# **APPENDIX A**

# **HISTORIC FLOODS**

Extract from Sydney Morning Herald, Saturday 12 May 1860, p.10

#### ANOTHER DESTRUCTIVE FLOOD

SYDNEY has not been visited with such heavy rain for many years, as that which fell from Wednesday, the 25th April, to the following Sunday. Scarcely have we rallied from the effects of the disastrous inundations recorded in our last summary, ere another visitation, but this time not attended with so great a loss of life, sweeps once more the Western and Southern districts, making 1860, indeed, a memorable year. In the metropolis there was little destruction to property, but in the suburbs the people were not so fortunate.

The market gardeners at Rushcutters and Double Bay have suffered severely, all their little plots having been under water, which, draining off, has left behind a bed of sand. These poor people had but just recovered from the last flood, and had only repaired the damage then inflicted, a short time before the rain set in. Their plots of barley, and their beds of vegetables, and feed for cattle, are all destroyed by the sand and water, and their prospects for the winter therefore are bleak enough. The new South Head Road was literally worn out by this last rain.

Extract from Sydney Morning Herald, Saturday 13 April 1867, p.5

#### THE RAIN AND ITS EFFECTS

After several weeks of changeable weather, embracing frequent showers and several rather heavy rainfalls, we have at last had a regular downpour, and the effects in some parts of the city and suburbs have been disastrous. Shortly before midnight of Thursday the heavy masses of clouds that had been gathering up from the southward overspread the sky, and the rain began to fall in heavy showers. Not very long after the first shower the rain came down in torrents, and continued to descend as one sheet of water all night long. We hear the same statements from all parts of the city and suburbs, that no one can remember such incessant heavy rain for so many hours. The effects, in the sweeping away of metal from the streets, the breaking up of culverts, and the displacement of guttering, are sufficiently evident in all parts of the city.

At Double Bay, the destruction caused by the terrific rush of water, was also very great. A large portion of Mr. Guilfoyle's exotic nursery was submerged, and the destruction among the flowers and tender plants was very great. The market gardens on both sides of the Old South Head Road suffered similarly to those at Rushcutters Bay, but not, apparently, to the same extent. A large portion of these gardens was covered at one time, but the water subsided without causing much damage, except as regards the culvert under the main road, which is in a dangerous state, and if not speedily re- paired, will render the road impassable. Lower down in the bay a bridge over the main watercourse suffered severely. A large portion of the road close to this bridge was washed away, leaving an immense hole, into which a horse fell in the course of the morning; and it was with great difficulty that he was got out alive. Many of the houses in Double Bay were, for a time, ankle deep, and some of them knee-deep in water.

Extract from Sydney Morning Herald, Saturday 20 May 1933, p.13

#### FIERCE STORM ON COAST WITH TORRENTIAL RAIN Floodings in City and Suburbs

A fierce cyclonic storm swept Sydney and the central coast late yesterday afternoon.

At Sydney, 3½ inches of rain fell, more than 2 inches of which was registered between 5 and 6.30 o'clock.

Low lying areas in Rose Bay, Double Bay and Rushcutters Bay were inundated.

Extract from Sydney Morning Herald, Friday 15 November 1940, p.9

#### RAIN IN CITY Heavy Fall This Morning

Heavy rain began about 1.45 a.m. today and continued steadily for about an hour. Then it eased slightly, but the outlook for further falls was promising.

Roads in the city were flooded shortly after 2am. In New South Head Road, Double Bay, the water was a foot deep opposite Hoyts theatre, and a tram was held up for some time waiting for the water to recede Several motor cars were also halted by the floodwater.

Extract from Sydney Morning Herald, Monday 24 July 1950, p.1

#### RAIN CHAOS IN SYDNEY AND SUBURBS Families Flooded Out of Homes

Torrential rain in Sydney and suburbs yesterday temporarily drove scores of people from their homes, disrupted rail and air traffic, and swamped road bridges.

Between 9 a.m. and 8 p.m., 429 points fell in the city, making the total so far this year greater than the whole of last year's.

Some of the worst floodings were in Glebe; Manning Road, Double Bay; Curlewis Street, Bondi; Epping Road, Epping; Moore Park Road, Centennial Park; sections of Kingsford, Daceyville, Maroubra, Kingsford, Mortdale, and Bankstown.

# **APPENDIX B**

# **COMMUNITY CONSULTATION MATERIAL**

- Letter to Residents
- Information Sheet No. 1 (introduction to study)
- Community Questionnaire
- Agency Questionnaire
- Information Sheet No. 2 (with public exhibition)

*Council Ref:* 1037.G (AR:AR) *Your Ref:* 

11 September 2009

[Name] [Address 1] [Address 2]

Dear [Name],

#### Double Bay Catchment Floodplain Risk Management Study & Plan

Woollahra Municipal Council has commissioned Bewsher Consulting to undertake a floodplain risk management study for the Double Bay catchment. The study will examine flooding problems within the Double Bay catchment and investigate solutions to these problems.

The included community information sheet gives you valuable information on the flood plain management process. If you could take a few minutes to read it and complete the attached community survey it would be greatly appreciated. When complete the survey will be used to ensure that all the flood related issues in the catchment have been covered and that all residents' concerns have been adequately addressed. A pre-paid addressed envelope is included for your convenience.

Should you require any further information on this matter, please contact Mr Michael Casteleyn, Drainage Engineer, on 9391 7131 during business hours.

Yours Sincerely

Alan Opera Manager – Engineering Services



# Double Bay Catchment Floodplain Risk Management Study & Plan

Community Information Sheet 1

September 2009

#### Introduction

Woollahra Council has appointed Bewsher Consulting Pty Ltd (floodplain management specialists) to prepare a Floodplain Risk Management Study & Plan for the Double Bay Catchment.

Storms are known to have generated flooding problems near New South Head Road in 1943, 1951, 1983 and 1988. Some residents reported houses flooded above floor level in the November 1984 event. Some shops were flooded and the northern part of Kiaora Road was completely inundated in the April 2007 event (Figure 1).

The Study will assess the potential impact of flooding on the community and evaluate options for addressing flooding problems.

It is being funded under the NSW Government's Floodplain Management Program.

#### The study area

The Double Bay catchment has an area of about 2.8 km<sup>2</sup> which drains to Sydney Harbour (Figure 2). It includes Double Bay and parts of Edgecliff, Woollahra and Bellevue Hill. Of the total area, 0.3 km<sup>2</sup> represents the West Double Bay portion of the catchment which has separate pipelines conveying local runoff to the harbour.

The upper section of the catchment comprises urban development, commercial and retail premises and limited areas of open space apart from Cooper Park. Stormwater within this section is carried within the underground piped network, or when this is exceeded, along roads or through private property.

The lower section comprises the area where stormwater collects into the open channel downstream of Lough Park and the receiving covered channel which passes under the Double Bay retail area. Sydney Water owns and maintains the major open and covered channels between Lough Park and the harbour, while Council owns and maintains the stormwater pipe systems.



Glendon Road, April 1988 Figure 1: Historical flooding



New South Head Road, April 2007



Figure 2: Catchment Map

#### Floodplain management process

The first step in the floodplain management process depicted in Figure 3—preparation of the Flood Study—has been completed. Council formally adopted the Double Bay Catchment Flood Study in December 2007.

The current investigation represents the second and third steps in the process. Preparation of the Floodplain Risk Management Study involves evaluating a range of floodplain management measures to address the areas of concern. The Floodplain Risk Management Plan is a recommended management plan for addressing the flood problem, following public exhibition and consideration of community feedback. After formal adoption by Council, the Plan will be implemented as resources permit.



#### **Management measures**

The Floodplain Risk Management Study will consider various options that may be able to reduce the damages caused by floods. This evaluation takes into account local residents' views, as well as environmental, social, economic and engineering factors. Among the options that could be considered are:

#### Measures that modify the way a flood behaves

- Constructing detention basins
- Enlarging the capacity of drainage infrastructure
- Reducing the potential for culvert blockage
- Constructing permanent levees

#### Measures that modify property

- Applying appropriate planning controls on new buildings (e.g. minimum floor levels)
- 'Flood-proofing' properties (e.g. using shutters)
- Council offering to purchase the most severely flood affected properties
- Raising houses above the 100 year flood level

Measures that modify people's response to flooding

- Improving flood warning systems and evacuation plans
- Promoting community flood awareness

The overall objective is to reduce the flood risk to life and damage to property.



Figure 4: The Double Bay Catchment FRMS will assess the potential impacts of climate change on flood behaviour.



Figure 5: Open channel next to Kiaora Road. The FRMS will consider the propensity for drains to block and measures to avert blockage.



Figure 6: One option could be to 'uncover' the Sydney Water underground channel and provide some 'naturalisation' of the trunk drainage system.

#### How can you be involved?

Community input to the Double Bay Floodplain Risk Management Study is essential. Several opportunities to let your voice be heard are available.

#### 1) Questionnaire

Accompanying this information sheet is a questionnaire that seeks your ideas about how flooding issues should be managed and disclosed. In order to evaluate the economic merit of various floodplain management options, we are also seeking information about the average value of property contents. (Obviously, all questionnaire responses are confidential).

#### 2) Public display

Once all the floodplain management options have been identified and evaluated and tentative recommendations have been formulated and agreed with the Floodplain Management Committee, a public display will be held providing a further opportunity to comment.

#### 3) Public exhibition

Public exhibition of the draft *Double Bay Catchment Floodplain Risk Management Study & Plan* will provide a further opportunity to comment.

#### 4) <u>Speak to a member of the Floodplain</u> Management Committee

Clr Chris Howe, Double Bay Ward, Woollahra Council Tel: 9328 1198

Mr Tony Gregory, Double Bay Residents Association Tel: 0414 609898 or 9327 1782

Mr Bart Foley, Dept Environment, Climate Change and Water

Ms Kim Edwards, Waverley-Woollahra SES

Mr Ray Parsell, Sydney Water

#### **Property Survey**

In order to identify properties, houses and businesses potentially exposed to flood risks, Council has engaged Turner Surveying to survey buildings over September - October. This will require access onto private property (but not inside houses). The survey will extend from Cooper Park to the Double Bay retail area and nearby residential areas. We are grateful for your assistance in facilitating this work.



#### Who can you contact for more information?

For more information about the Double Bay Catchment Floodplain Risk Management Study & Plan, please contact:

#### Woollahra Municipal Council

Michael Casteleyn Phone: 9391-7131 E-mail: Michael.Casteleyn@woollahra.nsw.gov.au

#### **Bewsher Consulting Pty Ltd**

Stephen Yeo Phone: 9868-1966 E-mail: syeo@bewsher.com.au

#### Thank you for being part of this study



Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water NSW







## Double Bay Catchment Floodplain Risk Management Study Community Questionnaire, September 2009

Please complete this questionnaire for the property within the Double Bay Catchment study area, in which you have <u>an interest</u>. (Refer to the map over page).

The information provided from this questionnaire will help us to identify and evaluate potential measures for addressing any flood problems.

All information provided will be treated as confidential and will be used only for this study. No names or addresses will be included in any published material.

Type of development		Address	Name of business (if applicable)
	Residence		
	Business		

1. Are there any particular flood issues that you are aware of in the Double Bay study area that warrant attention?

#### 2. Do you have any suggestions that would help reduce flooding problems in the study area ?

#### 3. Do you have any other suggestions about what the Study should cover?

4. In order to assist us in estimating the economic merit of potential floodplain management options, could you please complete this table for your residence or business?

Approximate internal ground floor area (m <sup>2</sup> )	Value of contents that would be destroyed or damaged if 30cm of muddy water entered your ground floor. ( <i>Include</i> in your estimate floor coverings, items stored in a garage or shed below the same level, landscaping etc. <i>Exclude</i> from your estimate motor vehicles.)
	□ below \$20,000, □ \$20,000-\$40,000, □ \$40,000-\$60,000, □ \$60,000-\$80,000, □ \$80,000-\$100,000, □\$100,000-\$120,000, □ above \$120,000

# 5. How do you think information about the risks of flooding should be provided to the local community? (Indicate with a ✓)

	Yes	No	Neutral/ unsure
Council should have flood maps available on its web site.			
Council should have flood maps available for inspection at its office.			
Council should issue flood level certificates to property owners on request.			
Council should issue flood level certificates to prospective purchasers on request.			
Council should issue flood level certificates to property owners regularly.			
Council should provide no advice about flooding.			

#### 6. Contact details (optional):

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone number:

Email:

#### Please return the completed questionnaire by 9 October 2009 to Bewsher Consulting:

1) Using the reply-paid envelope provided

Bewsher Consulting Reply Paid No. 352 EPPING NSW 1710



2) Faxing your questionnaire to 9868-5759



Please mark any flood problem areas on the map.



#### DOUBLE BAY CATCHMENT FLOODPLAIN RISK MANAGEMENT STUDY & PLAN

## STAKEHOLDER SURVEY

## FOR AGENCIES, AUTHORITIES AND INTEREST GROUPS

### **SEPTEMBER 2009**

## PART A: CONTACT DETAILS

Name of Organisation:	
Contact Name:	
Position of Contact Person:	
Postal Address:	
Contact phone number:	
Contact fax number:	
Contact e-mail:	

## PART B: RELEVANT REPORTS, STUDIES AND DESIGNS

Are you aware of any reports, studies or design drawings that have been carried out within the study area? These may or may not be related to flooding or the floodplain.

Author	Date	Title of report or drawing	Prepared for	Published by	Does your office have a copy we could borrow if required?

POTENTIAL FLOOD DAMAGE TO PROPERTY, ASSETS OR SERVICES PART C: We are interested in your views relating to the potential damage that *could* occur to your property, assets or services if they were inundated by floodwaters. Items that could be damaged by floodwaters through inundation or be damaged if undermined by erosion during a flood might include buildings, road surfaces, pumps, pumping stations, electricity substations, traffic signals, other electrical equipment, equipment and/or stock piles at depots, monitoring equipment as well as cables, conduits or pipes.

Please complete the following table using the examples as a guide.

1					 	 
Could potential damage be reduced if flood mitigation works were constructed or if warnings were issued? Please give details.	Damage may be reduced if Brown Street bridge was enlarged.	Pumps may be protected with at least 2 hours warning.	 	 	 	 
How critical would the property/asset/service be to the community if it were damaged by floodwaters?	About 5000 vehicles/day would have to find alternative routes for up to 2 weeks	There would be no sewer to about 400 homes for up to 5 days				
Approximately, how long would it take to repair the damage.	About 2 weeks	About 1 week				
Please estimate the approximate cost of damage that could be sustained.	\$100 per m <sup>2</sup> of affected pavement	000'09\$				
Please describe the type of damage that could be sustained if inundated by floodwaters.	Damage to road surface if inundated for > about 3–6 hrs	Pumps would fail if inundated by more than 300 mm of water				
Please provide the location of the property/ asset/service.	Brown Street	Corner Smith and Jones Streets				
Please describe the property/ asset/service that could be damaged by floodwaters.	Road surface	Sewer Pumping Station				

PART D: POSSIBLE FUTURE WORKS IN STUDY AREA

Does your organisation have any planned future works within the Double Bay Catchment Study Area that could be affected by flooding, or could have an impact on possible floodplain management options?

Floodplain management options could include constructing detention basins in Cooper Park and/or the Lough Playing Fields, enlarging the capacity of drainage infrastructure, reducing the potential for culvert blockage, constructing permanent levees, etc.

Please complete the following table using the example as a guide. Please attach a separate sheet if required.

Proposed Work	Location (attach map if required)	Approximate Cost	Indicative Time Frame
600 mm dia sewer rising main	Crosses the river upstream of the William Long bridge	\$10 million (2006 estimate)	Within next 5–10 years

### PART E: COMMENTS AND MORE INFORMATION

Do you have <u>any other comments</u> about flood-related issues? Does your organisation have any <u>specific</u> <u>issues</u> that they think should be addressed by the Double Bay Catchment Floodplain Risk Management Study? Please attach a separate sheet if required.

Please return your completed survey by **MONDAY 19TH OCTOBER** to:



Bewsher Consulting Pty Ltd PO Box 352 EPPING NSW 1710 Attention: Stephen Yeo



Fax: 9868 5759



Email: <u>syeo@bewsher.com.au</u> (an electronic copy of this survey is available on request) For further information about the Double Bay Catchment Floodplain Risk Management Study, please contact:

- Michael Casteleyn, Drainage Engineer, Woollahra Municipal Council, Ph: 9391 7131
- Stephen Yeo, Bewsher Consulting, Ph: 9868 1966

Thank you for your time and assistance.









# Double Bay Catchment Floodplain Risk Management Study & Plan

Community Information Sheet 2

May 2011

#### Introduction

Commencina in 2009. and with financial assistance from the Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water (DECCW), Woollahra Council has been working to prepare a Floodplain Risk Management Study & Plan for the Double Bay catchment. Floodplain management specialists Bewsher Consulting, overseen by Council's Flood Risk Management Committee, have completed a draft report, which is now on In broad terms, the report public exhibition. investigates what can be done to minimise the effects of flooding in the Double Bay catchment and has recommended a strategy in the form of a We invite you to take this draft Plan. opportunity to inspect the draft report and welcome your comments.

#### Floodplain management process

The first step in the floodplain management process depicted below—preparation of the Flood Study—has been completed. Council formally adopted the Double Bay Catchment Flood Study in December 2007.

The current investigation represents the second and third steps in the process. Preparation of the Floodplain Risk Management Study involves evaluating a range of floodplain management measures to address the areas of concern. The Floodplain Risk Management Plan is a recommended management plan for addressing the flood problem, following public exhibition and consideration of community feedback. After formal adoption by Council, the Plan will be implemented as resources permit.

#### The study area

The Double Bay catchment has an area of about 2.8 km<sup>2</sup> which drains to Sydney Harbour. It includes Double Bay and parts of Edgecliff, Woollahra and Bellevue Hill (see page 3).

#### **Principal outcomes**

The principal outcomes of the study include:

- A summary of flood behaviour (including updated modelling), and an assessment of the sensitivity of flood behaviour to the potential impacts of climate change;
- An assessment of potential flood damages in the Double Bay catchment – an estimated 62 dwellings and 142 businesses would be flooded above floor level in the 100 year flood; the average annual damage of flooding is estimated to cost \$3.7 million;
- An evaluation of potential floodplain management measures to reduce flood damages; and
- A recommended draft Double Bay catchment Floodplain Risk Management Plan.



#### Draft Floodplain Risk Management Plan

A draft Floodplain Risk Management Plan showing floodplain risk the preferred management measures for the Double Bay catchment study area is presented below and in the figure opposite. The recommended measures have been selected from a range of measures considered in the study, after an assessment of each measure's impact on flood risk, as well as consideration of environmental, social, and economic factors.

The principal components of the Plan are presented below according to priority, which is assessed on the basis of how easily (quickly) each measure can be implemented and on value for money. The timing of the proposed works will depend on Council's overall budgetary commitments, and the availability of funds from other sources.

High priority measures include:

 Install secure fencing adjacent to the Sydney Water channel from the Lough Playing Fields to New South Head Road, to prevent objects entering the drain and potentially blocking culverts;



Open channel next to Kiaora Road. One recommendation is to replace the existing fencing next to the channel with structurally designed safety fencing, to reduce the potential for large objects-including motor vehicles-from blocking critical culverts during flooding.

Amend the flood risk management provisions the Development Control Plan in in with best accordance practice and to incorporate climate change flood risk considerations;

- Improve emergency management planning by preparing a Local Flood Plan for Woollahra Local Government Area (SES);
- Improve public flood readiness by:

1) preparing a Double Bay Commercial District floodproofing brochure,

2) preparing a Double Bay Commercial District flood emergency response plan template,

3) conducting a Business FloodSafe breakfast (SES), and

4) installing safety signage at Lough Playing Fields and Manning Road;

 Prepare a questionnaire and institute processes to facilitate the rapid capture of flood data following future flooding in Woollahra LGA.

Medium priority measures include:

- Further investigate and if feasible implement the Bellevue Road conduit scheme (see Figure 6.3 in draft report);
- Implement the Bay Street/Knox Street conduit scheme (see Figure 6.4 in draft report);
- Implement the Ocean Avenue conduit scheme (see Figure 6.4 in draft report);
- Carry out minor outlet works for the pipe joining the Sydney Water channel near Nos. 24-26 Glendon Road.

Low priority measures include:

Further investigate (including consultation) and if practical invite owners of six Manning Road properties to join a voluntary house redevelopment scheme, which would offer a partial subsidy to landowners to redevelop buildings in a flood-compatible manner.

#### Funding

The total capital cost of implementing the draft Plan is estimated to be \$13.0-14.5M.



#### **Public exhibition**

A previous opportunity for the community to provide input to the Double Bay Floodplain Risk Management Study was through completing a questionnaire issued in September 2009. Now that the draft report has been prepared, we encourage you to inspect the report during public exhibition, and welcome your comments. Details about the public exhibition are contained in the attached letter.



#### **History corner**

For the history buffs, here's a report of a historical inundation at Double Bay:

#### THE RAIN AND ITS EFFECTS

After several weeks of changeable weather, embracing frequent showers and several rather heavy rainfalls, we have at last had a regular downpour, and the effects in some parts of the city and suburbs have been disastrous. Shortly before midnight of Thursday the heavy masses of clouds that had been gathering up from the southward overspread the sky, and the rain began to fall in heavy showers. Not very long after the first shower the rain came down in torrents, and continued to descend as one sheet of water all night long. We hear the same statements from all parts of the city and suburbs, that no one can remember such incessant heavy rain for so many hours. The effects, in the sweeping away of metal from the streets, the breaking up of culverts, and the displacement of guttering, are sufficiently evident in all parts of the city.

At Double Bay, the destruction caused by the terrific rush of water, was very great. A large portion of Mr. Guilfoyle's exotic nursery was submerged, and the destruction among the flowers and tender plants was very great. The market gardens on both sides of the Old South Head Road suffered similarly to those at Rushcutters Bay, but not, apparently, to the same extent. A large portion of these gardens was covered at one time, but the water subsided without causing much damage, except as regards the culvert under the main road, which is in a dangerous state, and if not speedily repaired, will render the road impassable. Lower down in the bay a bridge over the main watercourse suffered severely. A large portion of the road close to this bridge was washed away, leaving an immense hole, into which a horse fell in the course of the morning; and it was with great difficulty that he was got out alive. Many of the houses in Double Bay were, for a time, ankle deep, and some of them knee-deep in water.

Sydney Morning Herald, Saturday 13 April 1867, p.5

#### Who can you contact for more information?

For more information about the Double Bay Catchment Floodplain Risk Management Study & Plan, please contact:

#### Woollahra Municipal Council

Michael Casteleyn Phone: 9391-7131 E-mail: Michael.Casteleyn@woollahra.nsw.gov.au





Stephen Yeo

Phone: 9868-1966

**Bewsher Consulting Pty Ltd** 

E-mail: syeo@bewsher.com.au

# **APPENDIX C**

# FLOOD DAMAGES ASSESSMENT INPUTS

- Inputs for Deriving Residential Sector Stage-Damage data
- Residential Sector Stage-Damage data
- Commercial Sector Stage-Damage data
- Distribution of Businesses by Value Class

Version 3.00 October 2007					vio@dnr	
		Queries i	o dunc			nsw.gov.au
PROJECT	DETAILS				<u>J(</u>	<u>JB NO.</u>
Double Bay Floodplain Risk Management Study & Plan				Apr-10	) J1806	
BUILDINGS						
Regional Cost Variation Factor	1.00	From Rawlinsons	;			
Post late 2001 adjustments	1.42	Changes in AWE	see AW	E Stats Works	heet	
Post Flood Inflation Factor	1.40	1.0	to	1.5		
Multiply overall structural costs by this factor		Judgement to be	used. S	ome suggestid	ons below	
	Regional City			Regional To	wn	
	Houses An	fected	Factor	House	s Affected	Factor
Small scale impact	<	50	1.00	<	: 10	1.00
Medium scale impacts in Regional City		100	1.20		30	1.30
Large scale impacts in Regional City	> >	150	1.40	>	50	1.50
Typical Duration of Immersion	2	hours				
Building Damage Repair Limitation Factor	0.85	due to no insurar	ce	short duratio	n	long duration
	100	Suggested range		0.85	to	1.00
Typical House Size	190	m^2	240	) m^2 is Base		
Building Size Adjustment	8.0					
Total Building Adjustment Factor	1.34					
CONTENTS						
Average Contents Relevant to Site	\$ 95,000	Ba	se for 24	0 m^2 house	\$ 60,00	00
Post late 2001 adjustments	1.42	From above				
Contents Damage Repair Limitation Factor	0.75	due to no insurar	ce	short duratio	n	long duration
Sub-Total Adjustment Factor	1.07	Suggested rang	ge 🛛	0.75	to	0.90
Level of Flood Awareness	low	low or high only.	Low defa	ault unless oth	erwise justi	fiable.
Effective Warning Time	C	hour				
Interpolated DRF adjustment (Awareness/Time)	0.99	IDRF = Interp	olated [	Damage Re	duction F	actor
Typical Table/Bench Height (TTBH)	0.90	0.9m is typical he	ight. If ty	pical is 2 stor	ey house us	se 2.6m
i otal Contents Adjustment Factor AFD <= TTBH	1.06	AFD = Above	Floor D	epth	- -	
Total Contents Adjustment Factor AFD <= TTBH Total Contents Adjustment Factor AFD > TTBH	1.06 1.07	AFD = Above	Floor D	epth		
Total Contents Adjustment Factor AFD <= TTBH Total Contents Adjustment Factor AFD > TTBH Most recent advice from Victorian Rapid Assessment Method	1.06 1.07	AFD = Above	Floor D	epth		
I Otal Contents Adjustment Factor AFD <= TTBH	1.06 1.07 deviation needs	AFD = Above	Floor D	) epth	- 	
I otal Contents Adjustment Factor AFD <= TTBH Total Contents Adjustment Factor AFD > TTBH Most recent advice from Victorian Rapid Assessment Method Low level of awareness is expected norm (long term average) any Basic contents damages are based upon a DRF of	1.06 1.07 deviation needs 0.9	AFD = Above	Floor D	bepth		
I Otal Contents Adjustment Factor AFD <= TTBH	1.06 1.07 deviation needs 0.9 0	AFD = Above	Floor E	Depth	24	
I Otal Contents Adjustment Factor AFD <= TTBH	1.06 1.07 deviation needs 0.9 0 0.90	to be justified. 3 0.80	Floor E 6 0.80	Depth 12 0.80	<b>24</b> 0.70	
I Otal Contents Adjustment Factor AFD <= TTBH	1.06 1.07 deviation needs 0.9 0 0.90 1.00	to be justified. 3 0.80 0.89	<b>6</b> 0.80 0.89	Depth 12 0.80 0.89	<b>24</b> 0.70 0.78	
I Otal Contents Adjustment Factor AFD <= TTBH	1.06 1.07 deviation needs 0.9 0 0.90 1.00 0.80	AFD = Above to be justified. 3 0.80 0.89 0.80	<b>6</b> 0.80 0.89 0.60	Depth 12 0.80 0.89 0.40	<b>24</b> 0.70 0.78 0.40	
I Otal Contents Adjustment Factor AFD <= TTBH	1.06 1.07 deviation needs 0.9 0 0.90 1.00 0.80 0.89	AFD = Above to be justified. 3 0.80 0.89 0.80 0.89	<b>6</b> 0.80 0.89 0.60 0.67	12 0.80 0.89 0.40 0.44	<b>24</b> 0.70 0.78 0.40 0.44	
I Otal Contents Adjustment Factor AFD <= TTBH	1.06 1.07 deviation needs 0.9 0 0.90 1.00 0.80 0.89 1.00	AFD = Above to be justified. 3 0.80 0.89 0.80 0.89 0.89 0.89	<b>6</b> 0.80 0.89 0.60 0.67 0.89	12 0.80 0.89 0.40 0.44 0.89	<b>24</b> 0.70 0.78 0.40 0.44 0.78	
I Otal Contents Adjustment Factor AFD <= TTBH	1.06 1.07 deviation needs 0.9 0 0.90 1.00 0.80 0.89 1.00 0	AFD = Above to be justified. 3 0.80 0.89 0.89 0.89 0.89 3	6 0.80 0.60 0.67 0.89 0.60 0.67	12 0.80 0.89 0.40 0.44 0.89	<b>24</b> 0.70 0.78 0.40 0.44 0.78	
I Otal Contents Adjustment Factor AFD <= TTBH	1.06 1.07 deviation needs 0.9 0.90 1.00 0.80 0.89 1.00 0 1.00	AFD = Above to be justified. 3 0.80 0.89 0.89 0.89 0.89 3 0.89	<b>6</b> 0.80 0.89 0.60 0.67 0.89 0 0.99	12 0.80 0.89 0.40 0.44 0.89	<b>24</b> 0.70 0.78 0.40 0.44 0.78	
I Otal Contents Adjustment Factor AFD <= TTBH	1.06 1.07 deviation needs 0.9 0 0.90 1.00 0.80 0.89 1.00 0 1.00	AFD = Above to be justified. 3 0.80 0.89 0.89 0.89 0.89 3 0.89	6 0.80 0.89 0.60 0.67 0.89 0 0.99	12 0.80 0.89 0.40 0.44 0.89	<b>24</b> 0.70 0.78 0.40 0.44 0.78	
I otal Contents Adjustment Factor AFD <= TTBH	1.06 1.07 deviation needs 0.9 0 0.90 1.00 0.80 0.89 1.00 0 1.00	AFD = Above to be justified. 3 0.80 0.89 0.89 0.89 0.89 3 0.89 2. From above	<b>6</b> 0.80 0.89 0.60 0.67 0.89 0 0.99	<b>12</b> 0.80 0.89 0.40 0.44 0.89	<b>24</b> 0.70 0.78 0.40 0.44 0.78	
I Otal Contents Adjustment Factor AFD <= TTBH	1.06 1.07 deviation needs 0.9 0 0.90 1.00 0.80 0.89 1.00 0 1.00 5 6,700	AFD = Above to be justified. 3 0.80 0.89 0.89 0.89 0.89 3 0.89 3 0.89 2. From above \$6,700 recomme.	<b>6</b> 0.80 0.89 0.60 0.67 0.89 0 0.99	12 0.80 0.89 0.40 0.44 0.89	<b>24</b> 0.70 0.78 0.40 0.44 0.78	
I otal Contents Adjustment Factor AFD <= TTBH	1.06 1.07 deviation needs 0.9 0 0.90 1.00 0.80 0.89 1.00 0 1.00 0 1.00 \$ 6,700 \$ 4,000	AFD = Above to be justified. 3 0.80 0.89 0.89 0.89 0.89 3 0.89 2. From above \$6,700 recomme. \$4,000 recomme.	6 0.80 0.89 0.60 0.67 0.89 0 0.99	12 0.80 0.89 0.40 0.44 0.89	<b>24</b> 0.70 0.78 0.40 0.44 0.78	
I otal Contents Adjustment Factor AFD <= TTBH	1.06 1.07 deviation needs 0.9 0 0.90 1.00 0.80 0.89 1.00 0 1.00 0 1.00 2 \$ 6,700 \$ 4,000 2	AFD = Above to be justified. 3 0.80 0.89 0.89 0.89 0.89 3 0.89 2 5 5,700 recomme. \$4,000 recomme. \$4,000 recomme.	<b>6</b> 0.80 0.89 0.60 0.67 0.89 0 0.99	12 0.80 0.89 0.40 0.44 0.89	24 0.70 0.78 0.40 0.44 0.78	
I otal Contents Adjustment Factor AFD <= TTBH	1.06 1.07 deviation needs 0.9 0 0.90 1.00 0.80 0.89 1.00 0 1.00 1.00 \$ 6,700 \$ 4,000 2 \$ 220	AFD = Above to be justified. 3 0.80 0.89 0.89 0.89 0.89 3 0.89 2 5 6,700 recomme. \$4,000 recomme. \$4,000 recomme. \$220 per week recomme.	6 0.80 0.89 0.60 0.67 0.89 0 0.99 nded with nded with	12 0.80 0.89 0.40 0.44 0.89	24 0.70 0.78 0.40 0.44 0.78	
I otal Contents Adjustment Factor AFD <= TTBH	1.06 1.07 deviation needs 0.9 0 0.90 1.00 0.80 0.89 1.00 0 1.00 1.00 1.42 \$ 6,700 \$ 4,000 \$ 220 ACTORS	AFD = Above to be justified. 3 0.80 0.89 0.89 0.89 0.89 3 0.89 2 From above \$6,700 recomments \$4,000 recomments \$4,000 recomments \$220 per week reference	6 0.80 0.89 0.60 0.67 0.89 0 0.99 nded with nded with	12 0.80 0.89 0.40 0.44 0.89	24 0.70 0.78 0.40 0.44 0.78	
I otal Contents Adjustment Factor AFD <= TTBH	1.06 1.07 deviation needs 0.9 0 0.90 1.00 0.80 0.89 1.00 0 1.00 0 1.00 2 \$ 6,700 \$ 4,000 \$ 220 ACTORS 2.6	AFD = Above to be justified. 3 0.80 0.89 0.89 0.89 0.89 3 0.89 2 From above \$6,700 recomme. \$4,000 recomme. \$4,000 recomme. \$220 per week re	6 0.80 0.89 0.60 0.67 0.89 0 0.99 nded with nded with scommen	12 0.80 0.89 0.40 0.44 0.89	24 0.70 0.78 0.40 0.44 0.78 0.78	Ground
I otal Contents Adjustment Factor AFD <= TTBH	1.06 1.07 deviation needs 0.9 0 0.90 1.00 0.80 0.89 1.00 0 1.00 0 1.00 220 ACTORS 2.6 2.6 2.6	AFD = Above to be justified. 3 0.80 0.89 0.89 0.89 0.89 3 0.89 2 From above \$6,700 recomme. \$4,000 recomme. \$4,000 recomme. \$220 per week recomme. m	6 0.80 0.89 0.60 0.67 0.89 0 0.99 nded with nded with nded with nded with nded with	12 0.80 0.89 0.40 0.44 0.89	24 0.70 0.78 0.40 0.44 0.78 0.78 0.78 0.78	Ground
I otal Contents Adjustment Factor AFD <= TTBH	1.06 1.07 deviation needs 0.9 0 0.90 1.00 0.80 0.89 1.00 0 1.00 0 1.00 2 \$ 6,700 \$ 4,000 \$ 220 ACTORS 2.6 2.6	AFD = Above to be justified. 3 0.80 0.89 0.89 0.89 0.89 3 0.89 2 From above \$6,700 recomme. \$4,000 recomme. \$4,000 recomme. \$220 per week recomme. \$220 per week recomme.	6 0.80 0.89 0.60 0.67 0.89 0 0.99 nded with nded with	12 0.80 0.89 0.40 0.44 0.89	24 0.70 0.78 0.40 0.44 0.78 0.78 0.78 0.78 0.78 0.78 0.78	Ground
I otal Contents Adjustment Factor AFD <= TTBH	1.06 1.07 deviation needs 0.9 0 0.90 1.00 0.80 0.89 1.00 0 1.00 0 1.00 2 \$ 6,700 \$ 4,000 \$ 4,000 \$ 220 ACTORS 2.6 2.6 2.6 2.6	AFD = Above to be justified. 3 0.80 0.89 0.89 0.89 0.89 3 0.89 2 From above \$6,700 recomme. \$4,000 recomme. \$4,000 recomme. \$220 per week rec m m AFD = Above Flo +	6 0.80 0.89 0.60 0.67 0.89 0 0.99 nded with nded with nd	12 0.80 0.89 0.40 0.44 0.89 nout justification nout justification ded without justification ded without justification ded single Store	24 0.70 0.78 0.40 0.44 0.78 0.78 0.78 0.78 0.78 0.78 0.78 0.78	Ground Ground
I otal Contents Adjustment Factor AFD <= TTBH	1.06 1.07 deviation needs 0.9 0 0.90 1.00 0.80 0.89 1.00 0 1.00 1.00 1.42 \$ 6,700 \$ 4,000 \$ 220 ACTORS 2.6 2.6 13164 AFD	AFD = Above to be justified. 3 0.80 0.89 0.89 0.89 0.89 3 0.89 2 From above \$6,700 recomme. \$4,000 recomme. \$4,000 recomme. \$220 per week recomme. The second sec	6 0.80 0.89 0.60 0.67 0.89 0 0.99 nded with nded with nd	12 0.80 0.89 0.40 0.44 0.89 nout justification nout justification no single Store x m	24 0.70 0.78 0.40 0.44 0.78 0.78 0.78 0.78 0.78 0.78 0.78 0.78	Ground Ground Bround
I otal Contents Adjustment Factor AFD <= TTBH	1.06 1.07 deviation needs 0.9 0 0.90 1.00 0.80 0.89 1.00 0 1.00 1.42 \$ 6,700 \$ 4,000 \$ 220 ACTORS 2.6 2.6 13164 AFD AFD	AFD = Above to be justified. 3 0.80 0.89 0.89 0.89 0.89 3 0.89 2 From above \$6,700 recomme. \$4,000 recomme. \$4,000 recomme. \$4,000 recomme. \$220 per week recomme. The second	6 0.80 0.89 0.60 0.67 0.89 0 0.99 nded with nded with nd	12 0.80 0.89 0.40 0.44 0.89 nout justification nout justification ded without justification ded without justification single Store Single Store Single Store M	24 0.70 0.78 0.40 0.44 0.78 0.78 0.78 0.78 0.78 0.78 0.78 0.78	Ground Ground
I otal Contents Adjustment Factor AFD <= TTBH	1.06 1.07 deviation needs 0.9 0 0.90 1.00 0.80 0.89 1.00 0 1.00 1.00 \$ 6,700 \$ 4,000 \$ 4,000 \$ 220 ACTORS 2.6 2.6 13164 AFD AFD 16586	AFD = Above to be justified. 3 0.80 0.89 0.89 0.89 0.89 3 0.89 2 From above \$6,700 recomme. \$4,000 recomme. \$4,000 recomme. \$4,000 recomme. \$220 per week recomme. \$300 per week recomme. \$400 per week recomm	6 0.80 0.89 0.60 0.67 0.89 0 0.99 nded with nded with nd	12 0.80 0.89 0.40 0.44 0.89 0.40 0.44 0.89 0.40 0.44 0.89 0.40 0.40 0.44 0.89 0.40 0.40 0.40 0.40 0.40 0.40 0.40 0.4	24 0.70 0.78 0.40 0.44 0.78 0.78 0.78 0.78 0.78 0.78 0.78 0.78	Ground Ground Ground
I otal Contents Adjustment Factor AFD <= TTBH	1.06 1.07 deviation needs 0.9 0 0.90 1.00 0.80 0.89 1.00 0 1.00 1.00 \$ 6,700 \$ 4,000 \$ 4,000 \$ 220 ACTORS 2.6 2.6 2.6 2.6 2.6 13164 AFD 16586 AFD	AFD = Above to be justified. 3 0.80 0.89 0.89 0.89 0.89 2 From above \$6,700 recomme. \$4,000 recom	6 0.80 0.89 0.60 0.67 0.89 0 0.99 0 0.99 nded with nded	12 0.80 0.89 0.40 0.44 0.89 0.40 0.89 0.40 0.89 0.40 0.44 0.89 0.40 0.89 0.40 0.44 0.89 0.40 0.89 0.40 0.89 0.40 0.89 0.40 0.89 0.40 0.89 0.40 0.89 0.40 0.89 0.40 0.89 0.40 0.89 0.40 0.89 0.80 0.89 0.40 0.89 0.40 0.89 0.80 0.89 0.80 0.89 0.80 0.89 0.80 0.89 0.80 0.89 0.89	24 0.70 0.78 0.40 0.44 0.78 0.78 0.78 0.78 0.78 0.78 0.78 0.78	Ground Ground Ground
Iotal Contents Adjustment Factor AFD <= TTBH	1.06 1.07 1.07 1.07 1.07 0.9 0.9 0.90 1.00 0.80 0.89 1.00 0 1.00 0 1.00 2 \$ 6,700 \$ 4,000 \$ 4,000 \$ 220 ACTORS 2.6 2.6 2.6 2.6 2.6 13164 AFD 16586 AFD 0.90 0.90 0.90 0.90 0.90 0.90 0.90 0.90 0.90 0.90 0.90 0.90 0.90 0.80	AFD = Above to be justified. 3 0.80 0.89 0.89 0.89 0.89 3 0.89 2 From above \$6,700 recomme. \$4,000 recomme. \$4	6 0.80 0.89 0.60 0.67 0.89 0 0.99 0 0.99 mded with commen 70% 110% 0 or Depth 4871 0.0 10 7454 -1.50 10	12 0.80 0.89 0.40 0.44 0.89 0.80 0.80 0.80 0.80 0.80 0.80 0.80	24 0.70 0.78 0.40 0.44 0.78 0.78 0.78 0.78 0.78 0.78 0.78 0.78	Sround Ground etres
I otal Contents Adjustment Factor AFD <= TTBH	1.06 1.07 deviation needs 0.9 0 0.90 1.00 0.80 0.80 0.89 1.00 0 1.00 0 1.00 2 \$ 6,700 \$ 4,000 \$ 4,000 \$ 4,000 \$ 220 ACTORS 2.6 2.6 2.6 2.6 2.6 AFD 16586 AFD AFD 16586 AFD AFD	AFD = Above to be justified. 3 0.80 0.89 0.89 0.89 0.89 3 0.89 2 From above \$6,700 recomme. \$4,000 recomme. \$4,	6 0.80 0.89 0.60 0.67 0.89 0 0.99 nded with nded with rcommen 70% 110% or Depth 4871 0.0 1to 7454 -1.50 1to 20000	12 0.80 0.89 0.40 0.44 0.80 0.40 0.40 0.40 0.40 0.40	24 0.70 0.78 0.40 0.44 0.78 0.78 0.78 0.78 0.78 0.78 0.78 0.78	Ground Ground Detres

#### Floodplain Specific Damage Curves for Individual Residences

Steps in Curve	0.1	m	
	Single Storey High Set	Single Storey Slab/Low Set	2 Storey Houses
Туре	1	2	3
AFD from Modelling	Damage	Damage	Damage
-5.00	\$0	\$0	\$0
-1.50	\$9,514	\$0	\$0
-1.40	\$17,742	\$0	\$0
-1.30	\$18,739	\$0	\$0
-1.20	\$19,736	\$0	\$0
-1.10	\$20,734	\$0	\$0
-1.00	\$21,731	\$0	\$0
-0.90	\$22,728	\$0	\$0
-0.80	\$23,725	\$0	\$0
-0.70	\$24,722	\$0	\$0
-0.60	\$25,719	\$0	\$0
-0.50	\$26,716	\$9,514	\$9,514
-0.40	\$27,713	\$9,514	\$9,514
-0.30	\$28,710	\$9,514	\$9,514
-0.20	\$29,708	\$9,514	\$9,514
-0.10	\$30,705	\$9,514	\$9,514
0.00	\$71,732	\$27,124	\$21,841
0.10	\$76,101	\$70,834	\$52,438
0.20	\$80,471	\$74,827	\$55,233
0.30	\$84,840	\$78,820	\$58,028
0.40	\$89,210	\$82,813	\$60,823
0.50	\$93,580	\$86,806	\$63,618
0.60	\$97,949	\$90,799	\$66,413
0.70	\$102,319	\$94,791	\$69,208
0.80	\$106,688	\$98,784	\$72,003
0.90	\$111,058	\$102,777	\$74,798
1.00	\$115,428	\$107,395	\$78,030
1.10	\$119,797	\$111,419	\$80,847
1.20	\$124,167	\$115,443	\$83,664
1.30	\$128,537	\$119,467	\$86,481
1.40	\$132,906	\$123,491	\$89,298
1.50	\$137,276	\$127,515	\$92,115
1.60	\$141,645	\$131,539	\$94,932
1.70	\$146,015	\$135,563	\$97,748
1.80	\$150,385	\$139,587	\$100,565
1.90	\$154,754	\$143,611	\$103,382
2.00	\$159,124	\$147,636	\$106,199
2.10	\$160,121	\$148,287	\$106,655
2.20	\$161,118	\$148,939	\$107,111
2.30	\$162,115	\$149,590	\$107,567
2.40	\$163,112	\$150,242	\$108,024
2.50	\$164,109	\$150,894	\$108,480
2.60	\$165,106	\$151,545	\$108,936
2.70	\$166,104	\$152,197	\$166,465
2.80	\$167,101	\$152,848	\$167,182
2.90	\$168,098	\$153,500	\$167,899
3.00	\$169,095	\$154,152	\$168,615
3.50	\$174,080	\$157,409	\$172,199
4.00	\$179,066	\$160,667	\$175,783
4.50	\$184,052	\$163,925	\$179,367
5.00	\$189,037	\$167,183	\$182,950





DOUBLE BAY Residential Damage Curve 25-10-07 Version 3.00 P.xlsTypical Curve Output

	Small commercial properties (<186m <sup>2</sup> )					Medium commercial properties (186-650m <sup>2</sup> )				Large commercial properties (>650m <sup>2</sup> )*					
	Value class Value class					6			V	alue clas	S				
Depth (m)	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
0.01	\$350	\$710	\$1,400	\$2,800	\$5,700	\$1,100	\$2,200	\$4,500	\$9,000	\$17,900	\$1	\$2	\$5	\$10	\$20
0.05	\$710	\$1,400	\$2,800	\$5,700	\$11,300	\$2,200	\$4,500	\$9,000	\$17,900	\$35,800	\$2	\$5	\$10	\$20	\$39
0.10	\$1,400	\$2,800	\$5,700	\$11,300	\$22,600	\$4,500	\$9,000	\$17,900	\$35,800	\$71,600	\$5	\$9	\$20	\$39	\$79
0.20	\$2,800	\$5,700	\$11,300	\$22,600	\$45,300	\$9,000	\$17,900	\$35,800	\$71,600	\$143,300	\$10	\$19	\$41	\$79	\$157
0.25	\$3,500	\$7,100	\$14,100	\$28,300	\$56,600	\$11,200	\$22,400	\$44,800	\$89,600	\$179,100	\$12	\$24	\$51	\$98	\$196
0.30	\$4,100	\$8,100	\$16,300	\$32,500	\$65,000	\$12,800	\$25,600	\$51,100	\$102,300	\$204,600	\$17	\$34	\$71	\$138	\$276
0.40	\$5,100	\$10,300	\$20,500	\$41,000	\$82,000	\$16,000	\$31,900	\$63,900	\$127,700	\$255,500	\$27	\$54	\$110	\$217	\$436
0.50	\$6,200	\$12,400	\$24,700	\$49,500	\$99,000	\$19,100	\$38,300	\$76,600	\$153,200	\$306,400	\$37	\$75	\$149	\$297	\$595
0.60	\$7,200	\$14,500	\$29,000	\$58,000	\$116,000	\$22,300	\$44,700	\$89,300	\$178,600	\$357,300	\$48	\$95	\$189	\$376	\$755
0.70	\$8,300	\$16,600	\$33,200	\$66,500	\$132,900	\$25,500	\$51,000	\$102,100	\$204,100	\$408,200	\$58	\$115	\$228	\$455	\$914
0.75	\$8,800	\$17,700	\$35,400	\$70,700	\$141,400	\$27,100	\$54,200	\$108,400	\$216,800	\$433,700	\$63	\$126	\$248	\$495	\$994
0.80	\$9,300	\$18,600	\$37,100	\$74,200	\$148,500	\$28,500	\$57,000	\$114,100	\$228,100	\$456,300	\$70	\$139	\$275	\$550	\$1,103
0.90	\$10,200	\$20,300	\$40,700	\$81,300	\$162,600	\$31,300	\$62,700	\$125,400	\$250,800	\$501,500	\$83	\$166	\$330	\$659	\$1,320
1.00	\$11,000	\$22,100	\$44,200	\$88,400	\$176,800	\$34,200	\$68,300	\$136,700	\$273,400	\$546,800	\$96	\$192	\$385	\$768	\$1,538
1.10	\$11,900	\$23,900	\$47,700	\$95,500	\$190,900	\$37,000	\$74,000	\$148,000	\$296,000	\$592,000	\$110	\$219	\$440	\$877	\$1,755
1.20	\$12,800	\$25,600	\$51,300	\$102,500	\$205,000	\$39,800	\$79,700	\$159,300	\$318,600	\$637,300	\$123	\$246	\$495	\$986	\$1,973
1.25	\$13,300	\$26,500	\$53,000	\$106,100	\$212,100	\$41,200	\$82,500	\$165,000	\$330,000	\$659,900	\$130	\$259	\$523	\$1,041	\$2,082
1.30	\$13,400	\$26,800	\$53,600	\$107,200	\$214,500	\$41,700	\$83,400	\$166,700	\$333,500	\$667,000	\$138	\$276	\$556	\$1,108	\$2,215
1.40	\$13,700	\$27,400	\$54,800	\$109,600	\$219,200	\$42,600	\$85,100	\$170,300	\$340,600	\$681,100	\$154	\$310	\$623	\$1,241	\$2,483
1.50	\$14,000	\$28,000	\$56,000	\$111,900	\$223,900	\$43,500	\$86,900	\$173,800	\$347,600	\$695,300	\$171	\$344	\$689	\$1,375	\$2,750
1.75	\$14,700	\$29,500	\$58,900	\$117,800	\$235,700	\$45,700	\$91,300	\$182,700	\$365,300	\$730,600	\$212	\$428	\$856	\$1,709	\$3,417
2.00	\$15,600	\$31,200	\$62,500	\$124,900	\$249,800	\$48,600	\$95,200	\$194,400	\$388,900	\$777,800	\$255	\$511	\$1,021	\$2,043	\$4,085
3.00	\$15,600	\$31,200	\$62,500	\$124,900	\$249,800	\$48,600	\$95,200	\$194,400	\$388,900	\$777,800	\$255	\$511	\$1,021	\$2,043	\$4,085

#### COMMERCIAL SECTOR STAGE-DAMAGE DATA, DOUBLE BAY CATCHMENT (Nov 2009 dollars)

\* units of \$/m<sup>2</sup>

		Value class		
1	2	3	4	5
Betting agency Mechanic Public toilets Pumping station Vacant shops	Café Church Florist Office (general) Pet shop School	Bakery Bank Beauty parlour Chocolates Club Deli Dry cleaners Fruit/veg Hairdresser Marina Medical/dental/ optical surgery Nail salon Real estate Restaurant Shoe repair Supermarket (small) Tailor Tanning salon Tobacconist Travel agent	Bookstore Bottle shop DVD rental Motel Newsagency Post office Stationary Supermarket (large)	Accessories (e.g. leather) Art gallery Bedding Boutique furniture Camera/ photography Chemist Clothing Electrical Electrical sub- station Fashion Giftware Glass/silverware Homeware Jewellery Shoes Wedding dresses

## COMMERCIAL SECTOR VALUE CLASSES, DOUBLE BAY CATCHMENT

# **APPENDIX D**

# EXTRACTS FROM SWC REPORT REVIEWING FEASIBILITY OF STORMWATER CHANNEL RESTORATION (4SITE NATURAL SOLUTIONS, 2003)

## Overview of rehabilitation options

Option	Description		Main advantages		Main disadvantages
1. Baseline.	<ul> <li>Remove and rep</li> </ul>	lace -	Conceptually simple	•	No improvement in
Repair unstable	cover of channe	ı I•	Low risk		ecology, water
channel		· ·	Minimal maintenance		quality, landscape or
					recreation
2.	<ul> <li>Remove cover a</li> </ul>	nd •	No excavation	•	Substantially reduced
Naturalise	retain existing c	hannel	required		hydraulic capacity
channel banks	<ul> <li>Place large rock</li> </ul>	banks •	Limited improvement	•	Removes access for
within existing	at 1:2 slope dow	n to	in habitat value		residents on w side
channel	denth of chappe	a -	landscape value		
	dictates slope)	·	(subjective)		
	<ul> <li>Fence both sides</li> </ul>	sof	(subjective)		
	channel (for safe	aty,			
	given steepness	of			
	banks)				
	<ul> <li>Construct pedes</li> </ul>	trian			
	bridge at Castra	place			
3.	<ul> <li>As per Option 1</li> </ul>	, but	Provides permanent	•	Reduced hydraulic
Naturalise	bed excavated to	)	estuarine habitat		capacity Democratic
and hed: lower	provide addition	al te		•	removes access for
invert level	Vegetate lower1	bonks			Scour of benthic
mentiover	with salt tolerar	it			habitat may occur in
	plants, other that	n			high flows
	mangroves;			•	Substantial
	<ul> <li>Fence both sides</li> </ul>	s of			excavation of
	channel (for safe	sty,			concrete invert may
	given steepness	of			cause scouring and
	banks)				undermining of
	<ul> <li>Construct pedes</li> </ul>	trian			property
1	<ul> <li>Remove covers</li> </ul>	from	Provides tidal hebitat		Scour of bonthic
<ul> <li>Naturalise hed</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Remove covers</li> <li>both channels</li> </ul>		Maintains hydraulie	-	habitat may occur in
and banks of	<ul> <li>Remove the adja</li> </ul>	acent	capacity		high flows
both channels	(inner) walls of	both •	May provides for	•	Significant potential
	channels structu	re and	some recreational		exists for impacts on
	reinstate a stable	e bed	access on e.side		adjacent properties
	(this will create	a 🗖	Provides for access		(western boundary)
	single channel o	f	from properties on		e.g. slumping.
	varying width)		western side	•	Major works with
	<ul> <li>Large rock limit both banks at 1.</li> </ul>	igs on			significant costs May require
	slope on both by	nke		-	realignment of
	<ul> <li>Vegetate lower 1</li> </ul>	banks			Sherbrooke Avenue
	with salt toleran	t		)	and relocation of
	plants, other tha	n			private garage, both
	mangroves;				of which appear to be
	<ul> <li>Pedestrian bridg</li> </ul>	e at			constructed over the
	Castra place				channel.
	<ul> <li>walkway and re adjacent to prop</li> </ul>	artica			
	on w side	ernes			
5.	<ul> <li>As per option 1</li> </ul>	- I.	Improved landscape	•	No open water or
Replace the	<ul> <li>Formalise the</li> </ul>		and recreational		improvement in
cover (as per	landscaping with	h areas	opportunities		aquatic ecology
option 1) and	of grass, ground	cover		•	Landscaping may be
landscape the	and small trees				at risk in major flood
channel	<ul> <li>Provide recreati</li> </ul>	onal			events and require
corridor	opportunities su	ch as a			reinstatement
	paved pathway	and			
	viewing point to Develop Deve				
	Louble Bay			I	

## Analysis of channel options

Option	Profile	Hydraulic Capacity
Option 1 Repair Unstable Channel		Cross-sectional area = approx 10.80 m² Depth of channel = 1.65m Width of channel = 5.85m
Option 2 Naturalise channel banks within existing channel		Bank slope = 1:2 Depth of channel=1.65m Cross-sectional area = approx 7.50m <sup>2</sup> This option reduces cross sectional by 30%.
Option 3 Naturalise channel banks and bed; lower invert level	No. AND	Bank slope = 2:1 Depth of channel=1.65m Depth of invert =3.15m Cross-sectional area = 10.755 m <sup>2</sup> This option retains a similar cross- sectional area to current, however the invert will be tidal and hydraulic capacity is likely to be reduced.
Option 4 Naturalise bed and banks of both channels	A CONTRACTOR	Existing total channel capacity = 15.945 m <sup>2</sup> Depth of naturalised channel = 1.85m Width of naturalised channel = 10.755m Cross-sectional area =12.772 m <sup>2</sup> This option provides for removal of the castern channel and naturalisation of the entire channel and naturalisation of the entire channel width. This option results in significant increase in cross sectional area but may result adverse impacts on adjacent properties. The costs of this option may be restrictive.
Option 5 Replace the cover (as per option 1) and landscape the channel corridor		