 10 m AHD hence adoption of 45:1, with limits of 36:1 and 60:1 would introduce some conservatism.



global mean sea level rise projections provided in IPCC (2013). These two approaches are discussed further below.

In terms of sea level rise projections based on DECCW (2009), **Figure 3-5** shows the following:

- the original projection, namely 0.4m at 2050 and 0.9m at 2100 relative to 1990; and
- a curve of best fit projection accounting for an estimated actual sea level rise over the period 1990-2020 of 0.08m and retaining the projections of 0.4m at 2050 and 0.9m at 2100⁶.

It is evident from **Figure 3-5** that a best fit sea level rise trajectory would be somewhat less than 0.4m at 2050, relative to 1990, compared to the original projection, as might be expected based on the estimates of actual sea level rise over the period 1990- 2020. A best fit trajectory could however still pass through 0.9m at 2100, relative to 1990.




Figure 3-5 Original sea level rise projection in DECCW (2009) and curve of best fit projection accounting for estimated actual sea level rise over the period 1990-2020, relative to 1990

IPCC (2013) provides global mean sea level projections for four representative concentration pathways (RCP) scenarios; namely RCP 2.6, RCP 4.5, RCP 6.0, and RCP 8.5. For each scenario a median sea level rise value is provided along with a likely range, corresponding to the 5% and 95% percentile values, for future years up to 2100. Global plots of percentage deviation from the global sea level rise are also provided and indicate that the local variation along the east coast of Australia is up to 10% higher than the global trend.

 $^{^6}$ The estimated actual sea level rise of 0.08m is based on the value of 0.06m advised to BMT WBM by OEH and reported in BMT WBM (2013) and an estimate of 0.02m for the period 2010-2020 based on an average relative mean sea level rise determined from the Fort Denison tide gauge record over the decade 2007-2016 of 1.81mm \pm 0.3mm/yr reported by Watson (2018).

Project related



IPCC (2013) global sea level rise projections, with adjustment of plus 10% to account for local variation in sea level rise relative to the global mean, have been adopted, for example, by Eurobodalla Shire Council, Shoalhaven City Council and Sutherland Shire Council.

In a probabilistic assessment of coastal hazard recently (2018) carried out by RHDHV for a large parcel of coastal land in Sutherland Shire the following range of sea level rise trajectories were adopted, endorsed by the Council and the then OEH (all IPCC values increased by 10%):

- peak/ modal trajectory: RCP 6.0 (high);
- minimum trajectory: RCP 2.6 (low); and
- maximum trajectory: RCP 8.5 (high).

Adoption of the 'high' value within RCP 6.0 as the peak/modal trajectory is potentially conservative but was preferred by Council and OEH. The adoption of RCP 2.6 (low) and RCP 8.5 (high) for the minimum and maximum trajectories respectively represented a wide range of sea level rise projections but was agreed as reasonable given IPCC (2013) noted that all RCPs are considered plausible.

Figure 3-6 is a compilation of five different sea level rise projections or trajectories, comprising the two trajectories in **Figure 3-5** and the three trajectories referred to above. All trajectories are plotted relative to 1990 for comparison purposes but note that the sea level rise projections in IPCC (2013) are stated as relative to the relatively wide period of 1986-2005. From **Figure 3-6** it is evident that:

- the peak/modal trajectory of RCP 6.0 (high) from IPCC (2013), increased by 10%, is lower than the
 original projection in DECCW (2009) and the adjusted curve of best fit based on DECCW (2009)
 accounting for the estimated actual sea level rise over the period 1990-2020, thus indicating that IPCC
 sea level rise projections have lowered, at least for the period up to 2120; and
- the trajectory of RCP 8.5 (high) does exceed the original projections in DECCW (2009) and the adjusted curve of best fit based on DECCW (2009) after about 2060-2070, so that the probabilistic approach will randomly sample higher sea level rise values then in DECCW (2009) in the latter period of the simulations.

Due to the variability in sea level rise projections, it is proposed that the simulations consider both the adjusted curve of best fit based on DECCW (2009) as well as the projections based on the more recent IPCC (2013) scenarios. In each case the projections would be 'normalised' to a zero sea level rise value at the start of the planning period of 2020.






Figure 3-6 Sea level rise projections based on DECCW (2009) and IPCC (2013)

3.6 Storm Demand

Department of Public Works (1978)

- interpretation of storm demand was limited by the short period of record available and the location of the particular beach profile examined (located within the zone of influence of Belongil Creek); and
- no specific value in the form of m³/m above 0m AHD was nominated.

BMT WBM (2013)

- a storm demand of 250m³/m was adopted for the North Byron area; and
- an average recurrence interval (ARI) for this storm demand was not nominated but based on Gordon (1987) and the experience of the writer it would be approximately equal to the 100year ARI 'high' demand value at a rip head.

Beach Profiles (2012-2019)

Based on the beach behaviour observed over the seven year period 2012-2019 it is not considered necessary to revise the assessment of storm demand undertaken by BMT WBM.

Proposed Values

Based on measurements at NSW beaches, Gordon (1987) derived relationships between storm demand and average recurrence interval, in both 'high demand' (at rip heads) and 'low demand' (away from rip



heads) areas. It was estimated by Gordon (1987) that the storm demand above 0m AHD was about 220m³/m for the 100year ARI event, for exposed NSW beaches at rip heads, and that the relationship between storm demand and the logarithm of ARI could be considered linear.

It is proposed that the relationship developed by Gordon (1987) be adopted for estimation of storm demand values with the following adjustments:

- the storm demand for the 100year ARI event (high demand, rip head) is set at 250m³/m, increased from 220m³/m, as assessed in the analysis contained in BMT WBM (2013);
- the ARI values are re-expressed as annual exceedance probability (AEP) to facilitate the probabilistic methodology; and
- the range of ARI (AEP) is extended to cover both more frequent events (1year ARI) and rarer events (1000year ARI) than those considered in Gordon (1987). The extrapolation is based on a linear relationship between storm demand and the logarithm of ARI up to the 1000year ARI event, which is likely to be conservative (a downward concave 'tail' to the relationship is expected to be the most physically realistic).

The proposed relationship between storm demand and ARI/AEP, together with the original relationship in Gordon (1987), is shown in **Figure 3-7**.




Figure 3-7 Relationship between storm demand and ARI/AEP

Project related



4 References

Nielsen, AF; Lord, DB; and HG Poulos (1992), 'Dune Stability Considerations for Building Foundations', *Australian Civil Engineering Transactions,* Institution of Engineers Australia, Volume CE34, No.2, June, pp. 167-173.

Department of Environment Climate Change and Water (DECCW), 'NSW Sea Level Rise Policy Statement', October 2009

Gordon AD (1987), 'Beach Fluctuations and Shoreline Change – NSW", Preprints of Papers, 8th Australasian Conference on Coastal and Ocean Engineering, Launceston, 30 November to 4 December, Institution of Engineers Australia National Conference Publication No 87/17, pp. 103-167

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (2013), Climate Change 2013, The Physical Science Basis, Working Group/Contribution to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, [Stocker, TF; Qin, D; Plattner, G-K Tignor, M; Allen, SK; Boschung, J;Nauels, A; Xia, Y; Bex, V and PM Midgley (editors)], Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, New York, USA

Watson, P. J. (2018) How Well Do AR5 Sea Surface-Height Model Projections Match Observational Rates of Sea-Level Rise at the Regional Scale?, Journal of Marine Science and Engineering, Volume 6 Issue 1, published 1 February 2018.



Appendix A – Technical Note Outlining Probabilistic Methodology



Note / Memo

Haskoning DHV Nederland B.V.

Maritime & Aviation

Subject: Probabilistic Coastal Hazard Assessment - Technical Note

October, 2019

1 Introduction

Traditionally, coastal hazard assessments (CHAs) have been undertaken under a deterministic approach, whereby each input parameter is assigned a single value (e.g. 'design' storm demand, sea level rise (SLR) projection, etc.) with generally conservative estimates applied. A probabilistic approach allows each input parameter to vary randomly according to appropriate probability distribution functions. The randomly sampled parameters are repeatedly combined in a process known as Monte Carlo simulation. All outputs from the Monte Carlo simulation are collated to develop a probability curve for the shoreline position at the end of a planning period.

This technical note outlines in detail the methodology followed in the probabilistic approach incorporating a Monte Carlo analysis.

03 October 2019 PA1998-RHD-ZZ-XX-NT-Z-0003 1/16



2 Probabilistic Input Parameters

The key input parameters in a probabilistic CHA typically comprise:

- 1. Shoreline movement due to sediment budget differentials 'Underlying/Long-Term Recession';
- 2. Sea level rise and the shoreline recession in response to sea level rise 'SLR Recession; and
- 3. Event-based erosion due to storm activity 'Storm Demand'.

These key parameters and their assumed distributions are discussed below.

2.1 Long-Term Shoreline Recession

Underlying or long-term shoreline recession rates are typically estimated by analysis of a photogrammetry dataset for a particular beach spanning a sufficiently long time period. Rates of shoreline movement (for each beach profile) of an appropriate elevation contour position(s) are derived by linear regression. Alternatively, or in addition, rates of shoreline movement may be determined by assessment of volumetric change (for each beach profile) above 0m AHD derived by linear regression. Underlying shoreline recession rates typically vary spatially (i.e. within a beach compartment) and temporally (i.e. depending on the analysis period considered). In all cases the interpretation of underlying recession needs to be developed in the framework of a strong coastal processes understanding.

A triangular probability distribution, as a rough approximation of a random variable with unknown distribution, is used to generate a set of random long-term recession values (refer **Figure 1**). The triangular distribution is defined by a minimum (a), maximum (b) and peak/modal (most likely) value (c).




Figure 1 Triangular distribution - example probability density function

2.2 Shoreline Recession due to Sea Level Rise

SLR may result in shoreline recession due to re-adjustment of the beach profile to the new coastal water levels. Bruun (1962; 1983) proposed a methodology to estimate shoreline recession due to SLR, the so-called *Bruun Rule*. The Bruun Rule is based on the concept that SLR will lead to erosion of the upper shoreface, followed by re-establishment of the original equilibrium profile. This profile is re-established by shifting it landward and upward. The Bruun Rule is illustrated in **Figure 2**, where:

R is horizontal recession

03 October 2019 PA1998-RHD-ZZ-XX-NT-Z-0003 2/16



B is width of the active beach profile (cross-shore distance from the initial dune height to the depth of closure

S is Sea Level Rise

h is active dune/berm height

dc is depth of closure




Figure 2 Illustration of the Bruun Rule

A recession rate can be estimated using the Bruun Rule equation, which divides sea level rise by the average slope of the active beach profile extending to the depth of closure (the outer limit for the nearshore littoral drift and exchange zone of littoral material between the shore and the offshore bottom area. Bruun, 1962):

$$R = \frac{S}{(h + d_c)/_R}$$

The inverse beach slope is also referred to as the 'Bruun factor':

$$Bf = \frac{1}{(h+d_c)/B} = \frac{B}{h+d_c}$$

Shoreline recession due to SLR is therefore a function of both SLR and the Bruun factor:

$$R = S * Bf$$

Similar to long-term recession (refer **Section 2.1**), there is uncertainty around the distribution of both of these parameters, i.e. the values for SLR and for the Bruun factor. As such, for the Monte Carlo simulations, both of these parameters are defined by separate triangular probability distributions and minimum, maximum and peak/modal SLR and Bruun factor values are required.

03 October 2019 PA1998-RHD-ZZ-XX-NT-Z-0003 3/16



2.3 Combined Long-Term Recession and Recession due to Sea Level Rise

Random values for SLR and the Bruun factor and long-term recession, are simulated using triangular distributions (refer **Section 2.1** and **Section 2.2**). The values for these variables are then combined in a Monte Carlo process to give a total shoreline movement (recession) along the beach for the given planning period (refer **Figure 3**).




Figure 3 Methodology for combining random values to estimate shoreline movement (based on: WRL, 2017)

2.4 Storm Demand

Storm demand represents the volume of sand removed from a beach in a severe storm or a series of closely spaced storms. It is typically measured above a level of 0m AHD and expressed as cubic metres for metre run of beach (m³/m).

Storm demand modelling using SBEACH is typically undertaken to determine storm erosion resulting under certain (average recurrence interval - ARI) storm conditions. Analysis of historical beach profiles is also used to estimate storm demand for particular ARIs. In addition, there are generally accepted values for storm demand for open coast beaches in NSW contained in the literature.

Storm demand probabilities for each year of the planning period in the Monte Carlo simulations are determined by random selection from a uniform distribution of annual exceedance probability (AEP) /ARI values (refer **Figure 4**).

03 October 2019 PA1998-RHD-ZZ-XX-NT-Z-0003 4/16






Figure 4 Uniform distribution of AEP values for generating storm demand volumes

The randomly generated AEP values are then converted to storm erosion volumes using empirical relationships. For beaches in NSW, it is reasonable to use the distribution of storm erosion volumes based on beach erosion data described in Gordon (1987), using the reference 100-year ARI storm demand volume for the beach in question. Gordon (1987) derived relationships between storm demand and ARI, in both "high demand" (at rip heads) and "low demand" (away from rip heads) areas (refer **Figure 5**). The "high demand" (rip head) values are adopted in the methodology.




Figure 5 Storm demand volumes for exposed beaches in NSW (based on: Gordon, 1987)

03 October 2019 PA1998-RHD-ZZ-XX-NT-Z-0003 5/16



In the following example, 100-year ARI storm demand values were estimated for a range of profiles based on SBEACH model results. The relationship between storm demand and ARI was then determined for each profile in accordance with the following methodology:

- Determine the ratio of the estimated 100-year ARI storm demand value to the appropriate ('low' or 'high' demand) Gordon (1987) 100-year ARI values (refer Figure 5); and
- Determine storm demand values for a range of ARIs by multiplying the appropriate Gordon (1987) storm demand values (describing 'low' or 'high' demand) by the storm demand scale factor (ratio) of that profile (re-interpolate to a range of nominated ARIs if applicable).

Example results of this exercise are presented in **Figure 6**.




Figure 6 Example storm demand scaled according to Gordon (1987)

03 October 2019 PA1998-RHD-ZZ-XX-NT-Z-0003 6/16



3 Monte Carlo Analysis Methodology

This section outlines the methodology followed in a CHA Monte Carlo analysis

3.1 Underlying Shoreline Recession

Further to **Section 2.1**, minimum, modal and maximum underlying shoreline recession values serve as input parameters for the triangular distribution of the long-term shoreline recession. One set of one million randomly-generated values of the long-term shoreline recession rate (m/year) is generated from the specified triangular distribution. These are essentially *annual* long-term shoreline recession values. The methodology to calculate *cumulative* long-term shoreline recession for each year is as follows:

 For each year in the planning period, for each of the one million randomly-generated values of annual long-term shoreline recession, calculate the *cumulative* long-term shoreline recession by multiplying the annual long-term shoreline recession value by the number of years passed in the planning period (subtract base year from the year under consideration)

Consequently, the above results in a matrix of one million (Monte Carlo simulations) by *n* (number of years in the planning period) of randomly-generated cumulative long-term shoreline recession values based on annual long-term shoreline recession values and its associated distribution (refer **Figure 7** for an example Monte Carlo results matrix).

Year in planning period 100 101 96 97 98 99 2 3 4 5 6 0.1051 0.2102 0.3153 0.4204 0.5255 0.6306 10.0888 10.1939 10.2990 10.4041 10.5092 10.6143 1 2 0.0830 0.1660 0.2490 0.3321 0.4151 0.4981 7.9694 8.0524 8.1354 8.2185 8.3015 8.3845 4.1536 4.1969 4.2401 4.2834 4.3267 4.3699 3 0.0433 0.0865 0.1298 0.1731 0.2163 0.2596 7.3488 7.4254 7.5019 7.5785 7.6550 7.7316 0.0766 0.1531 0.2297 0.3062 0.3828 0.4593 9.1199 9.2149 9.3099 9.4049 9.4999 9.5949 0.0950 0.1900 0.2850 0.3800 0.4750 0.5700 5 1.6065 0.0167 0.0335 0.0502 0.0669 0.0837 0.1004 1.6232 1.6400 1.6567 1.6734 1.6902 Monte Carlo simulation number 0.0750 0.3000 0.3749 0.4499 7.1989 7.2739 7.3489 7.4238 7.4988 7.5738 0.1500 0.2250 0.5951 9.5210 9.6201 9.7193 9.8185 9.9177 10.0169 0.0992 0.1984 0.2975 0.3967 0.4959 0.5866 9.3859 9.4837 9.5815 9.6792 9.7770 9.8748 0.0978 0.1955 0.2933 0.3911 0.4889 0.1695 2.7118 2.7401 2.7683 2.7966 2.8248 2.8531 10 0.0282 0.0565 0.0847 0.1130 0.1412 0.0405 0.0811 0.1216 0.2433 3.8928 3.9333 3.9739 4.0144 4.0550 4.0955 11 0.1622 0.2027 4.1145 4.1574 4.2860 4.3288 0.0429 0.0857 0.1286 0.1714 0.2143 0.2572 4.2002 4.2431 0.0301 0.0602 0.0903 0.1203 0.1504 0.1805 2.8883 2.9184 2.9485 2.9786 3.0087 3.0388 999990 0.0814 0.4882 7.8105 7.8918 7.9732 8.0545 8.1359 8.2173 999991 0.1627 0.2441 0.3254 0.4068 0.8860 0.8952 0.9044 0.9136 0.9229 0.9321 999992 0.0092 0.0185 0.0277 0.0369 0.0461 0.0554 0.0111 1.0699 1.0811 1.0922 1.1033 1.1256 999993 0.0223 0.0334 0.0446 0.0557 0.0669 1.1145 0.5420 13.0076 13.1431 13.2786 13.4141 13.5496 13.6851 0.1355 0.2710 0.4065 0.6775 0.8130 999994 7.6119 7.6912 7.7705 7.8498 7.9291 8.0084 0.0793 0.4757 999995 0.1586 0.2379 0.3172 0.3965 1.8969 1.9167 1.9365 1.9562 1.9760 1.9957 999996 0.0198 0.0395 0.0593 0.0790 0.0988 0.1186 0.0319 0.0638 0.0958 0.1277 0.1596 3.0964 199997 999998 0.0849 0.1697 0.2546 0.3394 0.4243 0.5091 8.2308 8.3156 8.4005 8.4853 8.5702 3.8397 4.0396 999999 0.0400 0.0800 0.1200 0.1600 0.2000 0.2400 3.8796 3.9196 3.9596 3.9996 6.286 6.3518 6.4172 6.6137 1000000 0.0655 0.1964 6.4827 6.5482

Figure 7 Example Monte Carlo results matrix for long-term recession

3.2 Shoreline Recession due to Sea Level Rise

As outlined in **Section 2.2**, shoreline recession due to SLR is a function of both SLR and the Bruun factor.

03 October 2019 PA1998-RHD-ZZ-XX-NT-Z-0003 7/16



In regard to SLR, Monte Carlo simulations are assumed to be based on proposed minimum, modal and maximum SLR projections. Where the adopted projections or trajectories are available at discrete points in time (e.g. IPCC concentration pathways), a polynomial fit through these points is estimated (refer example in **Figure 8**).




Figure 8 Example Sea Level Rise projections

A set of one million randomly-generated values of SLR for each year in the planning period is generated. The methodology is as follows:

- For each year in the planning period, the minimum, modal and maximum projected SLR is determined based on the above polynomial trajectory fits - these serve as input parameters for the triangular distribution of that year;
- Then, for each year in the planning period, one million random SLR values are generated from the specified triangular distribution of that year.

Note that in the case of SLR, relevant input parameters to the Monte Carlo simulation are set such that the algorithm (or 'set of rules') used to generate random SLR values is the same each year. In combination with a triangular distribution that changes from year to year (increasing minimum, maximum and modal values), basically one million random SLR *trajectories* are generated in the Monte Carlo simulations (refer **Figure 9** and **Figure 10**).

03 October 2019 PA1998-RHD-ZZ-XX-NT-Z-0003 8/16



Year in planning period




Figure 9 Monte Carlo results matrix for SLR




Figure 10 Example Monte Carlo Sea Level Rise trajectories

03 October 2019 PA1998-RHD-ZZ-XX-NT-Z-0003 9/16



Similarly, minimum, modal and maximum values for the Bruun factor (which result from a separate assessment of dune height and local closure depth) serve as input parameters for the triangular distribution of the Bruun factor. One set of one million randomly-generated values of the Bruun factor is generated from the specified triangular Bruun factor distribution.

		1
	1	46.9396
	2	36.4402
	3	38.7887
	4	43.0681
	5	45.2201
	6	38.4200
_	7	40.4453
o e	8	43.0260
Ε	9	40.0742
2	10	38.3600
Ĕ	11	32.4870
simulation numbe		
carlo	999989	41.1772
<u> </u>	999990	38.1521
_	999991	40.9444
Monte	999992	46.7384
₽	999993	43.6584
_	999994	40.5733
	999995	45.4701
	999996	38.0921
	999997	38.2370
	999998	39.9227
	999999	41.8228
	1000000	36.3170

Figure 11 Example Monte Carlo result values for the Bruun Factor

Randomly-generated values for shoreline recession due to SLR (one million for each year in the planning period) are then calculated using the probabilistic information of SLR and the Bruun factor. The methodology is as follows:

• For each year in the planning period, for each of the one million randomly-generated values of both SLR (for a particular year) and the Bruun factor, calculate the shoreline recession using the Bruun Rule equation (SLR multiplied by the Bruun factor - refer **Section 2.2**).

Consequently, the above procedure results in a matrix of one million (Monte Carlo simulations) by *n* (number of years in the planning period) of randomly-generated shoreline recession values based on SLR and the Bruun factor and their associated distributions (refer **Figure 12**).

03 October 2019 PA1998-RHD-ZZ-XX-NT-Z-0003 10/16



1000000

1000000

0.4866

0.7421

0.9406

1.1913

0.4211

0.6111

0.7442

0.9294

1.1170

2 3 96 97 98 99 100 101 1 5 0.5345 0.7756 0.9635 1.2036 1.4472 1.6943 42.8915 43.6051 44.3253 45.0521 45.7855 46.5256 0.5506 0.7990 1.0034 1.2537 1.5078 1.7659 47.1571 47.9561 48.7627 49.5769 50.3986 51.2281 2 3 0.5297 0.7687 0.7893 0.9835 1.1786 1.3745 24.2979 24.6327 24.9698 25.3092 25.6508 25.9947 0.4558 0.6615 0.8314 1.0388 1.2494 1.4634 39.2932 39.9602 40.6334 41.3130 41.9989 42.6912 0.5480 0.7952 0.9588 1.1973 1.4388 1.6834 39.6950 40.3345 40.9798 41.6306 42.2873 42.9496 5 0.3993 0.5794 0.5839 0.7274 0.8713 1.0157 17.2159 17.4463 17.6781 17.9114 18.1461 18.3823 0.4967 0.7208 0.7928 0.9888 1.1864 1.3855 28.0558 28.4755 28.8985 29.3248 29.7545 30.1875 Monte Carlo simulation number 0.4895 0.7104 0.8418 1.0510 1.2626 1.4767 33.8812 34.4204 34.9641 35.5126 36.0658 36.6237 0.5218 0.7573 0.9549 1.1935 1.4374 1.6861 46.9685 47.7747 48.5886 49.4103 50.2398 51.0771 0.46320.6721 0.8478 1.0600 1.2771 1.4985 42.0602 42.7838 43.5143 44.2519 44.9964 45.7480 0.5229 0.7587 0.7924 0.9876 1.1838 1.3810 25.3068 25.6639 26.0234 26.3855 26.7501 27.117 0.6094 0.8843 1.1157 1.3958 1.6825 1.9749 55.9356 56.9005 57.8746 58.8581 59.8510 60.853 999989 0.4033 0.5853 0.6999 0.8739 1.0500 1.2283 28.5895 29.0473 29.5091 29.9749 30.4448 30.9188 999990 0.5121 0.7431 0.7097 0.8834 1.0571 18.1887 18.8442 19.2861 999991 1.2309 18,4063 18.6247 19.0646 0.5720 0.8300 1.0061 1.2565 42.0495 42.7303 1.5101 1.7670 43.4172 44.1102 44.8093 45.5145 999992 0.5893 40.8415 42.1325 999993 0.8552 1.0079 1.2582 1.5114 1.7675 40.2043 41.4842 42,7862 43,4456 0.5174 0.7508 0.9350 1.1681 1.4046 1.6445 42.0157 42.7171 43,4250 44.1394 44.8604 45.5880 999994 44.4702 0.4726 0.6858 0.8653 1.0844 1.3086 1.5373 45.2419 46.0212 46.8079 47.6023 48,4042 999995 0.4660 0.6763 0.8479 1.0594 1.2741 1.4920 39.4045 40.0699 40.7414 41.4193 42.1035 42,7940 999996 0.5059 0.7341 0.7883 0.9829 1.1788 1.3759 26.6472 27.0360 27.4277 27.8224 28.2200 28.6205 999997 0.5245 0.7612 0.8969 1.1196 1.3449 1.5728 35.7632 36.3299 36,9015 37.4780 38.0595 38.6459 999998 0.5291 0.7679 0.9367 1.1699 1.4062 1,6456 39.6536 40.2996 40.9515 41.6091 42,2726 42.9420 999999

Year in planning period

Figure 12 Example Monte Carlo results matrix for recession due to SLR

1.3072

31.8874

31.3772

32.4022

32.9216

33,4456

33.9743

3.3 Combined Underlying Recession and Recession due to Sea Level Rise

Following from **Section 3.1** and **Section 3.2**, the combined long-term recession (refer **Figure 7**) and recession due to SLR (refer **Figure 12**) is simply calculated by summing the separate results (of each combination of Monte Carlo simulation number and year in the planning period) - refer **Figure 13**.

Year in planning period

100 52.980 1 0.6396 0.9858 1.2788 1.6240 1.9727 2.3249 53,7990 54.6243 55.4562 56.2947 57.1399 0.6336 0.9650 1.2524 1.5858 1.9229 2.2640 55.1263 56.0085 56.8981 57.7954 58,7001 59.6126 1.1566 28.4515 29.9775 0.5730 1.3949 1.6341 28.8296 29,2099 29.5926 30.3646 0.8552 0.9191 48.8915 1.9227 46.642 47.3856 50.4228 4 0.5324 0.8146 1.0611 1.3450 1.6322 48.1353 49.6539 48.8149 49.5494 2.2534 50.2897 5 0.6430 0.9852 1.2438 1.5773 1.9138 51.0355 51.7872 52,5445 0.4160 0.6129 0.6341 0.7943 0.9550 1.1161 18.822 19.0695 19.3181 19.5681 19.8204 20.0725 nulation number 1.8354 35.2547 0.5717 0.8708 1.0178 1.2888 1.5613 35.7494 36.2474 36.7486 37.2533 37.7613 2.0718 43.4022 8 0.5887 0.9088 1.1393 1.4477 1.7585 44.0405 44.6834 45.3311 45.9835 46.6406 56.3544 9 0.6196 0.9528 1.2482 1.5846 1.9263 57.2584 58.1701 50.0895 60.0168 60.9519 10 0.4914 0.7286 0.9325 1.1730 1.4183 1,6680 44.7720 45.5239 46.2826 47.0485 47.8212 48.6011 11 0.5634 0.8398 0.9140 1.1498 1.3865 1.6243 29.1996 29.5972 29.9973 26.3999 26.8051 27.212 ٠<u>=</u> Monte Carlo 0.6523 0.9700 1.2443 1.5672 1.8968 60.0501 61.0579 62.0748 63.1012 64.1370 0.4334 0.6455 0.7902 0.9942 1.2004 1,4088 31.4778 33.9576 999990 31.9657 32,4576 32.9535 33.4535 0.5935 0.9058 0.9538 1.2088 1.4639 1.7191 999991 25.9992 26.2981 26.5979 26.8987 27.2005 27.5034 999992 0.5812 0.8485 1.0338 1.2934 1.5563 1.8224 42.9355 43.6255 44.3216 45.0238 45.7322 46,4466 0.6004 0.8775 1.0413 1.3028 1.5671 1.8344 999993 41.2742 41.9226 42.5764 43.2358 43.9007 44.5712 0.6529 1.0218 1.3415 1.7101 2.0821 2.4575 999994 55.0233 55.8602 56.7036 57.5535 58.4100 59.2731 0.5519 0.8444 1.1032 1.4016 999995 1.7051 52.0821 52.9331 53.7917 54.6577 55.5314 56.4126 0.4858 999996 0.7158 0.9072 1.1384 1.3729 41.3014 41.9866 42.6779 43.3755 44.0795 44.7897 999997 0.5378 0.7979 0.8841 1.1106 1.3384 1.5674 29.7117 30.1324 30.5561 30.9827 31.4122 31.8446 999998 0.6094 0.9309 1.1515 1.4590 1.7692 2.0819 43.9091 44.5607 45.2171 45.8785 46.5448 47.2161 999999 0.5691 0.8479 1.0567 1.3299 1.6062 43.4933 44.1792 44.8711 45.5687 46.2722 46.9816

Figure 13 Example Monte Carlo results matrix for combined long-term recession and recession due to SLR

37.6635

38.2392

38.8194

39.4043

39.9938

40.5880

1.7001

1.4444

03 October 2019 PA1998-RHD-ZZ-XX-NT-Z-0003 11/1



An example overview of the statistical distribution of SLR as well as the recession parameters discussed above, is presented in **Figure 14**.




Figure 14 Example statistical distribution of SLR and recession input parameters

3.4 Storm Demand

As outlined in **Section 2.4**, storm demand probabilities for each year are calculated using a uniform distribution of AEP values, which vary between zero and one (inclusive). To this end, a random number generator, which generates numbers between zero and one (inclusive), is used to generate a matrix of one million (Monte Carlo simulations) by n (number of years in the planning period) of uniformly-distributed AEP values for storm demand (refer **Figure 15**).

03 October 2019 PA1998-RHD-ZZ-XX-NT-Z-0003 12/16



	1	2	3	4	5	6	 96	97	98	99	100	101
1	0.5211	0.1433	0.1681	0.5705	0.1985	0.0676	0.0143	0.4133	0.5005	0.4970	0.4689	0.6261
2	0.8149	0.7980	0.4172	0.7914	0.8939	0.0206	0.6072	0.8694	0.8399	0.1100	0.2615	0.4325
3	0.5458	0.5477	0.3296	0.2688	0.2379	0.0655	0.3834	0.0830	0.8493	0.5362	0.0073	0.1695
4	0.5087	0.4707	0.0038	0.1373	0.3797	0.9081	0.7995	0.9138	0.9794	0.5510	0.9034	0.5027
5	0.9881	0.6417	0.3252	0.6651	0.7316	0.7733	0.9320	0.5714	0.6254	0.7152	0.4875	0.4066
6	0.4740	0.2762	0.1815	0.3050	0.8444	0.8813	0.9521	0.1355	0.4809	0.0581	0.1155	0.3953
7	0.4222	0.3398	0.9737	0.3651	0.8694	0.3812	0.6662	0.1313	0.5621	0.8765	0.4046	0.5181
8	0.7992	0.6367	0.9084	0.3498	0.3013	0.4366	0.9541	0.6667	0.8798	0.7209	0.2139	0.8878
9	0.7240	0.1421	0.1627	0.6812	0.4241	0.1054	0.0642	0.4773	0.9751	0.1608	0.8695	0.7144
10	0.4086	0.6729	0.9885	0.8283	0.6452	0.6493	0.8389	0.4518	0.7750	0.1011	0.7526	0.6143
11	0.9980	0.9046	0.7173	0.2221	0.3897	0.1093	0.3159	0.6629	0.6563	0.4835	0.2639	0.4399
999989	0.1365	0.5059	0.3831	0.5096	0.4849	0.7014	0.0971	0.8647	0.5013	0.5413	0.7999	0.6870
-	0.1365 0.5131	0.5059 0.0999	0.3031 0.9039	0.5096 0.9366	0.4849 0.5538	0.7014 0.8772	0.0971 0.5771	0.8647 0.6315	0.5013 0.3175	0.5413 0.6496	0.7999 0.4016	0.6870 0.7901
999989												
999989 999990	0.5131	0.0999	0.9039	0.9366	0.5538	0.8772	0.5771	0.6315	0.3175	0.6496	0.4016	0.7901
999989 999990 999991	0.5131 0.8088	0.0999 0.7322	0.9039 0.5738	0.9366 0.0762	0.5538 0.5157	0.8772	0.5771 0.2237	0.6315 0.6372	0.3175 0.9301	0.6496 0.0782	0.4016 0.1860	0.7901 0.8296
999989 999990 999991 999992	0.5131 0.8088 0.8508	0.0999 0.7322 0.2440	0.9039 0.5738 0.4792	0.9366 0.0762 0.6550	0.5538 0.5157 0.5626	0.8772 0.9757 0.3994	0.5771 0.2237 0.7192	0.6315 0.6372 0.8316	0.3175 0.9301 0.0713	0.6496 0.0782 0.9394	0.4016 0.1860 0.8676	0.7901 0.8296 0.4612
999989 999990 999991 999992 999993	0.5131 0.8088 0.8508 0.1214	0.0999 0.7322 0.2440 0.2502	0.9039 0.5738 0.4792 0.1058	0.9366 0.0762 0.6550 0.5404	0.5538 0.5157 0.5626 0.3929	0.8772 0.9757 0.3994 0.2730	0.5771 0.2237 0.7192 0.5313	0.6315 0.6372 0.8316 0.5783	0.3175 0.9301 0.0713 0.5392	0.6496 0.0782 0.9394 0.7318	0.4016 0.1860 0.8676 0.8102	0.7901 0.8296 0.4612 0.7756
999989 999990 999991 999992 999993 999994	0.5131 0.8088 0.8508 0.1214 0.0767	0.0999 0.7322 0.2440 0.2502 0.6440	0.9039 0.5738 0.4792 0.1058 0.3050	0.9366 0.0762 0.6550 0.5404 0.2651	0.5538 0.5157 0.5626 0.3929 0.5803	0.8772 0.9757 0.3994 0.2730 0.5584	0.5771 0.2237 0.7190 0.5313 0.6843	0.6315 0.6372 0.8316 0.5783 0.1969	0.3175 0.9301 0.0713 0.5392 0.9896	0.6496 0.0782 0.9394 0.7318 0.2547	0.4016 0.1860 0.8676 0.8102 0.7687	0.7901 0.8296 0.4612 0.7756 0.3575
999989 999990 999991 999992 999993 999994 999995	0.5131 0.8088 0.8508 0.1214 0.0767 0.7449	0.0999 0.7322 0.2440 0.2502 0.6440 0.5510	0.9039 0.5738 0.4792 0.1058 0.3050 0.6578	0.9366 0.0762 0.6550 0.5404 0.2651	0.5538 0.5157 0.5626 0.3929 0.5803 0.4688	0.8772 0.9757 0.3994 0.2730 0.5584	0.5771 0.2237 0.7192 0.5313 0.6843 0.4908	0.6315 0.6372 0.8316 0.5783 0.1969 0.2624	0.3175 0.9301 0.0713 0.5392 0.9896 0.1648	0.6496 0.0782 0.9394 0.7318 0.2547 0.7591	0.4016 0.1860 0.8676 0.8102 0.7687 0.1004	0.7901 0.8296 0.4612 0.7756 0.3575 0.9544
999989 999990 999991 999992 999993 999994 999995 999996	0.5131 0.8088 0.8508 0.1214 0.0767 0.7449 0.2394	0.0999 0.7322 0.2440 0.2502 0.6440 0.5510 0.7564	0.9039 0.5738 0.4792 0.1058 0.3050 0.6578 0.5075	0.9366 0.0762 0.6550 0.5404 0.2651 0.9384 0.1577	0.5538 0.5157 0.5626 0.3929 0.5803 0.4688 0.7687	0.8772 0.9757 0.3994 0.2730 0.5584 0.5548	0.5771 0.2237 0.7192 0.5313 0.6041 0.4908 0.0607	0.6315 0.6372 0.8316 0.5783 0.1969 0.2624 0.4223	0.3175 0.9301 0.0713 0.5392 0.9896 0.1648 0.5405	0.6496 0.0782 0.9394 0.7318 0.2547 0.7591	0.4016 0.1860 0.8676 0.8102 0.7687 0.1004 0.8295	0.7901 0.8296 0.4612 0.7756 0.3575 0.9544 0.8812
999989 999990 999991 999992 999993 999994 999995 999996	0.5131 0.8088 0.8508 0.1214 0.0767 0.7449 0.2394 0.5580	0.0999 0.7322 0.2440 0.2502 0.6440 0.5510 0.7564 0.2587	0.9039 0.5738 0.4792 0.1058 0.3050 0.6578 0.5075	0.9366 0.0762 0.6550 0.5404 0.2651 0.9384 0.1577	0.5538 0.5157 0.5626 0.3929 0.5803 0.4688 0.7687 0.0549	0.8772 0.9757 0.3994 0.2730 0.5584 0.7278 0.1603	0.5771 0.2237 0.7192 0.5313 0.6943 0.4908 0.0607 0.6783	0.6315 0.6372 0.8316 0.5783 0.1969 0.2624 0.4223 0.4446	0.3175 0.9301 0.0713 0.5392 0.9896 0.1648 0.5405 0.0175	0.6496 0.0782 0.9394 0.7318 0.2547 0.7591 0.5732 0.9656	0.4016 0.1860 0.8676 0.8102 0.7687 0.1004 0.8295 0.6234	0.7901 0.8296 0.4612 0.7756 0.3575 0.9544 0.8812 0.5631

Year in planning period

Figure 15 Example Monte Carlo results matrix for the storm demand AEP

These AEP values are translated to actual storm demand values on a per-profile basis. The methodology (applicable to each profile) is as follows:

- For each storm demand AEP value (converted from ARI values), post-storm setback distance from the zero-elevation (0m AHD) crossing are calculated for the following hazard 'zones' (refer Nielsen, 1992, and **Figure 16**):
 - Zone of Wave Impact (ZWI);
 - Zone of Slope Adjustment (ZSA); and
 - Zone of Reduced Foundation Capacity (ZRFC).

This is an iterative process whereby the area below the beach profile (or volume per metre run of beach) is matched against the relevant storm demand value, while obeying the geometrical constraints of the above zones outlined in Nielsen (1992). Example results are presented in **Figure 17** and **Figure 18**.

• For each of the above zones, a matrix of one million (Monte Carlo simulations) by *n* (number of years in the planning period) of post-storm setback distance values is calculated by interpolating the AEP values and associated setback distance values onto the uniformly-distributed AEP values for storm demand (refer **Figure 15**).




Figure 16 Schematic representation of coastline hazard zones (after Nielsen, 1992)

03 October 2019 PA1998-RHD-ZZ-XX-NT-Z-0003 13/16






Figure 17 Example profile storm demand




Figure 18 Example storm demand and shoreline setback distance

03 October 2019 PA1998-RHD-ZZ-XX-NT-Z-0003 14/16



3.5 Combined Shoreline Position due to Underlying Recession, Sea Level Rise and Storm Demand

Total shoreline change for each of the hazard zones (ZWI, ZSA and ZRFC) outlined in **Section 3.4** is calculated by combining storm setback distances (cyan lines in **Figure 19**, presenting one example set of storm demand distances out of one million) with the 'combined recession' trajectories (grey lines and blue line, the latter representing one example trajectory out of one million) for each year in the planning period. The total shoreline change in each year (one million values in total – refer **Figure 19** for example distribution (in red) of the ZRFC setback distance in the final year of the planning period) is subsequently utilised to calculate probabilities of exceedance of each of the hazard zones and produce hazard lines on a map.




Figure 19 Example of simulated storm demand superimposed on background shoreline change due to combined recession

03 October 2019 PA1998-RHD-ZZ-XX-NT-Z-0003 15/16



4 References

Bruun, P.M. (1962). Sea-Level rise as a cause of shore erosion, Jnl. Waterways, Harbour & Coastal Eng. Div., ASCE, Vol. 88, No. WW1, pp 117-130.

Bruun, P.M. (1983). Review of conditions for uses of the Bruun Rule of erosion, Jnl. Coastal Eng., Vol 7, No. 1, pp 77-89.

Gordon, A.D. (1987). Beach fluctuations and shoreline change - NSW, 8th Australasian Conference on Coastal and Ocean Engineering, Launceston, p. 5.

Nielsen, A.F., D. B. Lord, H. G. Poulos (1992). Dune Stability Considerations for Building Foundations, Vol. CE34 No. 2 June 1992.

WRL (2017). Eurobodalla Coastal Hazard Assessment, WRL Technical Report 2017/09, October 2017.

03 October 2019 PA1998-RHD-ZZ-XX-NT-Z-0003 16/16



Appendix B – Copy of Letter from RHDHV to Planners North dated 1 February 2019



HASKONING AUSTRALIA PTY LTD.

Ms Kate Singleton
Partnership Principal
Planners North
6 Porter Street
BYRON BAY NSW 2481

Email: kate@plannersnorth.com.au

+61 2 8854 5000 **T** +61 2 9929 0960 **F**

56 Berry Street

NSW 2060 North Sydney

Level 14

project.admin.australia@rhdhv.com **E**

royalhaskoningdhv.com W

Date: 01 February 2019 Contact name: Greg Britton
Your reference: Telephone: 61 2 8854 5000

Our reference: PA1998MACO190117-coastal haz review Email: greg.britton@rhdhv.com

Dear Kate

Review of Assessments of Coastal Hazard at North Byron Beach

I refer to our recent discussions and to your letter of 14 November 2018 in which you requested a review of assessments of coastal hazard undertaken to date at North Byron Beach and, based on this review, provision of an opinion as to the suitability of a Planning Proposal developed by Planners North on behalf of North Byron Bay Resort Pty Ltd applying to certain land behind North Byron Beach. This letter report sets out the review and my opinion.

1. BACKGROUND

Planners North have prepared a Planning Proposal for submission to Byron Shire Council in relation to land at North Byron Beach identified as: Lots 1 & 2 DP1215893; Lots 12 & 13 DP243218; and Lot 449 DP812102. A copy of the Plan Set accompanying the application is included at **Appendix A**.

The subject land is presently identified by Byron Local Environmental Plan 2014 (BLEP14) as "Deferred Matter" and therefore the provisions of Byron Local Environmental Plan 1988 continue to apply to the land. Land identified as proposed for environmental zoning under BLEP14 was deferred from the LEP preparation process pending a review of the application of environmental zones by the Department of Planning & Environment. That review is complete and indicates that the subject land contains some areas of ecological significance and other areas which do not fit the criteria for the application of an E2 Environmental Conservation or E3 Environmental Management Zone.

An issue in determining the appropriate application of BLEP14 zones to the land is the extent to which the identified land is subject to coastal hazards. The following extract from the draft Planning Proposal supplied to Royal HaskoningDHV by Planners North outlined the position of the Proponent in relation to the coastal hazard.





The subject land is presently zoned 7(f1) Coastal Land in accordance with Byron Local Environmental Plan 1988 (BLEP88). This zoning reflects mapping undertaken in 1986 and adopted in Byron Development Control Plan 2010 (BDCP10) Chapter 1 Part J. Byron Shire Council has subsequently commissioned further coastline mapping and it is submitted that this mapping should form the basis for identifying land subject to the coastal hazard.

The mapping provided in Byron Shire Coastline Hazards Assessment Update Final Report September 2013, prepared by BMT WBM Pty Ltd for Byron Shire Council, reflects updated modelling. That mapping indicates that the immediate hazard line, minimum, best and maximum 2050 hazard lines and minimum, best and maximum 2100 hazard lines are significantly seaward of the lines previously identified in Part J of BDCP10. It is on this basis that it is submitted that the subject land should not be identified as subject to coastal hazard. It is also submitted that the resolution of the zoning for the subject land should therefore not be delayed to await the determination of the zoning regime which will be applied to other areas of the coastline which remain subject to coastal hazard.

Planners North propose that the E4 Environmental Living, E2 Environmental Conservation and SP3 Tourist zones are the appropriate zones to apply to the subject land based on the site constraints and attributes in accordance with the provisions of the Byron Local Environmental Plan 2014. The proposed zoning is considered by Planners North to be appropriate for a number of reasons including the view that the current coastal hazard assessment applying to the land (the BMT WBM update in September 2013) indicates the current land use zone (7(f1) Coastal Land) is not appropriate for the site.

In discussions between Planners North and Council it was considered that the Planning Proposal would be enhanced by a report which reviews the assessments of coastal hazard undertaken to date at the site and expresses an opinion as to the suitability of the land for the Proposal.

This letter report, prepared by Greg Britton, comprises the subject report. The qualifications and experience of the writer are set out in **Section 2**.

This report assumes the reader has a reasonable knowledge of the study area and an understanding of coastal hazard generally.

2. QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE OF THE WRITER

Greg is the Technical Director of Royal HaskoningDHV in Australia. He is the former Manager of Coastal and Marine at WorleyParsons, and was a founding Director of Patterson Britton & Partners.

Greg has 41 years professional experience in the investigation, design, documentation, planning, environmental assessment, and project management of coastal, estuary and maritime projects. He received a Bachelor of Civil Engineering (First Class Honours, University Medal) from the University of New South Wales in 1976 and a Master of Engineering Science (Coastal Engineering) from the University of New South Wales in 1981. He is a Fellow of the Institution of Engineers Australia

He has provided expert advice on coastal, maritime and environmental engineering to the NSW Land and Environment Court, NSW Supreme Court, Queensland Supreme Court, Federal Court of Australia and several Commissions of Inquiry. He has fulfilled the role of a Court Appointed Expert (CAE) in the



NSW Land and Environment Court. In 2018 he was appointed by the NSW Minister for Planning to the Sydney District and Regional Planning Panels as a coastal expert.

Greg has undertaken a range of projects at Byron Bay over the past 20 years. These projects have included preparation of coastal engineering studies and coastal management advice for a range of land owners, including North Byron Bay Resort Pty Ltd, Department of Industry (Crown Land) and individual land owners, and for Byron Shire Council¹.

3. REVIEW OF ASSESSMENTS OF COASTAL HAZARD UNDERTAKEN TO DATE AT THE SITE

3.1 Introduction

The two key assessments of coastal hazard undertaken to date at the site are:

- the 1978 Byron Bay Hastings Point Erosion Study prepared by the then NSW Department of Public Works (Department of Public Works, 1978). The findings of this study formed the basis of the hazard lines prepared in 1986 and included in Chapter 1 Part J of the Byron Development Control Plan 2010 (BDCP10);
- the 2013 Byron Shire Coastline Hazards Assessments Update prepared by BMT WBM Pty Ltd for Byron Shire Council (BMT WBM, 2013). The findings of this study have not as yet been included in any updated coastal hazard planning controls for Byron Shire.

The hazard lines determined from the 1978 study and included on Maps in Chapter 1 Part J of BDCP10 comprise an Immediate Impact Line and a 100 Year Impact Line, and are reproduced in **Figure 1**. The text in Part J states that the coastal hazards defined on the Maps were provided to Council by the then NSW Department of Land and Water Conservation. The 100 Year Impact Line would correspond to the year 2086, being 100 years from the date when the hazard lines were prepared.

01 February 2019

¹ Patterson Britton & Partners (2005), 'Scoping Study on Feasibility to Access the Cape Byron Lobe for Sand Extraction for Beach Nourishment', Draft Report for Byron Shire Council, November 2005.






Figure 1: Immediate Impact Line and 100 Year Impact Line from Part J BDCP10

The hazard lines included in BMT WBM (2013) for the subject area have been determined for two erosion hazard scenarios:

- Scenario 1: Retention and permanent maintenance of all existing coastal erosion protection works and interim beach access stabilisation works along the Byron Bay Embayment; and
- Scenario 2: Retention of only the Jonson Street protection works and removal of all other coastal erosion protection works and interim beach access stabilisation works along the Byron Bay Embayment.

Future shoreline recession in the subject area would be greater under Scenario 1 than Scenario 2. It is also considered likely that Scenario 1 would prevail into the foreseeable future. For this reason the report herein assumes Scenario 1 would apply, which is conservative for the subject area.

BMT WBM (2013) includes an Immediate Hazard Line, a 2050 Hazard Line and a 2100 Hazard Line. In the case of the 2050 and 2100 hazard lines, three positions of the line are provided; a 'minimum', 'best' and 'maximum' position.



As suggested by the terminology, 'best' represents the best estimate of the hazard line into the future. The inclusion of 'minimum' and 'maximum' hazard lines is a recognition of the uncertainty inherent in modelling of future shoreline behaviour and/or factors that are difficult to otherwise quantify. The minimum and maximum positions of the hazard lines were determined by applying factors of ±20% relative to the 'best estimate' hazard lines distances.

The report herein considers all three positions of the hazard lines; 'minimum', 'best' and 'maximum', for the Scenario 1 erosion hazard.

The position of the 100 Year Impact Line in Chapter 1 Part J of BDCP10 (year 2086) and the position of the 2100 Hazard Lines for Scenario 1 in BMT WBM (2013) are quite different (even accounting for the different end dates), with the more recent hazard lines located significantly further seaward. **Figure 2** shows the relative positions of the hazard lines. This 'best estimate' 2100 Hazard Line in BMT WBM (2013) is approximately 170m seaward of the 100 Year Impact Line in Part J of BDCP10.




Figure 2: Relative positions of hazard lines in Part J BDCP10 and BMT WBM (2013)



3.2 Factors to be considered in the Review of Coastal Hazard

There are a number of individual factors which determine the position of the erosion hazard at a future time and which can be considered in the review; namely:

- planning period;
- storm bite or storm erosion demand;
- long term recession due to net sediment loss;
- long term recession due to sea level rise;
- selection of the pre-storm beach profile;
- the specific delineation of the hazard line at the end of planning period according to either the Zone of Wave Impact (ZWI), Zone of Slope Adjustment (ZSA) or Zone of Reduced Foundation Capacity (ZRFC), as defined in Nielsen et al (1992) and outlined further below.

Each of the above factors is considered in turn in **Section 3.3**. Discussion is also included in **Section 3.3** in relation to coastal entrance instability in the context of Belongil Creek.

The various hazard zones delineated in Nielsen et al (1992) at a particular point in time are shown in **Figure 3** and are defined in the text below the figure. The zones assume an entirely sandy (erodible) subsurface.




Figure 3: Schematic representation of coastline hazard zones (after Nielsen et al, 1992)

The ZWI delineates an area where any structure or its foundations would suffer direct wave attack during a severe coastal storm. It is that part of the beach which is seaward of the beach erosion escarpment.

A ZSA is delineated to encompass that portion of the seaward face of the beach that would slump to the natural angle of repose of the beach sand following removal by wave erosion of the design storm demand. It represents the steepest stable beach profile under the conditions specified.

A ZRFC for building foundations is delineated to take account of the reduced bearing capacity of the sand adjacent to the storm erosion escarpment. Nielsen et al (1992) recommended that structural



loads should only be transmitted to soil foundations outside of this zone (i.e. landward or below), as the factor of safety within the zone is less than 1.5 during extreme scour conditions at the face of the escarpment. In general (without the protection of a terminal structure such as a seawall), dwellings/structures not piled and located with the ZRFC would be considered to have an inadequate factor of safety.

3.3 Review of Individual Factors

3.3.1 General

The individual factors listed in **Section 3.2** which determine the position of the erosion hazard are considered in turn below. For each factor, the approaches taken in Part J of BDCP10 and in BMT WBM (2013) are briefly outlined, followed by a discussion and opinion. Where necessary, in the case of Part J of BDCP10, reference is made back to the 1978 Byron Bay – Hastings Point Erosion Study (Department of Public Works, 1978).

3.3.2 Planning Period

Three planning periods were adopted in Part J of BDCP10; Immediate, 50 Year and 100 Year. Presumably these periods are measured from the date on the Maps; namely from 15 August 1986. Accordingly, the coastal hazard is defined at 1986, 2036 and 2086.

BMT WBM (2013) adopted three planning periods; Immediate, 2050 and 2100.

Guidance provided by the Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH) in Guidelines for Preparing Coastal Zone Management Plans (OEH, 2013a) notes that long term planning horizons to set strategic directions for coastal hazard areas would be 50 to 100 years.

Based on an understanding of the Planning Proposal, which involves creation of nine Lots, adoption of a planning period of 50 to 100 years is considered reasonable.

3.3.3 Storm Bite or Storm Erosion Demand

Storm erosion demand represents the volume of sand removed from a beach, measured above 0m relative to Australian Height Datum (AHD), in a severe storm or series of closely spaced storms. It is expressed in cubic metres per metre length of beach (m³/m).

Part J of BDCP10 does not specifically state the storm erosion demand used to establish the Immediate Impact Line in the 1986 Maps. Department of Public Works (1978) noted in relation to short term erosion that accurate beach profile data was available for a period of six years from 1972 to 1978. This information was examined in the study to assess movement of mean sea level and the vegetation line.

It was noted that the position of mean sea level on the beach fluctuates markedly with time, with movements of 50 to 100m being not uncommon. Movement of the vegetation line was not subject to the same extent of short term fluctuations as mean sea level on the beach. Information for North Byron Beach was also confounded by the single available beach profile being located within the zone of influence of Belongil Creek. Generally, the information was dominated by a significant recovery of the beach over the period 1976-1978 which is not surprising given the severe cyclones of the late 1960s



and early 1970s. Overall the interpretation of storm erosion demand was limited by the short period of record of only some 6 years (and the location of the particular beach profile).

BMT WBM (2013) was able to carry out a much more detailed assessment of storm erosion demand than was possible in the 1978 Erosion Study due to the longer period of historical data available and improved analysis techniques. The assessment included analysis of photogrammetric data over the 65 year period 1947 to 2012, comprising changes to beach volume and changes to the position of dunes (measured at specified dune contour level positions). On the basis of this analysis, a storm erosion demand of 250m³/m was adopted for the North Byron Beach area.

A storm erosion demand of 250m³/m is approximately equal to a 100 year Average Recurrence Interval (ARI) 'high demand' value at a rip head based on measurements at NSW beaches reported in Gordon (1987). It is similar to values adopted on the open coast by the writer and is considered reasonable for North Byron Beach.

3.3.4 Long Term Recession due to Net Sediment Loss

Long term recession due to net sediment loss refers to the shoreline recession due to ongoing sand losses from the coastal compartment. Commonly, these losses are the result of a difference in longshore sand transport out of a compartment compared to longshore sand supply into a compartment. This form of recession is considered separately to recession due to sea level rise. Typically, the assessment of recession due to net sediment loss is supported by development of a quantified conceptual model of sediment movement which explains the loss mechanism in physical terms.

Department of Public Works (1978) assessed 'long term erosion' based on three data sources:

- hydrographic surveys and associated survey data;
- historical, single point, data relating to a particular feature;
- aerial photographic coverage.

The greatest emphasis was placed on analysis of aerial photography, which covered the 30 year period 1947 to 1977. Erosion was examined in terms of movement of the back beach erosion escarpment located within the dunes. The accuracy of establishing the erosion escarpment at any point in time was considered to be ±20m.

The overall average long term recession rate for the entire Byron Bay to Hastings Point embayment was found to be 0.5m/yr. Localised average annual rates were up to 1.5m/yr in Byron Bay and 2.0m/yr at New Brighton. In the vicinity of North Byron Beach, average annual recession rates over the period 1947 to 1977 were approximately 1m/yr (Figure 5.7 in the 1978 Study).

Department of Public Works (1978) also set out a projected 50 Year and 100 Year shoreline position for the Byron Bay to Hastings Point embayment, measured from the present day (1978) erosion escarpment, based on a predictive model developed for the study area (Figure 13.1 in the 1978 Study). This information indicates, for the North Byron Beach area:

the projected 50 Year shoreline position (2028) was greater than 100m landward of the 1978 erosion escarpment. Reference to historical photogrammetric beach profiles included in BMT WBM (2013) from 1958 to 2012 and examination of recent aerial photographs of the subject



area (2018) show that this projected 50 Year shoreline position would not be expected to eventuate in practice. This outcome reduces the confidence in the predictive modelling in the 1978 Study;

 the difference between the 50 Year and 100 Year projected shoreline positions was approximately 100m, indicating that the model prediction for the average annual recession rate was around 2m/yr². This rate is in excess of the measured data over the period 1947 to 1977 reported in the 1978 Study.

As noted earlier, the findings of the 1978 Byron Bay – Hastings Point Erosion Study formed the basis of the hazard lines prepared in 1986 by the NSW Department of Land and Water Conservation and supplied to Council, and which are included on Maps in Part J of BDCP10. Accordingly, the 100 Year Impact Line (position of erosion escarpment) shown in Part J of BDCP10 is considered unduly conservative.

BMT WBM (2013) assessed the historical long term recession due to net sediment loss principally through photogrammetric analysis of historical vertical aerial photography, covering the 65 year period 1947 to 2012. The analysis included determination of dune volume changes and movement of specific contour levels in the dunes; namely the 1.5m AHD, 2.5m AHD and 4.0m AHD contour levels.

The photogrammetric analysis indicated little persistent shoreline change in the subject area north of Belongil Creek entrance (Zones 0 and 1 in the analysis) until around 1985 to 1990, after which there was commencement of a marked trend of volume loss and dune scarp recession, indicating a present trend of recession (year 2013) of about 1.0m/yr.

It was noted that the more recent 2010-2012 beach/dune condition was affected by substantial storm erosion since 2009, potentially masking the ongoing longer term trend of change, with greater than the trend retreat of the erosion escarpment occurring in the period 2010-2012. Nevertheless, it was considered that recession in the unprotected shoreline north of the seawalls along Belongil Spit, ie. in the subject area, appeared to be accelerating consistent with a transfer of the overall net loss of sand from the whole Byron Bay Embayment (Cape Byron to Tyagarah Beach) towards the north-western (downdrift) end of the embayment.

BMT WBM (2013) sought to explain the differences in measured historical rates of recession by different parties and to isolate a suitable ongoing trend of shoreline change for future planning purposes by identifying several factors influencing shoreline position over time:

- the underlying long term recession trend (decades to centuries);
- medium term variability in shoreline position due to cycles of naturally varying sand supply to the embayment from the south, measured in years, which are superimposed on the long term trend; and
- short term variability due to storm erosion and recovery which are superimposed on both trends

01 February 2019

² In addition, the distance between the Immediate Impact Line and 100 Year Impact Line in the relevant Map for North Byron Beach in Part J of BDCP10 is approximately 200m, also indicating an adopted average annual recession rate of approximately 2m/yr.



The above factors were illustrated conceptually by BMT WBM (2013) in Figure 4-27 of their report, reproduced here as **Figure 4**. It was also noted that the pattern of shoreline change over time is further complicated in the Byron Bay Embayment by the impacts of coastal protection works.

BMT WBM (2013) concluded that the assessment of shoreline recession in the 1978 Study, which gave values of up to 1.5m/yr in Byron Bay (1947-1977 analysis period), and the assessment of shoreline recession in WBM Oceanics Australia (2000), which gave a lower recession rate of 1.0m/yr (1947-2000 analysis period), were both influenced by the substantial storm erosion loss between 1947 and 1973 and the medium term variability involving a shoreline recession phase up to about 1980 (refer **Figure 4**). Accordingly, it was considered that both estimates were overestimates of the actual recession rates. It was noted that an estimate for the underlying long term trend of recession in the Byron Bay Embayment in Patterson (2013) was 0.25m/yr.




Figure 4: Conceptual representation of recession and variability in the Byron Bay Embayment

BMT WBM (2013) utilised a so-called EVO-MOD regional model, refined in detail within the Byron Bay Embayment, to project future shoreline behaviour. Use of a predictive model, rather than reliance completely on measured historic data, was considered unavoidable because:

- only by model simulation can the processes leading to reduction in the recession rate as the recession proceeds be simulated reasonably; and
- the non-uniform alongshore effects of headlands and coastal structures on shoreline response to sea level rise cannot be determined by other means.

Tables in BMT WBM (2013) indicated that the overall predicted recession rate due to net sediment loss adopted for the subject area in Scenario 1 (involving retention and permanent maintenance of all existing coastal protection works) was approximately 0.5m/yr for the period 2010 to 2050 and was approximately 0.45m/yr for the period 2050 to 2010.

The assessment of recession due to net sediment loss in BMT WBM (2013) involved a thorough analysis of photogrammetric data from historical aerial photography (1947-2012) and the establishment and validation of a predictive shoreline movement model that incorporates waves and sand transport.



While uncertainties exist with predictive modelling the approach taken in BMT WBM (2013) is considered to represent a sound basis for coastal hazard assessment in conjunction with the measured data. Uncertainties are provided for by adopting likely upper and lower limits for the future coastal hazard.

3.3.5 Long Term Recession due to Sea Level Rise

It is well accepted that a projected future climate change induced sea level rise will cause recession as the shoreline adjusts to the higher sea level.

Department of Public Works (1978) did not consider shoreline recession due to sea level as this phenomenon was not understood in the late 1970s.

BMT WBM (2013) used the EVO-MOD model to estimate shoreline recession due to projected sea level rise and compared these estimated recession distances to those calculated using the well-accepted Bruun Rule (Bruun, 1962).

Sea level rise estimates of 0.4m and 0.9m to the years 2050 and 2100 respectively (relative to 1990) were adopted. These estimates became 0.34m and 0.84m at 2050 and 2100 respectively when applied to the base year of 2010 in BMT WBM (2013). A best estimate Bruun Rule slope factor of 45:1 was adopted based on available data for the study region. To allow for the uncertainties involved in determining projected future sea level rise impacts at the shoreline, lower and upper limits of potential recession were set by applying variations of -20% and +30% to the best estimate slope factor, ie. a range of approximately 36:1 to 60:1, for 5m high dunes.

The EVO-MOD model approach gave somewhat higher estimated shoreline recession due to projected sea level than the Bruun Rule values and were adopted for establishing the future coastal hazards.

The approach adopted in BMT WBM (2013) for estimating shoreline recession due to projected sea level rise is considered sound. The values adopted for sea level rise are slightly higher than values recently adopted by the writer for the rezoning of coastal land on the Kurnell Peninsula in Sydney which were 0.22m and 0.72m at 2050 and 2100 respectively (relative to 2016). The latter values were based on the IPCC (2013) RCP6.0 (high) scenario, increased by 10% for local variation relative to the global mean values.

3.3.6 Selection of Pre-storm Profile

Selection of the pre-storm profile upon which to apply the storm erosion demand and subsequently the shoreline recession due to net sediment loss and due to sea level rise is important as this influences the ultimate position of the future coastal hazard.

In selecting the pre-storm profile the aim should be to adopt a relatively accreted beach profile, typically referred to by the writer as an 'average beach full' profile, as the high storm erosion demands selected in hazard analysis (such as 250m³/m selected at North Byron Beach in BMT WBM (2013)), can only be realised in practice if accreted profiles exist (in the situation of eroded profiles there are large quantities of sand in offshore bars which dissipate wave energy giving lower storm erosion demands). The selected pre-storm profile should also, ideally, be contemporary.



PWD (1978) adopted the 'present day' (1978) erosion scarp to determine the immediate erosion hazard zone and the future 50 year and 100 year erosion hazard zones. The state of the beach in 1978 based on photos in PWD (1978) indicated beach recovery following the severe cyclones in the late 1960s and early 1970s but may not have represented 'average beach full'. In any case the profile is now quite dated.

BMT WBM (2013) adopted the 'baseline mean shoreline trend position' as at 2010 for the pre-storm profile with the provision that, following application of the design storm erosion demand, the immediate erosion hazard line extended as far landward as the crest of the most landward measured erosion escarpment in the historical record.

Of the two studies, the BMT WBM (2013) is the most contemporary and the pre-storm profile adopted in that study, established for 2010, is considered the most appropriate from the two studies. Having said that, the 'baseline mean shoreline trend position' is likely to be further landward than an 'average beach full' condition and therefore somewhat conservative.

3.3.7 Delineation of Hazard Line

The means of delineation of the hazard line at a particular point in time, ie. ZWI, ZSA or ZRFC from Nielsen et al (1992), affects the position of the hazard line 'on the ground' as outlined in **Section 3.2**.

PWD (1978) essentially adopted the ZSA, as they translated the position of the crest of the (slumped) erosion escarpment landward.

BMT WBM (2013) discussed the relevance of both the ZSA and ZRFC. The hazard definition maps included in the report corresponded to the landward edge of the ZSA and therefore did not include the ZRFC. It was noted that the actual geotechnical conditions on site (not known) will influence the extent of the ZRFC. It was recommended that expert geotechnical engineering assessment be sought to establish the structural stability of foundations located (or likely to be located) within the ZRFC, on a case by case basis.

The NSW Coastal Planning Guideline: Adopting to Sea Level Rise (NSW Department of Planning, 2010) provides some guidance as to how the Immediate Hazard line, 2050 Hazard Line and 2100 Hazard Line are defined relative to the erosion and recession hazards, and the ZRFC. In summary, the mapping lines are defined to <u>include</u> the ZRFC (refer to Glossary in NSW Department of Planning, 2010).

The above position in NSW Department of Planning (2010) is not to say development is necessarily prohibited seaward of, say, the 2100 Hazard Line as this would depend on provisions within the relevant LEP and DCP. Such development is in fact contemplated in the Planning Guideline, eg. refer Figure 4 in that document, and assessed on merit. It is essentially about managing risk.

3.3.8 Coastal Inlet Instability (Belongil Creek)

BMT WBM (2013) did not extend the coastal hazard mapping to include the entrance area of Belongil Creek, due to the effect of creek meandering on shoreline behaviour which can confound the analysis. It was noted that the more recent pattern of entrance behaviour appears to be one of southward migration associated with shoreline recession. There was considered to be a significant likelihood that the creek could break through to the ocean south of its current entrance location, in the Manfred Street



area, in the short to medium term (less than 20 to 50 years), although it was noted that this predicted behaviour was somewhat speculative and uncertain.

A significant feature of the entrance area of Belongil Creek not referred to in BMT WBM (2013) has been the formation, naturally, over the past 25 years or so, of a recurved spit at the northern end of Belongil Spit and its continued vegetative stabilisation and growth in volume (visible in **Figure 2**). This feature has forced the creek to be diverted westward causing erosion of the left hand bank of the creek (looking downstream) and loss of Littoral Rainforest. This process can be expected to be ongoing whilever there is a supply of sand to the recurred spit from Belongil Spit.

A further relevant feature of the entrance area is the Temporary Coastal Protection Works (TCPW), comprising sand filled geotextile containers (geocontainers), constructed in March 2015 to protect the creek entrance frontage of the North Byron Beach Resort. The works are located wholly on private land owned by Ganra Pty Ltd (North Byron Beach Resort).

The TCPW were permissible under the Coastal Protection Act, 1979. There is an ongoing requirement on Ganra Pty Ltd to ensure the works are appropriately maintained in accordance with statutory requirements as set out in OEH (2013b).

In the event Belongil Creek breaks through to the ocean south of its current entrance location, in the Manfred Street area, as considered likely in BMT WBM (2013), the consequences for North Byron Bay Resort would be unlikely to be adverse and more likely beneficial. The existing entrance area would be expected to infill with sand supplied from the south and, over time, an incipient and frontal dune system would be expected to develop, providing greater erosion protection locally to the Resort.

In the interim prior to any breakthrough to the south, the preferred approach to management of the entrance area of Belongil Creek is considered to be construction of low key entrance training works and creek bank protection which stabilise the entrance location and arrest ongoing loss of Littoral Rainforest.

The existing TCPW will continue to provide a level of erosion protection to the creek entrance frontage of the Resort and can be maintained following any damage. The most significant form of coastal hazard for this area for the foreseeable future is likely to be the coastal inundation hazard.

4. SUMMARY OF OPINION

The 1978 Byron Bay – Hastings Point Erosion Study (Department of Public Works, 1978) which informs the coastal hazard in Part J of BDCP10 was a landmark coastal erosion hazard study at the time but is now some 40 years old. It is also evident, 40 years later, that projections of future shoreline position made in that Study are unduly conservative.

BMT WBM (2013) had the benefit of more than twice the period of historical record from aerial photography, the availability of more sophisticated analysis techniques and predictive modelling capability, and selection of a relatively contemporary pre-storm profile.



For the above reasons, BMT WBM (2013) is considered a preferred basis for assessment of coastal hazard for the subject area. It is considered reasonable to adopt the 'best estimate' position of the hazard line from this study³.

In applying the findings of BMT WBM (2013) it should be noted that the extent of the coastal hazard does not include allowance for the ZRFC.

In the entrance area of Belongil Creek, where coastal hazards are not defined in BMT WBM (2013), adherence to maintenance responsibilities for the existing TCPW should be continued. The most significant form of coastal hazard for this area for the foreseeable future is likely to be the coastal inundation hazard. Construction of low key entrance training works and creek bank protection works would address the existing coastal entrance instability hazard and the current ongoing loss of Littoral Rainforest over the long term.

5. REFERENCES

BMT WBM (2013), 'Byron Shire Coastline Hazards Assessment Update', prepared for Byron Shire Council, Final Report, R.B19093.001.03.docx, September 2013

Bruun P (1962), 'Sea Level Rise as a Cause of Shore Erosion', Journal of Waterways and Harbours Division, American Society of Civil Engineers, Vol 88, pp117-130

Department of Public Works (1978), 'Byron Bay – Hastings Point Erosion Study', Coastal Engineering Branch, Report No PWD 78026, November 1978

Gordon, AD (1987), 'Beach Fluctuations and Shoreline Change – NSW', Preprints of Papers, 8th Australasian Conference on Coastal and Ocean Engineering, Launceston, 30 November to 4 December, Institution of Engineers Australia National Conference Publication No 87/17, pp. 103-167

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (2013), *Climate Change 2013, The Physical Science Basis, Working Group/Contribution to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, [Stocker, TF; Qin, D; Plattner, G-K; Tignor, M; Allen, SK; Boschung, J; Nauels, A; Xia, Y; Bex, V and PM Midgley (editors)], Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, New York, USA

Nielsen, AF; Lord, DB and HG Poulos (1992), 'Dune Stability Considerations for Building Foundations', Australian Civil Engineering Transactions, Institution of Engineers Australia, Volume CE34, No. 2, June, pp. 167-173

NSW Department of Planning (2010), 'NSW Coastal Planning Guideline: Adapting to Sea Level Rise', Pub no. DoP 10-022, ISBN 978-1-74263-035-9, August 2010

³ The positions of the hazard lines in BMT WBM (2013) have been established using a 'deterministic' approach, which has been the traditional methodology adopted in NSW. In this approach, single values are adopted for the main parameters used to derive the hazard line, eg. storm erosion demand, recession rate due to net sediment loss, etc with generally conservative estimates applied. In addition, the design storm is assumed to occur at the end of the planning period. More recently, probabilistic approaches have been adopted for determination of coastal hazard lines. The probabilistic approach allows each input parameter to vary randomly according to appropriate probability distribution functions. In the experience of the writer, the deterministic approach gives more conservative outcomes compared to the probabilistic approach. In addition, the 2010 prestorm profile adopted in BMT WBM (2013) is likely to be somewhat conservative.



Office of Environment and Heritage [OEH] (2013a), *Guidelines for Preparing Coastal Zone Management Plans*, OEH 2013/0224, ISBN 978-1-74359-054-6, July 2013

Office of Environment and Heritage [OEH] (2013b), *Guide to the Statutory Requirements for Temporary Coastal Protection Works*; OEH 2013/0638, ISBN 978-1-74359-272-4, August 2013

Patterson DC (2013), 'Modelling as an Aid to Understand the Evolution of Australia's East Coast in Response to Late Pleistocene – Holocene and Future Sea Level Change', PhD Thesis, Civil Engineering, University of Queensland

WBM Oceanics Australia (2000), 'Byron Shire Coastal Hazard Definition Study', prepared for Byron Shire Council

I trust the above meets your current requirements. Please call should you require any clarification or additional information.

Greg BrittonYours faithfully


Technical Director


Maritime & Aviation, Australia





APPENDIX A – COPY OF PLAN SET PREPARED BY PLANNERS NORTH













Attachment 2 – Comments Register

29 November 2019 PRESENTATION OF RESULTS



Comments Register

Document name: Review of Coastal Hazard at North Byron Bay using a Probabilistic Approach – Methodology and Selection of Key Parameters – 3 October 2019 (RHDHV reference PA1998-ZZ-XX-RP-Z-0001)

		_		
Review Date	Reviewer	Section	Reviewers comment	RHDHV response
17.10.19	DPIE (Ben Fitzgibbon)	1.1 – Background	Date for Byron Bay – Hastings Point Erosion Study should be 1978 not 1998.	Thank you, this typo has been noted.
17.10.19	DPIE (Ben Fitzgibbon)	3.3 – Planning Period	The NSW Coastline Management Manual recommends a CMP should consider timeframes and planning horizons including immediate, 20 years, 50 years and 100 years (refer Part A, mandatory requirement 2). It is recommended the study assess the hazards over immediate, 20, 50 and 100 years.	Agreed. Study will assess the hazards at: Immediate 20 years (2040) 50 years (2070) 100 years (2120)
17.10.19	DPIE (Ben Fitzgibbon)	3.5 – Recession due to Sea Level Rise	In the interest of cost savings, Byron Shire Council <u>may</u> continue to use the BMT WBM (2013) Byron Shire Coastline Hazards Assessment Update Report (with possible probabilistic enhancement incorporating a greater sea level rise range assessment) as the basis of the hazard work for the CMP currently under development. This has not yet been confirmed. The BMT WBM (2013) work uses the old NSW SLR Policy benchmarks (0.4m and 0.9m of SLR relative to 1990 for 2050 and 2100). Councils current SLR policy is here: https://www.byron.nsw.gov.au/Services/Environment/Climate-change/Adaptation/Climate-Change-Strategic-Planning-Policy	The study will consider both Council's current SLR policy and a range of SLR projections provided in IPCC (2013). See also response under Point 4 – email 25.10.19.



Review Date	Reviewer	Section	Reviewers comment	RHDHV response
17.10.19	DPIE (Ben Fitzgibbon)	Appendix A – Figure 5 and Figure 6	This plot appears to show 'low demand' as based on Figure 5 above, not 'high demand'?	The plot <u>does show</u> 'high demand'. The particular example of the methodology provided within Appendix A happens to be for a sheltered beach (not North Byron Bay) where the storm demand is lower than for an open coast beach. The study will adopt high demand (rip head) values of storm demand, based on assessment of Byron Bay data by BMT WBM (2013) and review by RHDHV (100 year ARI value equal to 250m ³ /m).
17.10.19	DPIE (Ben Fitzgibbon)	Appendix A – Figure 18	115m³/m for the 100 year ARI storm demand?	Again Figure 18 shows an example only of the methodology, which happens to be for a sheltered beach. As noted above, 250m³/m will be adopted in the study for the 100 year ARI storm demand.

Fitzgibbon (DPIE) to Kate Singleton (Planners North) and Greg Britton (RHDHV) dated 25.10.19 Document name: Email from Ben

Review Date	Reviewer	Section	Reviewers comment	RHDHV response
25.10.19	DPIE (various)	Point 1	The proposed probabilistic methodology appears generally reasonable, however, we note the proposal does not list which bounding parameters will be used, or how closely the triangular distributions may fit the actual distribution of any applied parameters. Therefore we are unable to comment on whether or not these factors are fit for purpose.	Listing of bounding parameters: The following bounding parameters were listed in the report: • underlying recession (Section 3.4): - peak/modal value (best estimate): 0.5m/yr; - minimum: 0.4m/yr (-20%); and - maximum: 0.6m/yr (+20%).



Review Date Reviewer	Section	Reviewers comment	RHDHV response
			 Sea level rise (Section 3.5):
			Both the adjusted curve of best fit based on
			DECCW (2009), as presented in Figure 3-5
			and the following trajectories from IPCC
			(2013) (5% and 95% percentile values),
			increased by 10% to account for local variation
			in sea level rise relative to the global mean:
			 peak/modal trajectory: RCP 6.0 (high);
			- minimum trajectory: RCP 2.6 (low); and
			- maximum trajectory: RCP 8.5 (nign).
			All the above sea level rise projections were
			illustrated in Figure 3-6;
			 Bruun slope factor for dune crest level of 5m
			AHD, 8m AHD and 10m AHD (Section 3.5):
			- peak/modal values (best estimate): 45:1,
			40:1, 35:1
			- minimum: 36:1, 32:1, 28:1 (all -20%); and
			- maximum: 60:1, 54:1, 47:1 (all +35%).
			storm demand (Section 3.6):
			Relationship developed by Gordon (1987) for
			high demand (rip head) areas, adjusted such
			that 100 year ARI event is set at 250m³/m
			(increased from 220m³/m), ARI values are re-
			expressed as AEP, and range of ARI (AEP)
			extended to cover both more frequent events
			(1 year ARI) and rarer events (1000 year ARI).
			The proposed relationship was shown in
			Figure 3-7.
			How closely triangular distributions fit actual
			distribution



Review Date	Reviewer	Section	Reviewers comment	RHDHV response
				Triangular distributions were proposed for: • underlying recession; • sea level rise (set to follow a specified trajectory); and • Bruun slope factor. It is noted that in the paper by Kinsela et al (2017), referred to by DPIE, and stated to represent 'some of the more contemporary science in this space', triangular distributions are also adopted for the above parameters. Kinsela et al state ' This simplistic representation of the uncertainty space is commensurate with the state of knowledge, in that sufficient data or scientific understanding may exist to define the feasible range and best estimate value of a model parameter or variable, although the exact shape of the probability distribution remains largely unknown'. In the circumstances, adoption of a triangular distribution for the above parameters is considered reasonable.
25.10.19	DPIE (various)	Point 2	The attached paper by Dr. Mike Kinsela (Kinsela et al. (2017) Journal of Marine Science & Engineering) represents some of the more contemporary published science in this space.	The paper by Dr Mike Kinsela has been noted. Reference to it is made within this Comments Register.
25.10.19	DPIE (various)	Point 3	In the case of previously completed probabilistic hazard studies as referenced on Page 12 of the methodology report (Sutherland Shire study), the trajectories	The advice by DPIE is noted that increasing IPCC (2017) values by 10% does not represent a formal position by the NSW Government.



Review Date	Reviewer	Section	Reviewers comment	RHDHV response
			adopted/endorsed by Council and OEH i.e. all IPCC values increased by 10%, do not represent a formal position on the use of these values by the NSW Government. Therefore, it's recommended that the use of IPCC values and any potential variations should be considered on a case by case basis.	Be that as it may, application of an increase of 10% is considered to be a reasonable conservatism in the current assessment of the coastal hazard at North Byron Bay.
25.10.19	DPIE (various)	Point 4	When considering published IPCC sea level rise projections, it's noted these projections (e.g. RCP 6.0 modal, RCP 2.6 min, RCP 8.5 max) only cover the 17th-83rd (likely) percentile range. Therefore, consideration of the expanded dataset would be warranted to effectively cover the 0-100th percentile ranges.	The study will consider the expanded data set to effectively cover the 0-100th percentile ranges.
25.10.19	DPIE (various)	Point 5	Its noted distributions are to be defined through triangular distribution, whilst such an approach is useful when the distribution is not fully known, recent advancements in the science around storm demand (fluctuating beach erosion volumes) suggest these distribution are better defined through the application of a gamma distribution (see Kinsela et al. (2017) Journal of Marine Science & Engineering) and may warrant further consideration.	The comment suggests the study proposes adoption of a triangular distribution for storm demand. This is not the case. The proposed distribution for storm demand is shown in Figure 3-7 and is based on Gordon (1987) which proposed a linear relationship between storm demand and the logarithm of ARI (over the range of approximately 2 year ARI to 100 year ARI). It is noted that Kinsela et al also adopt Gordon (1987) as a basis. The proposed distribution and the gamma distribution are quite similar as indicated by the values below: • 99th percentile values: - proposed 250m³/m - gamma 250m³/m



Review Date	Reviewer	Section	Reviewers comment	RHDHV response
				 50th percentile values: proposed 75m³/m gamma 85m³/m
25.10.19	UPIE (various)	Point 6	The proposed methodology does not appear to consider potential implication of off-axis sink effects that may result under sea level rise from Belongil Creek in line with a sediment compartment type approach. Given the proximity of Belongil Creek to the location of the assessment, consideration should be given for sequestration of sand to the estuary under such scenarios, which may lead to an increased sediment loss (recession) on adjacent area of the shoreline. Given uncertainty surrounding this response, this component should also be treated probabilistically.	Kinsela et al (2017) consider the influence of potential sequestration of sand to an estuary under rising sea level. The sediment loss from the beach is taken to be the product of the sea level rise over the planning period and the submerged area of the active flood tide delta deposits. The potential sand loss to the estuary is distributed along the length of sandy shoreline within the sediment compartment. Belongil Creek is a small estuarine system with a limited submerged area of active flood delta. When considered together with predicted sea level rise over, say, 50 to 100-year planning periods, and the length of the sediment compartment, it can be shown that the contribution to shoreline recession of potential sequestration of sand to Belongil Creek is very small compared to other factors. Treating this contribution probabilistically is not considered warranted. The potential influence of sequestration can be considered analytically at the conclusion of the probabilistic assessment of the coastal hazard.