Economics Baseline

Sidmouth and East Beach Management Plan

Prepared for

East Devon District Council

October 2016

CH2MHILL®

Ash House, Falcon Road
Sowton, Exeter
Devon, EX2 7LB

PAGE LEFT BLANK FOR DOUBLE SIDED PRINTING

Document history

Economics Baseline Report

Sidmouth & East Beach Management Plan

East Devon District Council (EDDC)

This document has been issued and amended as follows:

Version	Date	Description	Created by	Verified by	Approved by
1.0	31/03/2015	Initial Draft for EDDC comment	Alan Frampton	Jonathan Rogers	Jonathan Rogers
1.1	16/07/2015	Draft for comment	Alan Frampton	Jonathan Rogers	Jonathan Rogers
1.2	24/08/2015	Revised Draft for comment	Alan Frampton	Jonathan Rogers	Jonathan Rogers
1.3	26/01/2016	Final	Alan Frampton	Jonathan Rogers	Jonathan Rogers
1.4	12/10/2016	Final – revised	Alan Frampton	Jonathan Rogers	Jonathan Rogers

PAGE LEFT BLANK FOR DOUBLE SIDED PRINTING

Contents

PAGE LEFT BLANK FOR DOUBLE SIDED PRINTING

1 Introduction

This document provides details of the economic basis (i.e. the economic benefits) for both ongoing and future beach management and coastal flood and risk management activities along the Sidmouth frontage, within the extent of the Sidmouth and East Beach Management Plan (BMP) extent defined in Figure 1-1.

This economic basis is developed from new assessment of flood and erosion risk (Section 3), but set in context by comparing the findings of the new analysis with previous economic assessments used to provide the case for past coastal protection and flood defence schemes along the BMP frontage (Section 2).



Figure 1-1 Sidmouth & East Beach Management Plan extent

2 Economic Appraisals from Previous Studies

There has been a number of previous studies that have produced economic appraisal to demonstrate the value of continued investment in coastal flood and erosion risk management measures along the Sidmouth BMP frontage. This section provides a summary of the economic case put forward by those previous studies between 1990 and 2011. The purpose of this is to provide understanding of the economic case upon which the previous coast protection works at Sidmouth were justified.

2.1 Coast Protection at Sidmouth Benefit Cost Analysis (May, 1990)

The *Coast Protection at Sidmouth Benefit Cost Analysis* (Posford Duvivier, 1990) provides the economic justification for the Phase 1 coast protection works at Sidmouth. This stated the economic benefits as being £500k (promenade and roadway) plus £17,500k (Hotel and other seafront property). These benefits stemmed only from expected coastal erosion losses should the Sidmouth seawall fail and thus allow erosion to impact these assets no coastal flood losses were considered. A 6% discount factor was applied (as per national guidance at that time) to the combined £18,000k benefits, giving rise to Present Value (PV) benefits of between £11,743k (if assets are lost in years 5-7) and £14,307k (if assets are lost in years 2-4); these reflecting the expectation that the seawall was already damaged and in imminent danger of failing completely.

The costs of the Phase 1 coast protection works to repair the seawall are stated at £350k. Therefore, given the range of benefits, the range of benefit:cost ratios for the Phase 1 works were assessed to be between 1:34 (if assets are lost in years 2-4) and 1:41 (if assets are lost in years 5-7).

2.2 Coast Protection at Sidmouth: Report on Phase 2 Works and Benefit Cost Analysis (January, 1992)

The *Coast Protection at Sidmouth: Report and Phase 2 Works and Benefit Cost Analysis* (Posford Duvivier, 1992a) contains, in Appendix A of that report, calculation of the amenity benefits of undertaking coast protection works along the Sidmouth frontage. This assessment of amenity benefits was based upon the Flood Hazard Research Centre (FHRC) Yellow Manual (FHRC, 1992), which was best-practice guidance at the time the analysis was done.

The basis for the assessment was estimates of visitor numbers to Sidmouth as no site specific survey was undertaken at the time. These were based on the following assumptions:

- 100% of day-visits based on visitor numbers derived from car parking data (100,837 visitors over a 150 day summer season).
- 10% of staying visitors based on hotel booking data (50,500 staying visitors assumed from 505,000 hotel bookings over a 150 day summer season).
- In lieu of actual data, local visitor numbers assumed to be 75 visitors/day over 150 day summer season (therefore 11,250 visitors over a season).

These visitor numbers were then multiplied by values from the FHRC Yellow Manual based on stated value of the damage that would be caused if the coastal defences were allowed to fail and the beach lost, as follows:

- £2.37 per adult day visitor
- £5.55 per adult staying visitor
- £1.58 per adult local visitor.

In addition, the FHRC Yellow Manual values for perceived value gained (i.e. benefit) of protecting the coast with a new scheme were also applied, as follows:

- £1.80 per adult day visitor
- £1.31 per adult staying visitor
- £1.04 per adult local visitor.

The amenity benefits from damages avoided (i.e. by not allowing the coastal defence to fail and beach to be lost) combined with the benefit gained from a new scheme were calculated over a 50 year appraisal period (as was required by national guidance at that time; note, currently a 100 year appraisal period is used), and are summarized in Table 2-1.

Table 2-1 Summary of amenity benefits for the Phase 2 coast protection scheme (from Posford Duvivier, 1992a)

Visitor Type	No. Visitors per 150 day summer season	Loss per 150 day summer season (£k)	Total loss over 50 years (£k)	Gain per 150 day summer season (£k)	Total gain over 50 years (£k)	TOTAL Benefits over 50 Years (£k)
Day	100,837	238.98	11,949.00	66.16	3,308.00	15,257.00
Staying	50,500	280.23	14,011.50	181.51	9,075.50	23,087.00
Local	11,250	17.78	889	11.7	585	1,474.00
TOTALS	**162,587**	**536.99**	**26,849.50**	**259.37**	**12,968.50**	**39,818.00**

The total benefits from amenity over 50 years of providing new coast protection measures at Sidmouth were therefore assessed to be £39,818k. Applying a 6% discount factor to these gave a total PV Benefit of £12,552.71k. This is split between PV losses (£8,464.68k) and PV gains (£4,088.03k).

2.3 Coast Protection at Sidmouth Phase 2: Engineers Report (October, 1992)

The *Coast Protection at Sidmouth Phase 2: Engineers Report* (Posford Duvivier, 1992b) provided the economic case for implementing the present coast protection scheme at Sidmouth in the form of rock groynes, beach recharge and two detached breakwaters. In doing so it presented the total Present Value (PV) benefits from properties at risk of erosion only (i.e. the property damages incurred under a 'Do Nothing' scenario) should the seawall that existed at the time collapse in 10, 15 or 20 years' time. No flood damages were calculated.

The outputs of the assessment are presented in Table 2-2 alongside estimated scheme costs (assuming a 50 year scheme life) and benefit:cost ratios.

Table 2-2 Summary of economic case in 1992 (from Posford Duvivier, 1992)

Assumed Year of Seawall Collapse	Total Present Value (PV) Property Benefit (£k)	Total Scheme Cost (£k)	Benefit:Cost Ratio
10	9,020.90	4,400	2.05
		5,300	1.70
15	6,740.90	4,400	1.53
		5,300	1.27
20	5,037.10	4,400	1.14
		5,300	0.95

In addition to assessing property damages, this report also included assessment of the impacts of providing increased amenity benefit to beach users through a scheme that included beach recharge. This

beach user benefit was based upon a beach user survey carried out at Sidmouth[1] and provided an estimated beach amenity PV benefit of £4,088k in January 1992 (refer to Section 2.2). The impact of including this amenity beach user benefit in the economic case is demonstrated in Table 2-3.

Table 2-3 Impact of including beach user benefit on the economic case in 1992 (from Posford Duvivier, 1992)

Assumed Year of Seawall Collapse	Total Present Value (PV) Property Benefit (£k)	Beach User (Amenity) Benefit (£k)	Total Benefits (£k)	Total Scheme Cost (£k)	Benefit:Cost Ratio (excluding amenity gain)	Benefit:Cost Ratio (with amenity gain)
10	9,020.90	4,088	13,108.90	4,400	2.05	2.98
				5,300	1.70	2.47
15	6,740.90	4,088	10,828.90	4,400	1.53	2.46
				5,300	1.27	2.04
20	5,037.10	4,088	9,125.10	4,400	1.14	2.07
				5,300	0.95	1.72

It should be noted that the total outturn cost of the Phase 2 scheme (excluding ongoing beach management costs) was £7,100k (Posford Duvivier, 1998). This is £1,800k greater than estimated in 1992 as shown in Tables 2-2 and 2-3. Applying this outturn cost of the scheme to the benefits stated in those above tables would indicate the scheme had an outturn benefit:cost ratio of between 1.27 and 0.71 (excluding amenity benefits), and between 1.85 and 1.29 (including amenity benefits).

2.4 Sidmouth – Emergency Works: Engineers Report (November, 1993)

The *Sidmouth – Emergency Works: Engineers Report* (Posford Duvivier, 1993) provides economic justification for construction of emergency 400m length of rock revetment to reduce the risk of seawall collapse due to low beach levels. The cost of these works is stated as being £550k. These are assessed against the benefits already calculated for the Phase 2 Coast Protection Scheme (refer to Section 2.3), to give benefit:cost ratios of between 1:25 and 1:28.

2.5 Coast Protection Connaught Gardens: Revised Engineers Report (August, 1994)

The *Coast Protection Connaught Gardens: Revised Engineers Report* (Posford Duvivier, 1994) provided the economic case for the construction of the rock revetment around Chit Rocks to support and protect the existing seawall that already ran around the base of the cliffs in this area, such that the land above the cliffs (Connaught Gardens) would continue to be protected for the next 60 years (the scheme design life).

The scheme benefits were based upon cliff erosion that would be expected to occur should the existing seawall collapse in 10, 15 or 20 years' time. Such erosion could impact up to 10 properties (though the term 'properties' in this case includes the value of the promenade, Jacobs Ladder stairways, public shelters, kiosks, walls, pergolas and gates) with a market (capital) value at the time of £583k.

The amenity benefit of continuing to protect Connaught Gardens atop the cliff for 60 years was also calculated for each seawall failure scenario, based on an estimate of 25,000 visitors per annum.

[1] The date of the beach user survey at Sidmouth is unknown. Details are reported to be included in Appendix D of the Engineers Report (Posford Duvivier, 1992), but this appendix is not included in the data provided for this project from East Devon District Council.

Table 2-4 summarises the benefits presented in this report of August 1994, along with the estimated costs of the preferred rock revetment scheme and associated benefit:cost ratios.

Table 2-4 Summary of the economic case for rock revetment at Chit Rocks (from Posford Duvivier, 1994)

Assumed Year of Seawall Collapse	Total Property Benefit (£k)	Amenity Benefit (£k)	Total Benefits (£k)	Total Scheme Cost (£k)	Benefit:Cost Ratio (excluding amenity)	Benefit:Cost Ratio (with amenity)
10	268	790	1,058	250	1.07	4.20
15	200	580	780	250	0.80	3.10
20	150	420	570	250	0.60	2.30

2.6 Sidmouth Phase 2 Coast Protection Scheme: Beach Management Plan (October, 1996)

The *Sidmouth Phase 2 Coast Protection Scheme: Beach Management Plan* (Posford Duvivier, 1996) restates the scheme benefits from the Engineers Report (refer to Section 2.3), which in turn draws upon the assessment of amenity benefits (refer to Section 2.2). It also states that since sufficient benefits to justify the coast protection scheme were provided by the combination of potential erosion losses to seafront properties and amenity benefits, no further analysis of damages to properties landwards of Sidmouth esplanade was carried out (i.e. no flood damages were calculated).

This 1996 BMP also provides economic justification for the construction of an additional rock groyne opposite Bedford Road – the Bedford Groyne. The cost of this additional rock groyne is stated as being £692k. This cost was added to the total PV cost of the Phase 2 scheme (refer to Section 2.3), giving an overall scheme cost of £7,800k for the Sidmouth Coast Protection Scheme Phase 2.

2.7 Sidmouth Phase 2 Coast Protection Scheme: Revised Beach Management Plan (July, 1998)

The *Sidmouth Phase 2 Coast Protection Scheme Revised Beach Management Plan* (Posford Duvivier, 1998) provides the economic case for a third phase of the Sidmouth Coast Protection Scheme, to construct an additional rock groyne along the frontage adjacent to the Bedford Hotel (the 'Bedford Groyne') and undertaking annual beach management works over a 50 year period.

The economic case was based upon the 1992 economic case (refer to Section 2.1), with the benefit values being inflated by the Retail Price Index inflation between May 1992 and May 1997 (a multiplier of 1.37). The economic case was also updated to reflect greater amenity benefit from both avoidance of loss of beach and amenity gain through introducing beach recharge; this gave a revised and inflated amenity benefit of £17,847.50k in 1998.

In addition, a revised retrospective calculation was undertaken based on the assumption that the seawall could, in 1992 calculations, have potentially failed within 5 years; resulting in a calculated PV benefit of £14,545.50k from property damages.

These revised property and amenity benefits gave total benefits in 1998 of £32,393k. When compared to combined Phase 2 outturn costs of £7,100k and estimated costs for rock groyne construction and ongoing beach management activity over a 50 year scheme life of £730k – giving a total 50 years scheme cost in 1998 of £7,843k – the benefit:cost ratio for the third phase of coast protection works at Sidmouth was calculated to be 1.86 (excluding amenity benefit) and 4.13 (including amenity benefit). As with preceding economic assessments (refer to Sections above) the benefits were based only on coastal erosion losses and no consideration was given to coastal flood damages.

2.8 Pennington Point Coastal Study (August, 2001)

The *Sidmouth – Pennington Point Coastal Study* (Posford Duvivier, 2001) included an economic appraisal of 4 options for the introduction of coast protection measures to the east of the River Sid (East Beach) to reduce the risk of coastal erosion to cliff top properties above Pennington Point along Cliff Road. The economic case was also based upon the need to protect the western river wall of the River Sid against the risk of it becoming exposed to coastal wave action as the adjacent Pennington Point eroded further back in the future.

The 4 scheme options appraised were:

- Scheme Option 1: River Sid Wall Upgrading
- Scheme Option 2: Rock Groyne constructed at Pennington Point
- Scheme Option 3: Rock Revetment constructed at Pennington Point
- Scheme Option 4: Rock Revetment constructed at Pennington Point and extended eastwards to protect Cliff Road.

The economic benefits identified in this study included:

- Property losses along Cliff Road due to erosion give Present Value (PV) benefits under a 'Do Nothing' scenario of between £128k (assuming an erosion rate of 1m/year) and £640k (assuming an erosion rate of 2m/year). These values are based upon properties with a 2001 capital value of £3,291k.
- The western river wall of the River Sid protects a South West Water pumping station located (buried) immediately behind the wall and associated ancillary assets (i.e. outfall) with an estimated value of £6,000k.
- Other tangible benefits of a scheme in this area were identified as including £30k costs avoided that would otherwise be incurred to implement a permanent diversion along Beatlands Road to the Ford Footbridge once the Alma Bridge was lost to erosion.
- Intangible benefits from amenity value of the South West Coast Path and Alma Bridge valued at £250k per annum (£3,940k PV benefits over 50 years).[2]

Table 2-5 summarises the economic case for each of the 4 scheme options described above.

Table 2-5 Summary of the economic case for 4 scheme options for the River Sid and Pennington Point (from Posford Duvivier, 2001)

Scheme Option	PV Cost (£k)	River Wall Benefits (tangible) (£k)	Cliff Road Benefits (tangible) (£k)	Alma Bridge Benefits (intangible) (£k)	Total Benefits (tangible) (£k)	Total Benefits (tangible + intangible) (£k)	Benefit: Cost Ratio (tangible only)	Benefit: Cost Ratio (tangible + intangible)
1	190	3,170	0	0	3,170	3,170	16.7	16.7
2	346	3,170	157	290	3,327	3,617	9.6	10.5
3	360	3,170	157	290	3,327	3,617	9.2	10.1
4	1,016	3,170	640	290	3,810	4,100	3.8	4.0

The conclusion of this study was that only Scheme Option 1 was likely to attract Defra grant-in aid funding to implement. This economic assessment was further developed as part of the 2003 Project Appraisal Report (refer to Section 2.9).

[2] Since this study, it is no longer possible to include 'benefit' of protecting the South West Coast Path in economic appraisal. The policy of the South West Coast Path is to work with nature and move the path inland where it is lost to erosion. This is reflected in the SMP2 policy decisions referred to in Section 2.5.

2.9 Coast Protection – Pennington Point: Project Appraisal Report (February, 2003)

The *Coast Protection – Pennington Point: Project Appraisal Report* (Posford Haskoning, 2003) further developed the economic case of the preferred option identified in the 2001 coastal study (refer to Section 2.8).

The PV costs of the preferred option were further developed for construction of a 210m long rock revetment along East Beach, set 5-15m away from the base of the cliff, and totaled £810k. These costs also included repairs to the river wall in years 10 (2013) and 25 (year 2028).

These PV costs were compared to the benefits calculated in the 2001 coastal study (refer to Section 2.8), giving a range of benefit:cost ratios of between 1:4.4 and 1:5.7; depending on whether or not amenity benefits are included, and if a discount factor of 6% or 3.5% is applied.

These benefit:cost ratios were in turn used to calculate a priority score that had been introduced by that time for allocating Flood Defence Grant in Aid to coastal defence schemes in England. For this proposed Pennington Point scheme, the priority scores ranged between 7.5 and 9.5.

2.10 South Devon and Dorset Shoreline Management Plan Review (SMP2) (June, 2011)

The *South Devon and Dorset SMP2* (Halcrow, 2011) is a high level shoreline management policy document and covers a large length of coastline. As such the economic analysis contained within it (in Appendix H) is high level and determines if the shoreline management policy is:

- Clearly economically viable;
- Clearly not economically viable; or
- Potentially economically viable and in need of further study.

The following datasets were used for the economic review within the SDAD SMP2:

- National Property Dataset (second edition, 2005) – for property locations and property prices;
- RICS Rural Land Market Survey (H2 2008) – for agricultural land values;
- SMP Guidance and Environment Agency Unit Cost Manual – for defence costs;
- SDAD SMP2 Appendix C (Baseline Processes Understanding) – for details of erosion rates; and,
- Environment Agency Flood Zone 2 – for flood mapping extents.

The SMP2 policy for the Sidmouth BMP extent is in two parts, or Policy Units (PUs); namely PU 6a35 and PU 6a36 (refer to Figure 1-1). The policy for the section east of the River Sid (i.e. East Beach) is stated in PU 6a35 as being for Managed Realignment over the next 100 years. No economic benefits were identified for PU 6a35 in the SMP2 which, having evaluated all erosion rate data, concluded a lower rate of erosion for the cliffs in this area compared to the estimates made in the Pennington Point Study (refer to Section 2.8). The economic case for the Managed Realignment policy in 6a35 is based upon the need to manage the future recession of the cliffs along this section of coast such that the risk of flooding to the rest of Sidmouth by outflanking of the defences from the east is managed in the long term (i.e. to manage the defences along the western side of the River Sid much as argued in the economic case presented in the Pennington Point Study discussed in Section 2.8).

The economic case presented in the SMP2 for protecting the Sidmouth frontage that is subject of this BMP, was therefore based upon the economic benefits of protecting property assets only along the main Sidmouth frontage in PU 6a36. The assessment made in the SMP2 identified a total of 244 residential and 100 commercial properties as being at risk of flooding over a 100 year period, with a capital value of £50,340k and a Present Value (PV) benefit of £49,110k.

In total, the SMP2 estimated costs over 100 years (as per with current guidance) for managing coastal flood and erosion risk along the combined frontages of PU 6a35 and PU 6a36 as being £4,810k. Using this estimated cost with the PV benefit stated above, the benefit:cost ratio for continued intervention at Sidmouth was calculated to be 10.21.

3 Economic Appraisal for this BMP

3.1 Introduction

As the defence assessment carried out as part of developing this Sidmouth & East Beach Management Plan (CH2M HILL, 2015) indicates that the seawall along the Sidmouth town frontage is in good condition and unlikely to fail any time soon, provided the seawall is maintained appropriately, the main benefit of the seawall and associated coastal defences along the Sidmouth frontage is to reduce wave overtopping and so the risk of coastal flooding. As such, for this beach management plan it is considered more appropriate for the Sidmouth town frontage to assess the flood risk to property rather than the risk to properties from erosion as a result of failure of the seawall. This is counter to the basis for the Sidmouth Coast Protection Scheme constructed in the 1990's which was justified only on coastal erosion losses with no consideration of coastal flood damages (refer to Section 2). Coastal erosion risk to the area above East Beach (i.e. Pennington Point/East Cliff) is, however, appraised for this beach management plan.

The following sections describe the approach taken to assessing potential flood and erosion risk damages along the BMP extent.

3.2 Flood Risk Damages

As the scale of coastal flood damages has not been investigated in any substantial way before, to inform the development of the BMP a preliminary flood risk modelling exercise was carried out. The purpose of this preliminary modelling was to provide an initial assessment of the scale of flood damages that exist along the BMP frontage, thus providing coastal flood risk economic benefits to inform benefit:cost assessment of future management options as part of later stages of the BMP development.

Flood risk damages along the Sidmouth town frontage have been determined using a 2D TUFLOW flood propagation model, driven by wave overtopping rates derived for this BMP along the seafront (CH2M HILL, 2015) and extreme water levels ranging between 1:1 year and 1:200 year return periods along the River Sid, for both the present day (2014) and allowing for 50 and 100 years of sea level rise. The flood modelling was conducted for two wave overtopping cases:

- design beach profile; and
- lowest beach profile.

Appendix A provides full details of the modelling approach and presents the flood extents derived.

The flood extents derived have been used to calculate Annual Average Damages (AAD) and total Present Value damages (PVd) over 100 years; PVd values taking into account future discounting and being capped to current market valuation. These damage calculations were carried out using residential and commercial property data from the National Receptor Database (NRD) and CH2M HILL's *damage calculator* software, which utilizes depth-damage curves derived from Multi-Coloured Manual, MCM (FHRC, 2013) and assumes a property threshold level of 0.15m for all properties as well as a coastal saline factor adjustment. The AAD and PVd values are presented in Table 3-1.

Table 3-1 Annual Average Damages and Whole Life PV Damages

	Annual Average Damage, AAD (£k) by Future Year for sea level rise			Whole Life Present Value Damages. PVd (£k)
Scenario	2014	2065	2115	
Lowest Beach Profile	1,430	2,759	4,950	66,005
Design Beach Profile	0	0	0	0

From the results shown in Table 3-1, it is evident that the flood risk under the 'lowest beach profile' case is much more extensive, and so damaging economically, compared to the 'design beach profile' case. The 'lowest beach profile' case giving 100-year PVd of £66,005k (based on flood risk to up to 108 residential and 80 non-residential properties under the 1:200 year return period event in year 100; note, the 1:200 year event in year 0 poses flood risk to 86 residential and 57 non-residential properties), compared to £0k (and 0 property at risk) for the 'design beach case', indicating the potential benefits for flood risk reduction to be gained by providing the 'design beach profile' along the Sidmouth town frontage. This demonstrates the value of retaining the 'design beach profile' in its ability to significantly reduce the scale of wave overtopping along the seafront (by reducing wave breaking directly against the seawall) and thus the extent of flood risk to Sidmouth town.

It should be noted that the analysis also assumes that significant flooding occurs in the 1 in 1 year event which is unlikely and so these preliminary flood damages calculated here are potentially on the conservative side; however they do provide a basis for assessing potential options at this time. It should also be noted that these values are based on available data in the NRD and that the analysis does not include upper flood properties, basements, and properties with MCM code '999'. In addition, the preliminary modelling work undertaken for this BMP does not consider the in-combination flood risk of high fluvial flows and extreme tides, nor surface water impacts on flood risk. Nor does it assess the potential implications of increased wave overtopping along the River Sid western wall should it become exposed by retreat of the cliffs to the east (refer to Section 3.3). These are all areas where further investigation could be undertaken to develop and refine the economic case further.

3.3 Erosion Risk Damages

Assessment of future erosion risk potential has been made as part of cliff analysis presented in the Coastal Processes Baseline (CH2M HILL, 2016) produced alongside this economics baseline for the Sidmouth & East Beach Management Plan.

That assessment concluded that for East Cliff (CBU7 in assessment), over 100 years total cliff top recession is predicted to be between 20.9m and 30.9m. For Peak Hill (CBU4 in assessment), total cliff top recession over 100 years is predicted to be between 16.5m and 21.5m. These 100 year recession predictions are shown plotted in Figure 3-1 (for East Cliff) and Figure 3-2 (for Peak Hill).

It is important to note that the projections show the cumulative impact 100 years erosion and no attempt has been made to determine annual cliff losses or erosion rates. The actual erosion experienced in a given year is determined by the level of the beach, which is itself determined by the direction of waves that determines net drift direction; the timing, intensity and frequency of storms; and the amount of rainfall, none of which can be confidently predicted. Due to the current low beach levels, it is likely that the high rates of erosion seen in recent years will continue for several years, but that erosion will reduce in the near future once sediment has drifted back towards the west and a beach has accumulated.

The timing of a future reduction in cliff recession rate is uncertain, but several feedback mechanisms dictate that a continuation of a high rate of cliff recession for 100 years is not credible. Consistent accelerated erosion along a short section of coast would lead to formation of a set-back section of the cliff line where the cliff would become progressively further away from breaking waves causing erosion

to reduce. Furthermore, a set-back section of coast would allow a pocket beach to accumulate, which would absorb wave energy and reduce erosion (CH2M HILL, 2016).

From these projections of future erosion risk, it is evident that based on the assessments made, that no property assets are predicted to be at direct risk from coastal erosion in the next 100 years.

For Peak Hill, no direct erosion risk damages to properties have therefore been calculated as part of this new analysis. It should be noted that there is a potential risk in 100 years to the cliff top road that provides local access in this area; no valuation of this impact to highways is made in this new analysis.

For East Cliff, although the 100 year projection indicates no loss of cliff top property, due to uncertainty about the future extent of cliff top recession (refer to CH2M HILL, 2016), a sensitivity test is justified based on the assumption that an additional 10m of cliff top recession could potentially occur (i.e. total recession over 100 years would then be up 40.9m). The probability that such an additional 10m of erosion loss were to occur is estimated to be 5%. Should this occur, then it is evident from Figure 3-3 that up to five cliff top properties along Cliff Road (atop East Cliff) could be lost to erosion.

Following the approach recommended in the Flood Hazard Research Centre (2013) guidance, local property valuations (assuming no coastal erosion risk) were obtained for these five properties (Overthorpe, Shimoda, Uplands, Derby Cottage and Cliffe Cottage) from Fulfords Estate Agents in Sidmouth; the total market valuation determined as a result was £3,470k (refer to Appendix B). This valuation was used with the assumption that property loss would occur in year 100 (i.e. apply discount factor for year 100) with a 5% probability of loss occurring to determine PVd for coastal erosion losses. The resulting PVd for coastal erosion losses is therefore £9k.

Whilst the potential erosion losses along East Cliff (CBU7) described above are calculated to be relatively small (in comparison to the flood damages described in Section 3.2) based on current projections, ongoing monitoring of cliff recession (as recommended in the Coastal Processes Baseline (CH2M HILL, 2016) will allow regular review of this economic risk.

It should also be noted that as East Cliff recedes over the next 100 years (as indicated in Figure 3-1), the Alma Bridge would become unsustainable in its current position whilst the western wall of the River Sid, that provides fluvial flood defence at the present time, will become increasingly exposed to full coastal conditions (particularly during south-easterly storm events). Such exposure, which will start to occur if East Cliff receded by about a further 10-15m from its 2015 position, will increase the likelihood of defence failure and thus incurrence of flood damages discussed in Section 3.2 over time; this would also impact critical infrastructure located behind the western wall of the River Sid that serves the wider area, notably the Sewage Pumping Station operated by South West Water located immediately upstream of western Alma Bridge abutment. This serves to demonstrate that whilst measures along the Sidmouth Town frontage to reduce flood risk from wave overtopping are appropriate (i.e. reduce economic damages as evidenced in Section 3.2), this benefit would be for nought if the risk posed by outflanking from the east is not also addressed at the same time.

The fluvial defences will therefore need to be upgraded to full coastal standard in advance of them becoming exposed by erosion of the cliffs and/or there is a different approach to managing coastal erosion risk implemented along East Beach/East Cliff. The trigger for commencing the planning of such upgrades would prudently be when a further 5m of erosion occurs in the vicinity of Alma Bridge over a 30-50m length of open coast extending eastwards form Alma Bridge. Based on the assessments made for East Cliff, as described in the Coastal Processes Baseline (CH2M HILL, 2016), and factoring the potential uncertainty with regards timing of recession, this increased exposure could potentially occur within the next 20 years (i.e. by 2035). Again, this risk of outflanking can be kept under regular review if informed by regular ongoing monitoring of cliff recession and beach levels in front of the cliffs as recommended in the Coastal Processes Baseline (CH2M HILL, 2016).

As noted above, this risk of outflanking is also dependent upon the measures implemented along the open coast around the mouth of the River Sid, and so monitoring of cliff recession and beach levels along East Cliff/East Beach in the future will also inform assessment of the impact of any measures upon cliff erosion and so outflanking risk to the western wall of the River Sid.

As described in Section 3.2, further analysis, including numerical modelling, is required to better understand the wave and water level conditions that could be expected to occur along an exposed western wall of the River Sid defences, and in turn the associated wave overtopping potential and associated flood risk that would result should erosion continue as projected (i.e. no measures implemented along the open coast to reduce erosion risk).

Figure 3-1 Cliff recession projection for 100 years at East Cliff (CBU7). Note the projection is made from the 2015 cliff top, but are overlain on the 2012 image for presentation purposes.



Figure 3-2 *Cliff recession projection for 100 years at Peak Hill (CBU4). Note the projection is made from the 2012 cliff top and overlain on the 2012 image.*

Figure 3-3 *5m cliff recession intervals from 2015 for East Cliff (CBU7)*

3.4 Amenity Damages

In addition to calculating update flood and erosion risk damages (Sections 3.2 and 3.3), the 1992 calculation of amenity benefit has also been updated to provide an indication of the potential level of

amenity benefits that could be realized along the Sidmouth frontage. This achieved using the values presented in Section 2.2 adjusted as followed:

(a) Inflated to present day (2014) prices using the Retail Prices Index (RPI) inflation values from the Office of National Statistics (2015) between Q1 1992 (130.8) and Q4 2014 (257.4) – giving inflation of 196%; and

(b) Extended from a 50 year to 100 year assessment horizon.

The result of applying these two updates is presented in Table 3-2. This shows that the potential Present Value losses from visitors to the Sidmouth Seafront if coastal defences were allowed to deteriorate and fail is likely to be of the order of £31,431k over 100 years, allowing for application of discount factors. If defences are maintained (or improved), there is potential Present Value gain over 100 years of about £15,181k on top of avoiding the loss of £31,431k (i.e. total benefit of £46,612k over 100 years).

Table 3-2 Summary of amenity benefits based on data from Phase 2 (refer to Table 2-1) updated using RPI inflation of 196% between Q1 1992 (130.8) and Q4 2014 (257.4) and extended to 100 years.

Visitor Type	No. Visitors per 150 day summer season	Loss per 150 day summer season (£k)	*Total Present Value loss over 100 years (£k)* [A]	Gain per 150 day summer season (£k)	*Total Present Value gain over 100 years (£k)* [B]	*Total Present Value benefits over 100 Years (£k)* [A+B]
Day	100,837	468.40	*13,988*	129.67	*3,872*	*17,860*
Staying	50,500	549.25	*16,402*	355.76	*10,624*	*27,026*
Local	11,250	34.85	*1,041*	22.93	*685*	*1,726*
TOTALS	**162,587**	**1,0520.50**	***31,431***	**508.36**	***15,181***	***46,612***

This provides an indication of the potential value of amenity to Sidmouth to be gained from retaining coastal defence and a beach along the Sidmouth frontage, which is sufficient for appraising the economics benefits of potential future options as part of this project. Further research could be undertaken in the future to revise the visitor numbers assumed and/or values visitors assigned (via a contingent valuation survey).

3.5 Summary of 'Do Nothing' Economic Damages

The analysis presented in this section indicates that the potential Present Value (PV) economic damages to the Sidmouth BMP frontage from coastal flood risk to approximately 188 residential and commercial properties is at least £66,005k, and that this is considered to be a low-estimate given limitations of the analysis and the NRD data that underpins it. In addition, up to five residential properties are considered to be at potential risk of coastal erosion in the very long-term (i.e. 100 years); the PV economic damages for these erosion losses is calculated to be £9k.

In addition to property risks, the potential impact of not maintaining coastal defences at Sidmouth in upon the amenity value of the town is calculated to be of the order of £31,431k over 100 years.

Combining the property and amenity damages over 100 years gives total Present Value damages of £97,445k against which costs of future management can be assessed as part of the options development stage of the Sidmouth and East Beach Management Plan. Without amenity damages, the total PV damages is £66,014k.

4 Conclusions

The findings of the economics baseline assessment are:

- The Sidmouth Coastal Protection Scheme constructed in the 1990s was based on:
    - A 50 year scheme appraisal period. *NB: current guidance is now to use a 100 year appraisal period.*
    - Application of flat 6% discount factor over the appraisal period to derive Present Value damages (PVd). *NB: the new analysis in Section 3 is based upon a variable discount factor that changes over a 100 year appraisal period.*
    - Erosion losses of (up to 10no.) seafront properties with PVd calculated to be between £5,037k and £9,021k.
    - Amenity losses over the appraisal period calculated to be £12,553k.
    - No account was made of flood damages over the appraisal period.
- Assessments made as part of this BMP has determined that coastal erosion risk along the Sidmouth town frontage is not the main issue to be addressed given that the defences are assessed as being in good condition with significant residual life remaining. Rather, it is the coastal flood risk to the low-lying areas of Sidmouth town, as a result of wave overtopping of the seafront, that are the main issue to focus on.
- The SMP2 (Halcrow, 2011) was the first attempt to value flood damages along the Sidmouth frontage. This broad assessment which did not account for annual average damages based on impact of different return period events, calculated that up to 244 residential and 100 commercial properties lie within the flood zone defined by the Environment Agency, with PVd calculated to be £49,110k over a 100 years appraisal period.
- Based on the preliminary flood risk modelling and associated flood damages calculated in developing this BMP, it has been identified that up to 108 residential and 80 commercial properties are at risk of flooding, with PVd calculated over a 100 year appraisal period to be £66,005k based on a lowest beach profile scenario. Further work is recommended to refine this analysis further.
- Updated assessment of amenity losses from the 1990's analysis that is also extended to a 100 year appraisal period amenity, are calculated to be £31,431k. Further work would provide an improved estimate of these amenity damages.
- The assessment of options for Pennington Point/East Beach in 2001-2003 was based upon:
    - A 50 year scheme appraisal period. *NB: current guidance is now to use a 100 year appraisal period.*
    - Application of flat 6% discount factor over the appraisal period to derive Present Value damages (PVd). *NB: the new analysis in Section 3 is based upon a variable discount factor that changes over a 100 year appraisal period.*
    - Erosion losses of cliff top properties with PVd calculated to be between £128k and £640k.
    - Potential loss of South West Water infrastructure along the western wall of the River Sid as it becomes exposed to coastal conditions by erosion of Pennington Point/East Cliff valued at £6,000k.
- Assessment as part of the SMP2 (Halcrow, 2011) and this BMP both identify that the erosion risk to cliff top properties over the next 100 years is considered to be less than the assessment made in 2001-2003. There are, however, up to five properties at risk of coastal erosion along the top of

East Cliff (Cliff Road) in the very long term (100 years). The PVd calculated for these erosion losses is £9k.

- Combining the property flood and erosion damages with the amenity damages over 100 years gives total PVd of £97,445k against which costs of future management can be assessed as part of the options development stage of the Sidmouth and East Beach Management Plan. Without amenity damages included, the total PVd reduces to £66,014k.
- The main risk from erosion of Pennington Point/East Cliff over the next 100 years is (a) the loss of the Alma Bridge (in its current position), and (b) the exposure of the western wall of the River Sid to full coastal conditions, which would pose increased risk of wave overtopping and potentially structural failure of this wall leading to widespread flooding and loss of critical infrastructure (e.g. sewage pumping station) that serves the wider area, unless the wall is upgraded to full coastal design standards and/or there is a different approach to managing coastal erosion risk implemented along East Beach/East Cliff. This exposure is predicted to occur within the next 20 years (i.e. by 2035) based upon the current situation, and so planning to implement any wall upgrade is likely to be required within this time-frame; though that depends on what is done along the open coast of East Cliff/East Beach to reduce erosion and so outflanking risk to the low-lying area of Sidmouth town centre. Such measures are justifiable on that basis as otherwise investment to reduce flood risk along Sidmouth town frontage would be for nought if nothing was done to address potential future increased flood risk from the River Sid due to ongoing erosion of East Cliff.
- Along the Connaught Gardens (Chit Rocks) and Jacob's Ladder Beach sections of the BMP frontage, previous economic cases have all been based upon preventing coastal erosion to the benefit of amenity assets of economic value to Sidmouth. In 1994 these were estimated to have a capital value of £583k. However, given present funding rules for flood and coastal defence, future funding to maintain these assets, and/or to recycle beach sediment from the promenade area at Jacob's Ladder Beach back westwards when it causes an amenity use issue, is likely to require full 100% funding contributions from third-party (i.e. non-FCERM Grant in Aid) sources.

References

- CH2M HILL, 2015. *Defence Assessment Report*. East Devon District Council. May 2015.
- CH2M HILL, 2016. *Coastal Processes Baseline*. East Devon District Council. January 2016.
- Flood Hazard Research Centre, 2013. *Multi-Coloured Manual*. Middlesex University.
- Flood Hazard Research Centre, 1992. *Yellow Manual*. Middlesex University.
- Halcrow, 2011. *South Devon and Dorset Shoreline Management Plan Review (SMP2)*. South Devon & Dorset Coastal Advisory Group. June, 2011.
- Office for National Statistics, 2015. *Consumer Price Indices - RPI indices: 1987 to 2015: Jan 1987=100*. Website: http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/datasets-and-tables/data-selector.html?cdid=CHAW&dataset=mm23&table-id=2.1. Date accessed: 16th March 2015.
- Posford Haskoning, 2003. *Coast Protection – Pennington Point: Project Appraisal Report*. East Devon District Council. February, 2003.
- Posford Duvivier, 2001. *Sidmouth – Pennington Point Coastal Study*. East Devon District Council. August, 2001.
- Posford Duvivier, 1998. *Sidmouth Phase 2 Coast Protection Scheme: Revised Beach Management Plan*. Eat Devon District Council. July, 1998.
- Posford Duvivier, 1996. *Sidmouth Phase 2 Coast Protection Scheme: Beach Management Plan*. Eat Devon District Council. October, 1996.
- Posford Duvivier, 1994. *Coast Protection Connaught Gardens: Revised Engineers Report*. East Devon District Council. August, 1994.
- Posford Duvivier, 1993. *Sidmouth – Emergency Works: Engineers Report*. East Devon District Council. November, 1993.
- Posford Duvivier, 1992a. *Coast Protection at Sidmouth (Phase II): Report on Phase II Works and Benefit Cost Analysis*. East Devon District Council. January, 1992.
- Posford Duvivier, 1992b. *Coast Protection at Sidmouth (Phase II): Engineers Report*. East Devon District Council. October, 1992.
- Posford Duvivier, 1990. *Coast Protection at Sidmouth Benefit Cost Analysis*. East Devon District Council. May, 1990.

PAGE LEFT BLANK FOR DOUBLE SIDED PRINTING

Appendix A Coastal Flood Inundation Modelling Technical Note

PAGE LEFT BLANK FOR DOUBLE SIDED PRINTING

Halcrow Consultants Sdn Bhd
Suite A-05,08, Block A, Level 5, Unit 02, Plaza Mont' Kiara
No. 2, Jalan Kiara
50480 Kuala Lumpur

Halcrow
A CH2M HILL COMPANY

Technical Note

Project	Sidmouth Beach Management	**Date**	11th October 2016
Subject	Coastal Flood Inundation Modelling	**Ref**	Khairulanwar Abdul Jami / Aaron Oon / Matthew Kennedy

1 Introduction

This report provides a baseline assessment of the coastal flooding along the Sidmouth and East Beach Management Plan (BMP) frontage (Figure 1). The purpose of this assessment is to provide inundation maps and economic analysis for Sidmouth. As such, this report includes:

- Information about the data used for setting up the model (Sections 2 and 3).
- Methodology on how the assessment is done (Section 4).
- Assessment of TUFLOW 2D model results and economic analysis calculation (Section 5).
- Conclusions and recommendation for further investigation and possible mitigation in terms of reducing flood damages (Section 6).



Figure 1 – Sidmouth BMP extent

2 Data Information

The purpose of this section is to highlight the input data used for this project. Input data includes a Digital Terrain Model (DTM), overtopping rates for cases to be modelled along the open coast, tide curves to be modelled along the River Sid, defence crest level survey, and OS Master Map.

2.1 LiDAR DTM

DTMs are usually used to define topography for a certain extents or locations. For this project, the DTM received, cover the area of interest for this project and is used to define the topography of Sidmouth. The DTM comes in ascii file format that and was provided by the Environment Agency's Geomatics Group.

2.2 Overtopping Rates

Overtopping rate is the rate of water that flows over the top of the sea defences as a result of waves breaking against a sea defence. Overtopping rates are used as the input for the 2D model boundary condition which represent the overtopping of the Sidmouth defences along the coastline. The overtopping rates for cases to be modelled were derived from the Defence Assessment Report produced as part of the development of the Sidmouth and East Beach Management Plan. The rates used for this flood modelling study were defined for the following two categories:

(a) design beach; and

(b) lowest beach profile.

Each category then assesses three different scenarios:

(i) Present Day scenario (2014);

(ii) 50 years climate change scenario (year 2065) and

(iii) 100 years climate change scenario (year 2115).

Each scenario is assessed for five different return period events:

1) 1 in 1 year (100% AEP);

2) 1 in 5 years (20% AEP);

3) 1 in 50 years (2% AEP);

4) 1 in 100 years (1% AEP); and

5) 1 in 200 years (0.5% AEP).

2.3 Tide Curve

The tide curve predicts the times and heights of the high and low tides for a given location. The tide curve is used for the 2D model boundary condition which represent water that coming from the confluence of the river Sid and the sea. Event data that are used for the model are the 1 in 1 year (100% AEP), 1 in 5 years (20% AEP), 1 in 50 years (2% AEP), 1 in 100 years (1% AEP), and 1 in 200 years (0.5% AEP) events for present day, climate change 50 years and climate change 100 years.

2.4 Crest Level Survey

The Crest Level Survey came in CSV files and included the elevation of the crest, and coordinate of the defences. The survey data were used to locate the position of the defences and to determine the location of overtopping boundary for the 2D model.

2.6 Master Map

OS Mastermap information was downloaded from CH2M Hill's internal servers for use with this project.

3 Data Review

3.1 LiDAR Data Review

From the data sent, there is few of pre-merged DTM data and around 195 files of unmerged DTM tiles with 4m cell size.

3.1.1 Pre-Merged DTM

Finding of the pre-merged DTM shows that the data is not suitable to be used for 2D modelling. Since the merged DTM consist of unfiltered data and filtered data together in the same file. The unfiltered data include together the elevation of building on the area will impact the results for the flood map.

The pre-merged DTM will not be used for modelling.

3.1.2 Unmerged DTM

From preliminary checking of 195 files of unmerged DTM tiles, it seems that it can be categorized into two (2) different types, which is:

a) Unfiltered data, and

b) Filtered data.

Unfiltered data will not be used for modelling

3.1.3 Filtered DTM

After a thorough investigation, it comes out that the filtered unmerged DTM had its own different version dependent on the time it was taken (this was the same for the unfiltered data). The version is as follow:

i) Taken on 17th April 2007; this LiDAR data covers our area of interest, but it was taken on 2007.

ii) Taken on 31st January 2010; the LiDAR data had missing area on the northern part of Sidmouth, however this was outside the study area.

iii) Taken on 4th April 2010; Data did not cover area of interest.

iv) Taken on 20th March 2007; this LiDAR data does not cover our area of interest greatly as the data above, but it extend to the eastern part of Sidmouth where it does not include in our model.

After comparing each available unfiltered data, it was determined that filtered data taken on 31st of January 2010 will be used for the data taken on 17th of April 2007 may be useful for further study as the 2010 data does not cover the whole of Sidmouth.

All the data selected was then merged into one (1) ascii file using MapInfo.

3.2 Tide Curves Data Review

The tide curves data received was in excel spreadsheet format.

From review it is found that the data in the spreadsheet contained more events than required modelling. Since there are less events needed for this assessment as mentioned in Section 2.3, the necessary curves were selected and the highest peak of each curve was selected to model the extreme tidal scenarios. The tidal curves used are available in Annex A.

3.3 Crest Level Survey Data Review

The elevation and location of the crest level survey was reviewed against the DTM and found to be consistent with other data sources including mapping.

4 Methodology

4.1 2D Model Set Up and Runs

TUFLOW software (2013-12-AC-iSP-w64) was used to set up and run the 2D Model for this project. The simulations carried out are as below:

4.1.1 Boundary Conditions

For the 2D model, two boundary conditions have been used, one to represent wave overtopping along the defences (an inflow boundary-ST in TUFLOW) and a second to represent tidal incursion up the River Sid (a water level boundary- HT in TUFLOW). The locations of these boundaries can be seen in the model schematic in Annex B.

For the wave overtopping 4 ST Boundaries were used as indicated on the plans in Annex B. These are:

1) West Pier,

2) Bedford Steps,

3) York Steps Groyne, and

4) East Pier Groyne

Two wave overtopping boundaries (Clifton Walkway and Jacobs Ladder) were removed from the model as these was at the foot of the western cliffs and did not contribute to flooding.

The size and magnitude of the wave overtopping for each event is shown on the plans in Annex B and also tabulated in Annex A. For the wave overtopping, these values were divided by 1000 to represent that wave overtopping rates are not constant and are dependent on the wave period. Wave overtopping was applied as a triangular hydrograph with a duration of two hours and peaking after 1 hour. The initial and final wave overtopping rates were considered to be zero.

The water levels for the HT boundary to be applied along the River Sid were taken from a spreadsheet provided to the modelling team. The peak value for each return period is summarised in Table 1 below:

Table 1 – Peak Sea Levels

	Peak Level (mAOD)				
	1 in 1 Year	1 in 5 Years	1 in 50 Years	1 in 100 Years	1 in 200 Years
2014	2.7	2.86	3.1	3.16	3.24
2065	2.9	3.06	3.27	3.36	3.44
2115	3.15	3.31	3.52	3.61	3.69

4.1.2 Model Domain and parameters

The area modelled can be seen in the model schematic in Annex B. The domain was modelled using a 4m cell size and a 1 second time-step.

4.1.3 Model Geometry

4.1.3.1 Model topography

The merge DTM from section 3.1.3 was used to define model topography. However, since the DTM had a small hole due to a small lake that exist within the tiles, a z shape polygon was used in TUFLOW to fill this hole.

4.1.3.2 Buildings

From the Master Map, building polygons were extracted, and raised in elevation to 0.2m as an additional elevation to the DTM. In addition a high roughness value of 0.5 was used to ensure that water preferentially flowed around buildings.

4.1.3.3 Defining Roughness

Roughness values were based upon OS Mastermap land use classifications and followed the values outlined in the Table 2 below:

Table 2 – 2D Model Roughness Values

Code	Roughness Value	Type
10000	0.04	default
10021	0.5	building
10053	0.04	general surface ; residential yards
10054	0.025	general surface ; step
10056	0.03	general surface ; grass,parkland
10062	0.5	building ; glass house
10076	0.5	land heritage and antiquities
10089	0.035	water ; inland
10111	0.1	natural environment (confierous/non coniferous trees)
10119	0.02	roads tracks and paths ; manmade
10123	0.025	roads tracks and paths ; tarmac or dirt tracks
10167	0.05	rail
10172	0.02	roads tracks and paths ; tarmac
10183	0.02	roads tracks and paths(roadside) ; pavement
10185	0.03	structures ; roadside structure
10187	0.5	structures ; generally on top of buildings
10203	0.04	water ; foreshore
10210	0.035	water ; tidal water
10217	0.035	land (unclassified)
10096	0.04	slope
10193	0.04	pylon
10093	0.04	Land, assume grass
10099	0.04	Cliff, assumed step

4.2 Damage Calculation

Damage calculations have been carried out using ISIS damage calculator. This software utilizes damage curves derived from MCM 2013 and damage estimates have been made assuming a property threshold level of 0.15m for all properties and a coastal saline factor adjustment.

Further to this all upper flood properties and properties with MCM code 999 have been excluded from the analysis. The methodology also follows that a property is only flooded when flooding envelops the properties centroid.

After obtaining the results from the ISIS damage calculator, the values of the each of the flooded properties are capped at the total property value which was calculated based upon the tax band for residential properties, inflated using house price index data, as shown in Table 3.

Table 3 – Residential property capping values based on council tax band valuations inflated to present day.

Valuation Band	House values (April 1991)	Mid-point House Values (April 1991)	Inflated Mid-point House Values (Q3 2016) = capping value
A	Up to and including £40,000	£40,000	£152,998
B	£40,001 to £52,000	£46,001	£175,950
C	£52,001 to £68,000	£60,001	£229,499
D	£68,001 to £88,000	£78,001	£298,348
E	£88,001 to £120,000	£104,001	£397,797
F	£120,001 to £160,000	£140,001	£535,496
G	£160,001 to £320,000	£240,001	£917,991
H	£320,001 and above	£320,001	£1,223,989

The Office of National Statistics bulk class rateable values for the south-west region (Rateable Value per square metre) multiplied by 10 was used for valuing the non-residential properties. Larger non-residential properties like hotels were individually valued using Valuation Office Agency (VOA). Details of which is found in this link[1].

Values of a few properties were estimated. Firstly, the valuation of High Ho Silver is based upon the East Devon Art Valuation found in the Valuation Office Agency link as the floor area was 0 in the properties list. Secondly, the Devoran Hotel which the valuation on the VOA website has been deleted. The valuation was then estimated based upon the other hotels which had valuations and an average (£223/m^2) was obtained and applied to evaluate Devoran Hotel.

The final capping values for the properties are listed in Annex D. Only flooded properties were evaluated.

[1] http://www.2010.voa.gov.uk/rli/en/basic/find/assessment-history/2010/15988260000

5 Results

5.1 Flood Extents

Flood extents for each scenario and return period can be seen in Annex C. Each map also includes the damage estimates for each scenario. Results show a significant amount of flooding for low return periods. This is a result of large overtopping volumes of the eastern most defence near the River Sid estuary.

5.2 Damages and flooded properties

As a result of frequent flooding originating from the eastern flood defence, Annual Average Damage is high as seen in Table 4. The total 100-year PV damages arising from these Annual Average Damages is presented in Table 4, and comes to £66,005k.

Table 4 – Annual Average Damages and Whole Life PV Damages

	Annual Average Damage (£k) by Future Year for sea level rise			Whole Life Damages. Present Value (£k)
Scenario	**2014**	**2065**	**2115**	
Lowest Beach	1,430	2,759	4,950	66,005
Design Beach	0	0	0	0

6 Conclusions and Recommendations

6.1 Conclusions

Flood extents show that the area most at risk from wave overtopping in Sidmouth is concentrated along the west bank of the River Sid at the eastern end of the esplanade. Lower land elevations in this area means that even wave overtopping at the western end of the esplanade flows towards this area.

6.1.1 Lowest Beach Overtopping Rate

Flooded area and overtopping rate are shown to be directly proportional, leading to an increase in flooded area with climate change. Mapped flood extents in Annex C show that the area of Sidmouth along the west bank of the River Sid is most at risk, with topography directing flows to this area. Significant flooding occurs for even the 1 in 1 year return period as a result of the volume of wave overtopping. Whilst higher return period events and the impact of climate change increase the volume of overtopping, the flooded area still remains to the south east of Sidmouth bounded by the River Sid.

6.1.2 Design Beach Overtopping Rate

Compared to the lowest beach profile, flood extents for the design beach show a marked decrease in flooded area. This is due to overtopping rates that are orders of magnitude lower along all of the frontage with the exception of the East Pier (defence length 6). Overtopping rates here are not so significantly reduced and this is the main source of flooding under the design beach scenario. Even with this notable reduction, flooding still occurs for the 1 in 1 year event. However, the area affected is shallow and is not shown to impact property. Since overtopping rates are minimized elsewhere, flood extents are limited to the eastern end of the Esplanade. Even for climate change in 2115 extents only reach to York Street and East Street behind the esplanade where they largely affect the Ham Park and York Street Car Park.

6.2 Recommendations

The design beach scenario shows a marked decrease in wave overtopping rates and consequently, flood extents. From a flood risk perspective this would be the preferred option, however it would be also recommended to make amendments to the East pier such that wave overtopping here is also reduced.

From a modelling perspective the results shown are a reflection of the volume of water resulting from the wave overtopping calculations. Improvements to the model could be made by calculating wave overtopping over the entire course of a design event as it is considered unlikely that the extent of flooding observed in the model for the 1 in 1 year event occurs. At present the model is considered to represent a conservative estimate of flooding.

Damage calculations have been kept simple to give a broad understanding of the impacts of flooding on Sidmouth. However, if more detail is added to the hydraulic model, a more detailed damage assessment approach is recommended that takes into account the onset of flooding for properties that does not solely include when the property centroid is enveloped by the flood extent. Further to this some extra analysis using google streetview or a site visit is recommended to classify those properties with MCM code 999 that appear to be legitimate residential or commercial properties.

Annex A Model Boundary Conditions

A.1 Tide curve data

	2014 Water Level (mAOD)				
Time (H)	1 in 1 Year	1 in 5 Years	1 in 50 Years	1 in 100 Years	1 in 200 Years
75.5	-0.35	-0.22	-0.01	0.04	0.11
75.67	-0.25	-0.11	0.1	0.15	0.22
75.83	-0.15	-0.01	0.2	0.26	0.32
76	-0.04	0.1	0.31	0.36	0.43
76.17	0.06	0.2	0.42	0.47	0.54
76.33	0.26	0.41	0.62	0.68	0.75
76.5	0.47	0.61	0.83	0.88	0.96
76.67	0.57	0.72	0.94	0.99	1.06
76.83	0.77	0.92	1.14	1.2	1.27
77	0.98	1.13	1.35	1.4	1.48
77.17	1.18	1.33	1.55	1.61	1.69
77.33	1.38	1.53	1.76	1.82	1.89
77.5	1.58	1.74	1.96	2.02	2.1
77.67	1.79	1.94	2.17	2.23	2.3
77.83	1.99	2.14	2.37	2.43	2.51
78	2.09	2.24	2.48	2.54	2.61
78.17	2.29	2.45	2.68	2.74	2.82
78.33	2.39	2.55	2.78	2.84	2.92
78.5	2.49	2.65	2.89	2.95	3.03
78.67	2.5	2.65	2.89	2.95	3.03
78.83	2.6	2.76	2.99	3.05	3.13
79	2.6	2.76	3	3.06	3.13
79.17	2.7	2.86	3.1	3.16	3.24
79.33	2.7	2.86	3.1	3.16	3.24
79.5	2.7	2.86	3.1	3.16	3.24
79.67	2.7	2.86	3.1	3.16	3.24
79.83	2.7	2.86	3.1	3.16	3.24
80	2.7	2.86	3.1	3.16	3.24
80.17	2.6	2.76	3	3.06	3.14
80.33	2.6	2.76	3	3.06	3.14
80.5	2.5	2.66	2.9	2.96	3.04
80.67	2.5	2.66	2.9	2.96	3.03
80.83	2.4	2.56	2.79	2.85	2.93
81	2.3	2.45	2.69	2.75	2.83
81.17	2.1	2.25	2.49	2.55	2.63
81.33	1.99	2.15	2.39	2.45	2.53
81.5	1.79	1.95	2.19	2.24	2.32
81.67	1.69	1.85	2.08	2.14	2.22
81.83	1.49	1.65	1.88	1.94	2.02

	2014 Water Level (mAOD)				
Time (H)	1 in 1 Year	1 in 5 Years	1 in 50 Years	1 in 100 Years	1 in 200 Years
82	1.29	1.45	1.68	1.74	1.82
82.17	1.09	1.24	1.48	1.54	1.61
82.33	0.89	1.04	1.27	1.33	1.41
82.5	0.59	0.74	0.97	1.03	1.11
82.67	0.39	0.54	0.77	0.83	0.91
82.83	0.19	0.34	0.57	0.63	0.7
83	-0.12	0.04	0.27	0.32	0.4
83.17	-0.32	-0.16	0.06	0.12	0.2
83.33	-0.52	-0.37	-0.14	-0.08	-0.01
83.5	-0.72	-0.57	-0.34	-0.28	-0.21
83.67	-0.92	-0.77	-0.54	-0.49	-0.41
83.83	-1.12	-0.97	-0.74	-0.69	-0.61
84	-1.32	-1.17	-0.95	-0.89	-0.81
84.17	-1.42	-1.27	-1.05	-0.99	-0.92
84.33	-1.62	-1.47	-1.25	-1.19	-1.12
84.5	-1.72	-1.58	-1.35	-1.3	-1.22
84.67	-1.73	-1.58	-1.36	-1.3	-1.23
84.83	-1.83	-1.68	-1.46	-1.4	-1.33
85	-1.83	-1.68	-1.46	-1.41	-1.33
85.17	-1.83	-1.68	-1.47	-1.41	-1.34
85.33	-1.73	-1.59	-1.37	-1.32	-1.24
85.5	-1.73	-1.59	-1.37	-1.32	-1.25

	2065 Water Level (mAOD)				
Time (H)	1 in 1 Year	1 in 5 Years	1 in 50 Years	1 in 100 Years	1 in 200 Years
75.5	-0.18	-0.05	0.13	0.21	0.28
75.67	-0.08	0.06	0.24	0.32	0.39
75.83	0.03	0.17	0.35	0.43	0.5
76	0.13	0.27	0.46	0.54	0.61
76.17	0.24	0.38	0.57	0.65	0.72
76.33	0.44	0.59	0.77	0.86	0.93
76.5	0.65	0.79	0.98	1.06	1.14
76.67	0.75	0.9	1.09	1.17	1.25
76.83	0.96	1.1	1.3	1.38	1.46
77	1.16	1.31	1.51	1.59	1.66
77.17	1.36	1.51	1.71	1.8	1.87
77.33	1.57	1.72	1.92	2	2.08
77.5	1.77	1.92	2.12	2.21	2.29
77.67	1.98	2.13	2.33	2.42	2.49
77.83	2.18	2.33	2.54	2.62	2.7
78	2.28	2.44	2.64	2.73	2.81

	2065 Water Level (mAOD)				
Time (H)	1 in 1 Year	1 in 5 Years	1 in 50 Years	1 in 100 Years	1 in 200 Years
78.17	2.48	2.64	2.85	2.93	3.01
78.33	2.59	2.74	2.95	3.04	3.12
78.5	2.69	2.85	3.05	3.14	3.22
78.67	2.69	2.85	3.06	3.15	3.22
78.83	2.79	2.95	3.16	3.25	3.33
79	2.79	2.95	3.16	3.25	3.33
79.17	2.9	3.06	3.26	3.35	3.43
79.33	2.9	3.06	3.27	3.36	3.44
79.5	2.9	3.06	3.27	3.36	3.44
79.67	2.9	3.06	3.27	3.36	3.44
79.83	2.9	3.06	3.27	3.36	3.44
80	2.9	3.06	3.27	3.36	3.44
80.17	2.8	2.96	3.17	3.26	3.34
80.33	2.8	2.96	3.17	3.26	3.34
80.5	2.7	2.86	3.06	3.15	3.23
80.67	2.69	2.85	3.06	3.15	3.23
80.83	2.59	2.75	2.96	3.05	3.13
81	2.49	2.65	2.86	2.95	3.03
81.17	2.29	2.45	2.66	2.74	2.82
81.33	2.19	2.35	2.55	2.64	2.72
81.5	1.99	2.14	2.35	2.44	2.52
81.67	1.89	2.04	2.25	2.34	2.41
81.83	1.68	1.84	2.05	2.13	2.21
82	1.48	1.64	1.84	1.93	2.01
82.17	1.28	1.44	1.64	1.73	1.8
82.33	1.08	1.23	1.44	1.52	1.6
82.5	0.78	0.93	1.13	1.22	1.3
82.67	0.58	0.73	0.93	1.02	1.1
82.83	0.38	0.53	0.73	0.82	0.89
83	0.07	0.23	0.43	0.51	0.59
83.17	-0.13	0.02	0.22	0.31	0.39
83.33	-0.33	-0.18	0.02	0.11	0.18
83.5	-0.53	-0.38	-0.18	-0.1	-0.02
83.67	-0.73	-0.58	-0.38	-0.3	-0.22
83.83	-0.93	-0.78	-0.59	-0.5	-0.43
84	-1.14	-0.99	-0.79	-0.7	-0.63
84.17	-1.24	-1.09	-0.89	-0.81	-0.73
84.33	-1.44	-1.29	-1.09	-1.01	-0.94
84.5	-1.54	-1.39	-1.2	-1.11	-1.04
84.67	-1.54	-1.39	-1.2	-1.12	-1.04
84.83	-1.64	-1.5	-1.3	-1.22	-1.15
85	-1.65	-1.5	-1.31	-1.23	-1.15

	2065 Water Level (mAOD)				
Time (H)	1 in 1 Year	1 in 5 Years	1 in 50 Years	1 in 100 Years	1 in 200 Years
85.17	-1.65	-1.5	-1.31	-1.23	-1.16
85.33	-1.55	-1.41	-1.22	-1.14	-1.06
85.5	-1.56	-1.41	-1.22	-1.14	-1.07

	2115 Water Level (mAOD)				
Time (H)	1 in 1 Year	1 in 5 Years	1 in 50 Years	1 in 100 Years	1 in 200 Years
75.5	0.03	0.17	0.35	0.42	0.49
75.67	0.14	0.28	0.46	0.53	0.6
75.83	0.25	0.39	0.57	0.65	0.72
76	0.35	0.49	0.68	0.76	0.83
76.17	0.46	0.6	0.79	0.87	0.94
76.33	0.67	0.81	1	1.08	1.15
76.5	0.88	1.02	1.21	1.29	1.37
76.67	0.98	1.13	1.32	1.4	1.48
76.83	1.19	1.34	1.53	1.61	1.69
77	1.4	1.54	1.74	1.82	1.9
77.17	1.6	1.75	1.95	2.03	2.11
77.33	1.81	1.96	2.16	2.24	2.32
77.5	2.01	2.16	2.36	2.45	2.53
77.67	2.22	2.37	2.57	2.66	2.74
77.83	2.42	2.58	2.78	2.87	2.94
78	2.53	2.68	2.89	2.97	3.05
78.17	2.73	2.89	3.09	3.18	3.26
78.33	2.83	2.99	3.2	3.28	3.36
78.5	2.94	3.09	3.3	3.39	3.47
78.67	2.94	3.1	3.31	3.39	3.47
78.83	3.04	3.2	3.41	3.5	3.58
79	3.05	3.2	3.41	3.5	3.58
79.17	3.15	3.31	3.52	3.61	3.68
79.33	3.15	3.31	3.52	3.61	3.69
79.5	3.15	3.31	3.52	3.61	3.69
79.67	3.15	3.31	3.52	3.61	3.69
79.83	3.15	3.31	3.52	3.61	3.69
80	3.15	3.31	3.52	3.61	3.69
80.17	3.05	3.21	3.42	3.51	3.59
80.33	3.05	3.21	3.42	3.51	3.59
80.5	2.95	3.11	3.32	3.4	3.48
80.67	2.95	3.1	3.31	3.4	3.48
80.83	2.84	3	3.21	3.3	3.38
81	2.74	2.9	3.11	3.2	3.28
81.17	2.54	2.7	2.9	2.99	3.07

	2115 Water Level (mAOD)				
Time (H)	1 in 1 Year	1 in 5 Years	1 in 50 Years	1 in 100 Years	1 in 200 Years
81.33	2.44	2.59	2.8	2.89	2.97
81.5	2.23	2.39	2.6	2.69	2.76
81.67	2.13	2.29	2.49	2.58	2.66
81.83	1.93	2.09	2.29	2.38	2.46
82	1.73	1.88	2.09	2.17	2.25
82.17	1.53	1.68	1.88	1.97	2.05
82.33	1.32	1.48	1.68	1.77	1.85
82.5	1.02	1.18	1.38	1.46	1.54
82.67	0.82	0.97	1.17	1.26	1.34
82.83	0.62	0.77	0.97	1.06	1.13
83	0.31	0.47	0.67	0.75	0.83
83.17	0.11	0.26	0.46	0.55	0.63
83.33	-0.09	0.06	0.26	0.35	0.42
83.5	-0.29	-0.14	0.06	0.14	0.22
83.67	-0.49	-0.34	-0.15	-0.06	0.01
83.83	-0.7	-0.55	-0.35	-0.26	-0.19
84	-0.9	-0.75	-0.55	-0.47	-0.39
84.17	-1	-0.85	-0.66	-0.57	-0.5
84.33	-1.2	-1.05	-0.86	-0.77	-0.7
84.5	-1.31	-1.16	-0.96	-0.88	-0.8
84.67	-1.31	-1.16	-0.97	-0.88	-0.81
84.83	-1.41	-1.27	-1.07	-0.99	-0.91
85	-1.42	-1.27	-1.08	-0.99	-0.92
85.17	-1.42	-1.27	-1.08	-1	-0.93
85.33	-1.32	-1.18	-0.99	-0.91	-0.83
85.5	-1.33	-1.19	-1	-0.91	-0.84

A.2 Wave overtopping rates for design beach profile scenarios

Design Beach Profile with Present Day Wave and Water Levels (2014)

	OT Rate (l/s/m) by Frontage					
Return Period	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
1 in 1	17	0	0	0	0	67
1 in 5	34	1	0	0	1	93
1 in 50	84	10	1	0	2	143
1 in 100	103	16	1	0	2	166
1 in 200	135	32	1	1	3	193

Design Beach Profile with Present Day Wave and Water Levels increased for sea level rise to 2065

	OT Rate (l/s/m) by Frontage					
Return Period	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
1 in 1	41	3	1	0	1	102
1 in 5	75	12	1	0	2	139
1 in 50	169	79	3	1	4	221
1 in 100	204	123	4	1	5	249
1 in 200	260	222	5	2	7	292

Design Beach Profile with Present Day Wave and Water Levels increased for sea level rise to 2115

	OT Rate (l/s/m) by Frontage					
Return Period	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
1 in 1	106	28	2	0	2	169
1 in 5	180	96	3	1	5	231
1 in 50	370	552	8	3	11	374
1 in 100	437	837	11	4	14	424
1 in 200	542	1440	14	5	19	502

A.3 Wave overtopping rates for lowest beach profile scenarios

Lowest Beach Profile with Present Day Wave and Water Levels (2014)

	OT Rate (l/s/m) by Frontage					
Return Period	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
1 in 1	17	33	3	57	84	82
1 in 5	34	75	6	78	114	108
1 in 50	84	216	13	124	179	166
1 in 100	103	275	16	139	200	185
1 in 200	135	373	20	163	232	214

Lowest Beach Profile with Present Day Wave and Water Levels increased for sea level rise to 2065

	OT Rate (l/s/m) by Frontage					
Return Period	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
1 in 1	41	94	7	86	125	118
1 in 5	75	192	12	117	169	157
1 in 50	169	485	25	187	265	244
1 in 100	204	599	30	211	298	274
1 in 200	260	783	37	247	348	319

Lowest Beach Profile with Present Day Wave and Water Levels increased for sea level rise to 2115

	OT Rate (l/s/m) by Frontage					
Return Period	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
1 in 1	106	289	16	142	204	188
1 in 5	180	527	27	195	277	254
1 in 50	370	1163	53	318	444	406
1 in 100	437	1395	63	361	503	459
1 in 200	542	1759	79	428	593	541

Annex B Model Schematic



Annex C Maps

C.1 Flood maps based on lowest beach levels


Location Plan
Legend
Model Extent
Property
1 in 1 Year Event
1 in 5 Year Event
1 in 50 Year Event
1 in 100 Year Event
1 in 200 Year Event
0.001 -1.000 m/s
1.001 -2.000 m/s
> 2.000 m/s
Scale:
1:3,200
This Map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright. Unauthorized reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings (2016). Environment Agency 100026380 (2016).
Environment Agency
ch2m
Project Name:
Sidmouth Flood Forecasting Scenarios
Map Title:
Flood Extents: 2014 Lowest Beach Sidmouth
Drawn by : Aaron Oon
Checked by : Matthew Kennedy
Revision : A
Date : 06/10/16
Print size : A3
East Pier (4)
York Steps (3)
Bedford Steps (2)
West Pier (1)
0 25 50 75 100 m
Calculated Property Damage (£)
Lowest Beach Profile with Present Day Wave and Water Levels (2014)
Q Rate (l/s/m) by Frontage
Return Period
1 in 1 Year
1 in 5 Years
1 in 50 Years
1 in 100 Years
1 in 200 Years
Event
Property Type
Cost of Damage
Flooded Prop.
AAD
Residential
Non-Residential
Total
3166810.6
19
7938124.8
36
1568722
64
1782471
69
2151434
86
677858.2
398585.8
9
7938124.8
18
1568722
48
1782471
51
2151434
56
75249.5
7155396.3
28
15192250
54
3137445
112
3564943
120
4302868
142
1430078



Event	1 in 1 Year		1 in 5 Years		1 in 50 Years		1 in 100 Years		1 in 200 Years		
Property Type	Cost of Damage	Flooded Prop.	Cost of Damage	Flooded Prop.	Cost of Damage	Flooded Prop.	Cost of Damage	Flooded Prop.	Cost of Damage	Flooded Prop.	AAD
Residential	3168106	41	7581248	63	1568722	90	1782471	95	2151434	98	1350713
Non-Residential	396585.8	21	7581248	44	1568722	58	1782471	58	2151434	61	1408272
Total	7159963	62	1516250	107	3137445	148	3564943	153	4302868	159	2758985


Location Plan
Legend
1 in 1 Year Event
1 in 5 Year Event
1 in 50 Year Event
1 in 100 Year Event
1 in 200 Year Event
Model Extent
Property
0.001 -1.000 m/s
1.001 -2.000 m/s
> 2.000 m/s
Scale:
1:3,200
This Map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright. Unauthorized reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings (2016). Environment Agency 100026380 (2016).
Environment Agency
ch2m
Project Name:
Sidmouth Flood Forecasting Scenarios
Map Title:
Flood Extents: 2115 Lowest Beach Sidmouth
Drawn by : Aaron Oon
Checked by : Matthew Kennedy
Revision : A
Date : 06/10/16
Print size : A3
East Pier (4)
York Steps (3)
Bedford Steps (2)
West Pier (1)
0 25 50 75 100 m
Calculated Property Damage (£)
Lowest Beach Profile with Present Day Wave and Water Levels (2115)
OT Flow (l/s/m) by Frontage

C.2 Flood maps based on design beach levels


Location Plan
Legend
Model Extent
Property
1 in 1 Year Event
1 in 5 Year Event
1 in 50 Year Event
1 in 100 Year Event
1 in 200 Year Event
0.001 -1.000 m/s
1.001 -2.000 m/s
> 2.000 m/s
Scale:
1:3,200
This Map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright. Unauthorized reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings (2016). Environment Agency 100026380 (2016)
Environment Agency
ch2m
Project Name:
Sidmouth Flood Forecasting Scenarios
Map Title:
Flood Extents: 2014 Lowest Beach Sidmouth
Drawn by : Aaron Oon
Checked by : Matthew Kennedy
Revision : A
Date : 06/10/16
Print size : A3
East Pier (4)
York Steps (3)
Bedford Steps (2)
West Pier (1)
0 25 50 75 100 m
Calculated Property Damage (£)
Lowest Beach Profile with Present Day Wave and Water Levels (2014)
Q Rate (l/s/m) by Frontage


Location Plan
Legend
1 in 1 Year Event
1 in 5 Year Event
1 in 50 Year Event
1 in 100 Year Event
1 in 200 Year Event
Model Extent
Property
0.001 -1.000 m/s
1.001 -2.000 m/s
> 2.000 m/s
Scale:
1:3,200
This Map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings (2016). Environment Agency 100026380 (2016)
ch2m:
Environment Agency
Project Name:
Sidmouth Flood Forecasting Scenarios
Map Title:
Flood Extents: 2065 Lowest Beach Sidmouth
Drawn by : Aaron Oon
Checked by : Matthew Kennedy
Print size : A3
Revision : A
Date : 06/10/16
East Pier (4)
York Steps (3)
Bedford Steps (2)
West Pier (1)
0 25 50 75 100 m
Calculated Property Damage (£)


Location Plan
Legend
1 in 1 Year Event
1 in 5 Year Event
1 in 50 Year Event
1 in 100 Year Event
1 in 200 Year Event
Model Extent
Property
0.001 -1.000 m/s
1.001 -2.000 m/s
> 2.000 m/s
Scale:
1:3,200
This Map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright. Unauthorized reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings (2016). Environment Agency 100026380 (2016).
Environment Agency
ch2m
Project Name:
Sidmouth Flood Forecasting Scenarios
Map Title:
Flood Extents: 2115 Lowest Beach Sidmouth
Drawn by : Aaron Oon
Checked by : Matthew Kennedy
Revision : A
Date : 06/10/16
Print size : A3
East Pier (4)
York Steps (3)
Bedford Steps (2)
West Pier (1)
0 25 50 75 100 m
Calculated Property Damage (£)
Lowest Beach Profile with Present Day Wave and Water Levels (2115)
OT Flow (l/s/m) by Frontage

Annex D Property Valuations

Property Type	Property Name/Address	Final Capping Values (£)[2]
Residential	46 YORK STREET	229499.2
Residential	32 YORK STREET	229499.2
Residential	6 GLENISLA TERRACE	229499.2
Residential	23 YORK STREET	229499.2
Residential	1 CLIFTON PLACE	
Residential	BEDFORD	
Non-Residential	LOCOMOTION 1 STATION ROAD	
Residential	13 WESTERN COURT	175949.8
Residential	5 WESTERN COURT	175949.8
Residential	19 WESTERN COURT	
Residential	12 WESTERN COURT	175949.8
Residential	6 WESTERN COURT	175949.8
Residential	1 WESTERN COURT	175949.8
Non-Residential	KINGSWOOD HOTEL	80000
Non-Residential	TASTY BAGUETTE SHOP 4 DOVE LANE	43320
Non-Residential	PAPER MOON 38 FORE STREET	29640
Non-Residential	IAN ROPER CO 37 FORE STREET	22360

[2] Blank values indicate unvalued properties as only flooded properties were valued. Values with 9999999 indicate properties where isis damage calculator already has a capping value.

Property Type	Property Name/Address	Final Capping Values (£)[2]
Non-Residential		
Non-Residential	PURE INDULGENCE 1 FORE STREET	
Non-Residential	SANTANDER UK PLC 4 FORE STREET	70520
Non-Residential	FRILLS 5 OLD FORE STREET	
Non-Residential	EASTERBROOK EATON LTD COSMOPOLITAN HOUSE	
Non-Residential	TRUMPS OF SIDMOUTH	78660
Non-Residential	HEARD & CO COSMOPOLITAN HOUSE	59340
Non-Residential	NATIONAL TRUST COSMOPOLITAN HOUSE	78660
Residential	27 MILL STREET	
Non-Residential	BEAUTY WITHIN BANWELL HOUSE	115140
Non-Residential	COUNTRY BLOOMERS 31 FORE STREET	
Non-Residential	BRITISH HEART FOUNDATION 34 FORE STREET	114000
Non-Residential	ANCHOR INN	392160
Non-Residential	H S B C	61060
Non-Residential	COATES ACCOUNTING SERVICES 37 FORE STREET	22360
Residential	5 EAST STREET	229499.2

Property Type	Property Name/Address	Final Capping Values (£)[2]
Residential	COBBERS	397797.2
Residential	4 AMYATTS TERRACE	
Residential	2 AMYATTS TERRACE	
Non-Residential	TASTE OF SIDMOUTH	96900
Residential	IVE COTTAGE	
Residential	4 CHURCH STREET	
Non-Residential	PARAGON BOOKS 38 HIGH STREET	
Non-Residential	M & CO 18-20	
Non-Residential	BROPHYS 6 HIGH STREET	
Non-Residential	Q S PLC 5 HIGH STREET	
Non-Residential	NO 1 BY DESIGN 1 THE PARADE	
Non-Residential	REGENCY CLEANERS	78660
Non-Residential	SPORTING IMAGES COSMOPOLITAN HOUSE	78660
Non-Residential	THE FILLING STATION	78660
Non-Residential	SIDMOUTH GIFTS	96900
Residential	3 AMYATTS TERRACE	
Residential	CHURCH COTTAGE	
Non-Residential	ANNIES	31920

Property Type	Property Name/Address	Final Capping Values (£)[2]
Non-Residential	GLIDDON & SON	201780
Residential	SPENCER HOUSE	
Residential	3 CHURCH STREET	
Residential	5 CHURCH STREET	
Non-Residential	CHAPTER DRAKE HOUSE	
Residential	11 CHURCH STREET	
Residential	MEWS COTTAGE	
Residential	THE MASONS	
Residential	BARTON COURT	
Non-Residential	MICHELMORES HARSTON	
Non-Residential	WILLOW TREE CAFE	
Non-Residential	MIA 7 CHURCH STREET	
Residential	GOLDIES COTTAGE	
Residential	OSBORNE COTTAGE	
Residential	BARTON COURT	
Residential	ST. PETERS COURT	229499.2
Residential	ST. PETERS COURT	229499.2
Residential	ST. PETERS COURT	229499.2
Non-Residential	SHIPTON & CO LTD 10 HIGH STREET	

Property Type	Property Name/Address	Final Capping Values (£)[2]
Non-Residential	GANESHA 3 HIGH STREET	
Non-Residential	IAN WINCHESTER & SONS 2 HIGH STREET	
Non-Residential	WILLIAM HILL BOOKMAKERS	78660
Residential	9 GLENISLA TERRACE	229499.2
Residential	3 GLENISLA TERRACE	229499.2
Residential	55 YORK STREET	229499.2
Residential	51 YORK STREET	229499.2
Residential	49 YORK STREET	229499.2
Residential	VOUSAND	298348.4
Residential	4 RIVERSIDE	
Residential	ST. PETERS COURT	229499.2
Residential	BARTON COURT	
Residential	ST. PETERS COURT	229499.2
Non-Residential	THE EDINBURGH WOOLLEN MILL LTD 3 ROYAL LONDON HOUSE	216600
Residential	BARTON COURT	
Residential	BARTON COURT	
Residential	BARTON COURT	
Residential	BEDFORD	
Non-Residential	CARDS & THINGS 2 ROYAL LONDON HOUSE	52440
Residential	2 ROYAL LONDON COURT	298348.4

Property Type	Property Name/Address	Final Capping Values (£)[2]
Residential	3 TRINITY COURT	397797.2
Residential	BARTON COURT	
Residential	KINGDOM HALL	
Residential	9 RUSSELL STREET	
Residential	7 RUSSELL STREET	
Residential	38 YORK STREET	
Residential	29 YORK STREET	229499.2
Residential	22 YORK STREET	229499.2
Residential	2 EAST STREET	229499.2
Residential	2 RUSSELL STREET	
Residential	8 RUSSELL STREET	
Residential	39 YORK STREET	
Residential	31 YORK STREET	229499.2
Residential	26 YORK STREET	152998.2
Residential	21 YORK STREET	229499.2
Residential	TRUMPS COURT	229499.2
Residential	TRUMPS COURT	229499.2
Residential	TRUMPS COURT	229499.2
Residential	TRUMPS COURT	229499.2
Residential	TRUMPS COURT	229499.2
Residential	4 GLENISLA TERRACE	229499.2
Residential	2 GLENISLA TERRACE	229499.2

Property Type	Property Name/Address	Final Capping Values (£)[2]
Residential	53 YORK STREET	175949.8
Residential	3 RIVERSIDE	
Residential	9 RIVERSIDE	
Non-Residential	GILBERT STEPHENS 36 HIGH STREET	
Non-Residential	FORD SIMEY WARWICK HOUSE 30 HIGH STREET	
Residential	50 YORK STREET	229499.2
Residential	48 YORK STREET	229499.2
Residential	1 RIVERSIDE	
Non-Residential	ABBEYFIELD SIDMOUTH SOCIETY ABBEYFIELD COURT	
Non-Residential	BROWNS WINE BAR & BISTRO	52440
Non-Residential	ROYAL LONDON TEA ROOMS ROYAL LONDON HOUSE	52440
Residential	3 ROYAL LONDON COURT	175949.8
Residential	31 TRINITY COURT	397797.2
Residential	29 TRINITY COURT	397797.2
Residential	1 TRINITY COURT	397797.2
Residential	30 TRINITY COURT	397797.2
Residential	28 TRINITY COURT	397797.2
Non-Residential		9999999
Residential	BEDFORD COURT	

Property Type	Property Name/Address	Final Capping Values (£)[2]
Non-Residential	UTOPIA 20 FORE STREET	
Non-Residential	HOLLAND & BARRETT LTD	
Residential	MEREDITH HOUSE 27 FORE STREET	
Non-Residential	SHAUL BAKERY & COFFEE SHOP 27 FORE STREET	
Non-Residential	CANCER RESEARCH UK 19 FORE STREET	
Residential	ARLINGHAM	
Residential	8 RIVERSIDE	
Non-Residential	BARCLAYS BANK PLC 40 HIGH STREET	
Non-Residential	FORD SIMEY LLP 30 HIGH STREET	
Residential	2 TRINITY COURT	397797.2
Non-Residential	SAVE THE CHILDREN 3 CHURCH STREET	
Residential	VERANDAH COTTAGE	229499.2
Residential	BEDFORD COURT	
Non-Residential	THE MARINE	410400
Non-Residential	WHOOPS A DAISY	55860
Non-Residential	SIDMOUTH SURF SHOP	63840
Non-Residential	BARNET	93480
Residential	27 TRINITY COURT	397797.2

Property Type	Property Name/Address	Final Capping Values (£)[2]
Residential	BATH HOUSE	229499.2
Non-Residential	MOCHA RESTAURANT	139080
Residential	GULLS	175949.8
Non-Residential	ALL THINGS BRIGHT & BEAUTIFUL	80940
Non-Residential	SIDMOUTH OUTDOOR CO GAINSBOROUGH HOUSE	109440
Non-Residential	BOOTS THE CHEMISTS LTD	45600
Non-Residential	RACHAELS ROSE	66120
Non-Residential	POTBURY & SON LTD 33 HIGH STREET	
Residential	WINDRUSH	
Residential	4 LAKES COURT	
Non-Residential	WEDDING & PARTY ORGANISER FITZALAN HOUSE	
Non-Residential	BATEMANS (OPTICIANS) LTD FITZALAN HOUSE	
Residential	BANWELL HOUSE	175949.8
Non-Residential	TIMPSONS SHOES 11 HIGH STREET	
Non-Residential	THE TUDOR ROSE 30 HIGH STREET	
Residential	2A	
Non-Residential	4 HOMES LTD 41974	
Residential	38A	

Property Type	Property Name/Address	Final Capping Values (£)[2]
Residential	3 RUSSELL STREET	
Residential		
Non-Residential	SWAN INN 37 YORK STREET	
Residential	33 YORK STREET	
Residential	27 YORK STREET	175949.8
Residential	4 EAST STREET	229499.2
Non-Residential	ROLEYS FUDGE BRIDGWATER HOUSE	
Residential	4 RUSSELL STREET	
Residential	34 YORK STREET	229499.2
Residential	28 YORK STREET	397797.2
Residential	25 YORK STREET	152998.2
Residential	3 EAST STREET	152998.2
Non-Residential	SIDCOM 23 FORE STREET	
Residential	5 ROYAL LONDON COURT	298348.4
Residential	WYNDHAM BUNGALOW	229499.2
Residential	YORK COTTAGE	229499.2
Non-Residential	POLKA	121980
Non-Residential	FLO & US 8 FORE STREET	45600
Residential	7 FORE STREET	175949.8
Non-Residential	MARIE CURIE CANCER CARE 5 FORE STREET	395580

Property Type	Property Name/Address	Final Capping Values (£)[2]
Non-Residential	IVOR CORAM SHOES	66120
Non-Residential	TIFFANYS BODY TONING STUDIO	66120
Residential	6 ROYAL LONDON COURT	229499.2
Residential	PORT ROYAL HOUSE	175949.8
Non-Residential		
Residential		
Residential	ROCK COTTAGE	
Non-Residential		
Non-Residential	SIDMOUTH LIFEBOAT THE LIFEBOAT STATION	
Residential		
Non-Residential	THE FORT RESTAURANT	
Non-Residential	BELMONT HOTEL	
Non-Residential		
Residential	5 AMYATTS TERRACE	
Non-Residential		
Residential	CLIFTON COTTAGE	
Residential	EBDONS MEWS COTTAGE	
Non-Residential	ASHLEIGH BISHOP GALLERY 21 FORE STREET	

Property Type	Property Name/Address	Final Capping Values (£)[2]
Residential	CAXTON HOUSE	229499.2
Non-Residential	STAG MENSWEAR 7 HIGH STREET	
Residential	LENNARDS COURT	
Residential	3 LAKES COURT	
Residential	1 LAKES COURT	
Non-Residential	SOUTH WEST ART	
Non-Residential	REGENCY HOUSE BOOKS REGENCY HOUSE	34200
Residential	6 AMYATTS TERRACE	
Non-Residential	SIDMOUTH MUSEUM	
Non-Residential	SWEET TEMPTATIONS	87780
Non-Residential	HOME HARDWARE (SIDMOUTH) LTD 22 FORE STREET	
Non-Residential	MARTIN THE NEWSAGENT LTD 16 FORE STREET	
Residential	SUNNY VIEW	175949.8
Non-Residential	PREVENTIX LADYSMITH HOUSE	
Residential	1 GLENISLA TERRACE	229499.2
Residential	35 YORK STREET	175949.8
Residential	1 RIVERSIDE	
Residential	44 YORK STREET	175949.8
Residential	36 YORK STREET	175949.8

Property Type	Property Name/Address	Final Capping Values (£)[2]
Residential	56 YORK STREET	229499.2
Residential	10 GLENISLA TERRACE	229499.2
Residential	1 EAST STREET	229499.2
Non-Residential	BLACK HORSE HOTEL 30 FORE STREET	
Non-Residential		
Residential	LENNARDS COURT	
Residential	LENNARDS COURT	
Residential	2 LAKES COURT	
Non-Residential	OLD SHIP INN	
Residential	GRENVILLE HOUSE	
Non-Residential	WHITE HORSE CAFE	
Non-Residential	RINGS OF GOLD	34200
Residential	PRIMROSE COTTAGE	
Non-Residential	NUMBER TEN 10 CHURCH STREET	
Residential	TUDOR COTTAGE	
Residential	1 TUDOR MEWS	
Residential	OSBORNE HOUSE	
Residential	2 FORE STREET	
Residential	GRENVILLE HOUSE	

Property Type	Property Name/Address	Final Capping Values (£)[2]
Non-Residential	SIDMOUTH SOFTWARE LTD SIDSOFT HOUSE 9 CHURCH STREET	
Non-Residential	EIGHTS A WISH 8 CHURCH STREET	
Non-Residential	HAYMANS 6 CHURCH STREET	
Residential	THE LITTLE PLACE	
Residential	MERTON COTTAGE	
Residential	MASONS COTTAGE	
Non-Residential	THE SECRET GARDEN 42463	26220
Non-Residential	MONDAYS CHILD FIELDS	49020
Non-Residential	NEW LOOK 39 FORE STREET	114000
Residential	24 YORK STREET	229499.2
Non-Residential	S E S DOMESTIC & COMMERCIAL STATIONERS 15 HIGH STREET	
Residential	2 CLIFTON PLACE	
Residential	29 WESTERN COURT	
Residential	BEDFORD	
Residential	14 WESTERN COURT	175949.8
Residential	20 WESTERN COURT	
Residential	11 WESTERN COURT	
Residential	1 AMYATTS TERRACE	
Residential	BEACH HOUSE	397797.2

Property Type	Property Name/Address	Final Capping Values (£)[2]
Residential	28 WESTERN COURT	
Residential	30 WESTERN COURT	
Non-Residential	JIMMY GREEN MARINE 40 FORE STREET	
Non-Residential	THE SECRET GARDEN	26220
Non-Residential	MONDAYS CHILD	49020
Non-Residential	STEAD & SIMPSON PLC 1 ROYAL LONDON HOUSE	164160
Residential	24 WESTERN COURT	
Residential	SUSSEX HOUSE	
Residential	5 CHURCH STREET	
Non-Residential	FIELDS OF SIDMOUTH LTD	1236900
Non-Residential	DEVORAN HOTEL	81618
Non-Residential	DUKES	100000
Residential	23 WESTERN COURT	
Residential	BEDFORD	
Non-Residential	THE BEDFORD HOTEL	92750
Non-Residential	GLIDDONS TOY & LEISURE CENTRE SHEFFIELD HOUSE	
Residential	KITTIWAKE	229499.2
Non-Residential	HOTEL ELIZABETH	63750

Property Type	Property Name/Address	Final Capping Values (£)[2]
Non-Residential		
Residential	3 NEW STREET	175949.8
Residential	PROSPECT COTTAGE	229499.2
Residential	WINTER GARDENS	229499.2
Non-Residential	DELDERFIELDS 15 FORE STREET	229140
Non-Residential	HOTEL RIVIERA	52500
Residential	10 WESTERN COURT	175949.8
Non-Residential	SIDMOUTH WAR MEMORIAL SERVICEMENS CLUB	
Residential	5 DOVE LANE	175949.8
Residential	THE DOVE	175949.8
Residential	20 YORK STREET	397797.2
Non-Residential	ROYAL YORK & FAULKNER HOTEL	163000
Residential	CARLTON MANSIONS	535495.6
Non-Residential	FEATHERS 9 HIGH STREET	
Non-Residential	SIDMOUTH SWIMMING POOL	140660
Residential	1 ROYAL LONDON COURT	397797.2
Non-Residential	TOURIST INFORMATION CENTRE	616740
Non-Residential	THE MARKET FISH STALL	92340
Residential	5 NEW STREET	175949.8

Property Type	Property Name/Address	Final Capping Values (£)[2]
Non-Residential	NOSH	50160
Non-Residential	PROSPECT NEWSAGENCY	45600
Non-Residential	CARINAS NITECLUB	212040
Non-Residential	PROSPECT PLAICE	109440
Non-Residential	BENNETT & ROGERS OPTICIANS LIBRA HOUSE	131100
Residential	YORK HOUSE	175949.8
Non-Residential	WYNDHAM COURT	152998.2
Residential	8 THE ESPLANADE	175949.8
Residential	SHENSTONE	
Non-Residential	OSBORNES TEA SHOP HAVANA HOUSE 9 FORE STREET	98040
Residential	YORK HOUSE	175949.8
Residential	8 THE ESPLANADE	175949.8
Residential	CARLTON MANSIONS 6 YORK STREET	152998.2
Non-Residential	SIDMOUTH SAILING & SEA ANGLING CLUB THE PORT ROYAL	109440
Residential	CONNAUGHT HOUSE	
Residential	1 RUSSELL STREET	
Residential	2 RUSSELL STREET	
Residential	CARLTON MANSIONS 5 YORK STREET	152998.2
Residential	4 CLIFTON PLACE	

Property Type	Property Name/Address	Final Capping Values (£)[2]
Residential	THE BEACON	
Non-Residential	SIDMOUTH CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH	62920
Non-Residential	HIGH HO SILVER	5700
Non-Residential	EAST DEVON ART	5700
Non-Residential		
Non-Residential		
Non-Residential		9999999
Non-Residential		
Non-Residential		
Non-Residential		
Non-Residential		
Non-Residential		
Non-Residential		
Non-Residential		
Non-Residential		9999999
Non-Residential		
Non-Residential		

Property Type	Property Name/Address	Final Capping Values (£)[2]
Non-Residential		9999999
Residential	THE GABLES	
Residential	4 ROYAL LONDON COURT	298348.4
Residential	28 MILL STREET	
Residential	8 GLENISLA TERRACE	229499.2
Residential	5 GLENISLA TERRACE	229499.2
Residential	7 GLENISLA TERRACE	229499.2
Residential	4 RIVERSIDE	
Residential	5 RUSSELL STREET	
Residential	3 WEIRFIELD FLATS	175949.8
Residential	1 WEIRFIELD FLATS	175949.8
Residential	47 YORK STREET	229499.2
Residential	HOLMES COURT	
Residential	52 YORK STREET	229499.2
Residential	ROSEDALE	397797.2
Residential	2 RIVERSIDE	
Residential	45 YORK STREET	229499.2
Residential	5 WEIRFIELD FLATS	175949.8
Non-Residential	PAWLYNS	
Non-Residential	FITZALAN GEMS FITZALAN HOUSE	
Non-Residential	AZURE GALLERY	

Property Type	Property Name/Address	Final Capping Values (£)[2]
Residential	5 RIVERSIDE	
Residential	1 RUSSELL STREET	
Residential	5 RIVERSIDE	
Residential	30 YORK STREET	229499.2
Residential	6 RUSSELL STREET	
Residential	54 YORK STREET	229499.2
Non-Residential	BRIDGE HOUSE WINES 29 FORE STREET	
Residential	CORMORANT COTTAGE	
Residential	CURLEW COTTAGE	
Non-Residential	THE WORKS 18 FORE STREET	
Non-Residential	A J MOUNTSTEPHEN COUNTY HOUSE	192660
Residential	DOVE HOUSE	229499.2
Non-Residential	DRIFTWOOD LIBRA COURT	22800
Residential	LIBRA COURT	175949.8
Non-Residential	SELLEY'S COFFEE SHOP LIBRA COURT	22800
Residential	ASHCOMBE HOUSE	
Residential	6 RIVERSIDE	
Residential	3 RIVERSIDE	
Residential	2 RIVERSIDE	
Residential	7 RIVERSIDE	

Property Type	Property Name/Address	Final Capping Values (£)[2]
Non-Residential	CLOCKTOWER CAFE	

PAGE LEFT BLANK FOR DOUBLE SIDED PRINTING

Appendix B Cliff Road Property Valuation Data

Property	Valuations provide by Fulfords Estate Agents (Sidmouth), 9th July 2015	
	VALUE WITH EROSION	VALUE WITHOUT EROSION
Overthorpe	£ 375,000.00	£ 575,000.00
Shimoda	£ 500,000.00	£ 725,000.00
Uplands	£ 550,000.00	£ 795,000.00
Derby Cottage	£ 500,000.00	£ 725,000.00
Cliffe Cottage	£ 450,000.00	£ 650,000.00
Kenmore House	£ 525,000.00	£ 750,000.00
The Mynd / The Folly	£ 550,000.00	£ 795,000.00
Southernhay	£ 700,000.00	£ 1,000,000.00
Anthony / Seafield	£ 420,000.00	£ 600,000.00
Southerly	£ 385,000.00	£ 550,000.00
Longwood	£ 500,000.00	£ 650,000.00