



## How is flood risk managed by the Scottish Borders Council?

- proactive and risk based process for assessing flood risk.
- the Tweed Local Plan District.
- inform the management of flood risk in each community.

## Which communities are being assessed?

- **Peebles**, Broughton & Innerleithen
- Newcastleton
- Earlston

## How will Flood Protection Schemes be prioritised?

- SEPA will prioritise nationally where funding should be allocated.
- The reports and findings of our study will inform this process.

Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009

# **Borders Flood Studies**

• The Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009 aims to prioritise flood mitigation across Scotland using a

• This approach led to the preparation of SEPA's Flood Risk Management Strategies by SEPA and the Tweed Local Flood Risk Management Plan developed by the Scottish Borders Council as the Lead Local Authority for

• These plans identified specific communities as being at risk and in need of a detailed flood study to help

Potentially Vulnerable Areas

Flood Risk Management Strategy and Local Flood Risk Management Plan (2016)

National Flood Risk Assessment (2011)



consultin

Borders Flood Studies (2017-18)

Scheme considered against national priorities (2018/19)





## 1) Develop better understanding of flood risk in the community

- Create, update or develop new/existing flood model information;
- Determine existing flood risk;
- Develop improved flood mapping;

## 2) Develop recommendations for management of flood risk

- Develop a range of options to manage flood risk, including structural and non-structural options;
- Appraise actions to manage flood risk (consider the pros and cons and economic viability for all proposed options);
- Recommend options for the future management of flood risk;

## 3) Select a preferred approach to manage flood risk in each community and identify recommendations that the Council will take forward

- SEPA will prioritise nationally where funding should be allocated;
- The reports and findings of our study will inform this process.

## 4) Engage partners and stakeholders

**Today's consultation.** •

# What are the study objectives?

Why choose a 200 year standard of protection? • Scottish Planning Policy requires new build properties to have a 200 year standard of protection • This standard is accepted as low risk by the flood insurance companies. A higher standard of protection will mean the scheme will be considered more favourably by SEPA's scheme prioritisation making funding more likely

## Μ MOTT MACDONALD

JBA

consulting









Flood Review

Topographic surveys





Hydrology

Modelling



## Properties at risk



Options Appraisal

## What has been done so far?



Asset inspections



The models developed form a basis for assessing future flood levels, flood mitigation options, detailed design of schemes and the costs to deliver.



## Flood Mapping

**Cost-Benefit** 

### **Return periods and annual probabilities**

- When a river floods the severity of the flood is known as a 1 in x year flood. This event occurring in any year.
- For reference, the December 2015 event
- This does not mean that the flood will occur and again next week, or not for another 200 will occur once every 55 years.
- For example, there is a 1 in 100 (or 1%) chance of a flood exceeding the 100 year flood in any one year.



The studies aim to better assess current flood risks in

terminology represents the probability of that

(Storm Frank) on the River Tweed in Peebles had a 1 in 55 chance of occurring in any year. once every 55 years; it could occur tomorrow years. But on average a flood of that severity





Peebles is at flood risk from the River Tweed, Edderston Burn, Eddleston Water, Soonhope Burn and Haystoun Burn. Each of the watercourses has its own mechanism of flood risk and the individual watercourses were therefore studied independently. The River Tweed is the largest of the assessed watercourses with a catchment area of 700km<sup>2</sup> followed by the Eddleston Water (70km<sup>2</sup>), Haystoun Burn (23km<sup>2</sup>), Soonhope Burn (9.5km<sup>2</sup>) and finally the Edderston Burn with a catchment area of under 2km<sup>2</sup>. Some of the watercourses such as the Eddleston Water and the River Tweed have a long history of flooding whereas others have little available flood history.







The Edderston Burn is a small burn in Peebles flowing north into the River Tweed with a catchment area of 1.6 km<sup>2</sup>. It consists of two main tributaries which combine to form the main Edderston Burn channel approximately 600 m upstream of its confluence with the River Tweed. As part of the South Parks Flood Prevention Scheme (FPS) in 1988 a diversion channel was built to divert flows from the west tributary of the Edderston Burn to drain directly into the River Tweed via a culvert under South Parks Road. The diversion channel consists of an overflow structure, a re-graded drainage channel and culvert extending from South Parks Road to the outfall at the River Tweed. The figures below show the length of modelled channel and the full catchment area.



## **Catchment and watercourse**





## Flood mapping – Edderston Burn



Prop

Resi Com

### How do we create these flood maps?

### What do the maps show?



erty Type	Number at Risk (1 in 200 year flood)	
dential	38	
mercial	1	

A physical survey captured the measurements of river channels, banks and structures along each watercourse.

These measurements were input to a computer model, along with calculated river flows for a range of storm events.

This model produced a flood level which was then applied to a 3D representation of the land surface and buildings. The outcome resulted in a detailed flood map of river flooding in South Parks

The mapping indicates the predicted flooding for a given flood magnitude. The 1 in 10 year map shows what is expected to be inundated for a flood that is likely to occur once every 10 years (or with a probability of 10% in any one year).

The 1 in 200 year represents a flood event with a probability of 0.5% in any year.



## Flood mechanisms & key constraints on the Edderston Burn

Out of bank flow paths, key structures and constraints were identified. Water backing up behind bridges and culverts is the main source of flooding for South Parks. Flood water flowpaths have been identified on Edderston Ridge and South Parks Road with water also expected to flow into the low lying residential streets of South Park Crescent and South Park Drive.







## Complex out of bank flows

Key control structures





## Structures that constrain flows





JBA

Has this flow mechanism been seen before? The only known flooding from the Edderston Burn in recent times occurred along South Parks Road due to blockage of the double barrel culvert and resulted in flooding of properties on South Park Drive and Caledonian Road.



# **Edderston Burn Options appraisal** – Long list of options

The process for selecting options assesses a wide range of possible options, which are narrowed down to a short list according to whether the options are technically, environmentally and socially acceptable. Those that are short listed are shown in the following posters. The full list of options assessed is provided below.

- in South Parks.
- **Resilience Measures** Unlikely to be economically or socially viable.
- •

• **Relocation** - Relocation or abandonment of properties is not usually socially or politically acceptable. • Flood Warning – The existing level gauge on the Edderston Burn could be calibrated to a send flood alerts. • Resistance Measures – Property level protection is well suited to defend against shallow flood depths experienced

**Diversion channel –** There is potential to install a diversion channel on the western branch of the Edderston Burn. • Watercourse Maintenance – The Council should continue the scheduled maintenance regime. • **Demountable Defences** – A permanent wall is more suitable due to limited warning time. • Storage – Online storage could be built at the confluence of the Edderston Burn's east and west tributary. Natural Flood Management – NFM opportunities throughout the Edderston Burn catchment have been identified. • Structure Modification – Bridges or culverts restrict flow on both watercourses which contributes to flood risk but removing the bridge or upgrading the culvert is not sufficient to prevent flooding by itself. • **Direct Defences** – A combination of walls could contribute to containing flow in the watercourse. • Channel Modification – Channel deepening or widening could contribute to containing the flow in the channel.

## Least desirable options **Good practice and partial solutions** Most desirable options







## **Prerequisites to formal flood protection** scheme

### **Diversion channel improvements**

- Remove two small bridges on the existing diversion channel.
- Improve the way in which the diversion culvert wingwall ties into the embankment.
- Clean the diversion structure of sediment and keep erosion damage to a minimum downstream of the structure.

### **Edderston Burn channel improvements**

- Clean culvert of sediment
- Remove or upgrade culvert screen
- Remove weir upstream of culvert
- Remove small bridges on approach to Edderston Burn culvert



**Bridge and weir on approach** to Edderston Burn Culvert



# Edderston Burn – Quick wins



### **Diversion channel wingwall** tie-in

**Bridge on diversion channel** 



**Bridge on diversion** channel





### **Screen on Edderston Burn culvert**



### Diversion structure



## **Edderston Burn – Short Listed** Options

### **Option 1: Property Level Protection (PLP)**

- Automatic PLP installed on 38 out of 39 properties at flood risk to protect against the 1 in 200 year flood event. PLP would involve surveying each property to identify water entry points and recommending appropriate products such as self-sealing doors and air vents as well as non-return valves on plumbing.
- Estimated cost £1.8m
- Estimated damage avoided £2.5m



**Typical examples of PLP** 

## **Option 2: Online flood storage**

- This option provides a 200 year standard of protection by storing large flows and releasing them at a controlled rate.
- Wall heights of up to 1.3m at street level.
- Adaptation to climate change could be via culvert
- Estimated cost £1.1m
- Estimated damage avoided £3.2m

See adjacent technical drawings for further details for these options



**Typical example of on-line storage** 



replacement or enlargement of the storage area.



## **Edderston Burn – Short Listed** Options

### **Option 3a: Culvert upgrade with bed lowering**

- Increase the diameter of the Diversion Channel culvert and the Edderston Burn culvert under South Parks.
- Lower the channel bed of both watercourses on approach to the culverts.
- Climate change could be catered for by sizing the culverts appropriately and increasing bed depth appropriately.
- Estimated cost £2.0 m
- Estimated damage avoided £3.2 m

## **Option 3b: Culvert upgrade with channel widening**

- Increase the diameter of the Diversion Channel culvert and the Edderston Burn culvert under South Parks.
- Increase the channel width by 2.5m and 3.5m respectively to increase channel conveyance.
- Estimated cost £3.5m
- Estimated damage avoided £3.2m

## **Option 3c: Culvert upgrade with flood walls**

- Increase the diameter of the Diversion Channel culvert and the Edderston Burn culvert under South Parks.
- Construct low walls approximately half a metre high along each channel at key locations.
- Estimated cost £2.3m
- Estimated damage avoided £3.2m





**Typical example** of a new culvert







**Typical example of channel** widening





### **Typical example of channel** deepening

## See adjacent technical drawings for further details for these options

**Typical example of a flood wall Image compliments of Flood Control International** 

![](_page_11_Picture_0.jpeg)

## **Edderston Burn – Short Listed** Options

## **Option 4: Bypass Channel**

- A meandering bypass channel could be constructed to carry excess flow from the western tributary into the River Tweed.
- The existing diversion channel could be abandoned since it does not reduce flows on the eastern tributary so some flood risk remains.
- Estimated cost £1.1 m
- Estimated damage avoided £3.1m

![](_page_11_Picture_7.jpeg)

**Typical example of a bypass channel** 

![](_page_11_Figure_12.jpeg)

Contains Ordnance Survey data copyright (c) crown copyright and database right 2018 (100023423)

See adjacent technical drawings for further details for these options

![](_page_11_Picture_15.jpeg)

JBA

![](_page_12_Picture_0.jpeg)

## **Option 1 – Property Level** Protection

PLP is the last form of defence before water gets into a property. Automatic PLP measures mean that the property is always protected by, for example, watertight doors rather than having to insert waterproof door guards when floods are forecast. PLP can protect 38 out of 39 properties in South Parks up to the 1 in 200 year flood event.

The standard of protection (SOP) map indicates the existing level of protection each property in the flood study has.

![](_page_12_Picture_4.jpeg)

**Examples of how Property Level Protection can** mitigate the risks of flood inundation (image courtesy of Whitehouse Construction Co. Ltd)

![](_page_12_Figure_8.jpeg)

protection for each property in the flood study.

![](_page_12_Picture_11.jpeg)

JBA

Reproduced by permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of HMSO. © Crown Copyright and database right 2018. Ordnance Survey Licence number 100023423.

## The standard of protection (SOP) map indicates the existing level of

![](_page_13_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_13_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Figure_0.jpeg)

Option 2: 200 Year Standard of Protection **Edderston Burn Online** Flood Storage

Option Summary: Online flood storage area located at the confluence of the east and west tributary of the Edderston Burn. This option requires the modification of the diversion structure to limit the flow into the diversion channel. A sub-option would be to provide a smaller storage area and complement this with a bypass channel or upgrading of the Edderston Burn Culvert. LEGEND EXISTING GROUND LEVEL FINISHED GROUND 200 YEAR FLOOD LEVEL CONCRETE FLOOD WALL EXISTING WATERCOURSE STORAGE AREA Comments Rev.: Date Drawn Designed Checked Approved Client Approval A - Approved B - Approved with Revisions C - Do Not Use Purpose of Issue Status S1 Suitable for Coordination Unit 2.1 Quantum Court Research Avenue South Heriot Watt University JBA Edinburgh EH14 4AP United Kingdom www.jbaconsulting.com t +44 (0)131 3192940 f +44 (0)845 8627772 e info@jbaconsulting.com Offices at Coleshill, Doncaster, Edinburgh, Exeter, Glasgow, Haywards Heath, Isle of Man, Leeds, Limerick, Newcastle upon Tyne, Newport, Peterborough, Saltaire, Skipton, Tadcaster, Thirsk, Wallingford and Warringtor Project **Borders Flood Studies** Title Peebles Edderston Burn: Option 2 (200 Year SoP) Online Flood Storage — for — Client Scottish Μ Μ MOTT MACDONALD The property of this drawing and design vested in Jeremy Benn Associates Ltd. It shall not be reproduced in whole or in part, nor disclosed to a third party, without the prior written consent of Jeremy Benn Associates Ltd. 29/06/18 Drawn: A.Coad Scale Designed: J Garrett 28/06/18 As Shown @ A1 Checked: A Pettit 17/07/18 Approved: Project Number: 2017s5526 Revision Drawing Number AEM-JBAU-PB-EB-IM-C-1500 P02

![](_page_15_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Figure_0.jpeg)

Peebles **Option 3C: South Parks** 200 Year Standard of RIVER TWEED Protection Culvert Upgrade WEIR With Direct Defences EXISTING TWIN CULVERT APPROX. 95m LONG TO BE UPGRADED TO SINGLE BOX CULVERT **GROUND LEVEL** NEW WALL APPROX. 0.5m HIGH AND APPROX. 30m IN LENGTH **SECTION A-A DIVERSION CULVERT TYPICAL SECTION** 1:20 0.5m HIGH FLOOD WALL WITH STEEL RAILINGS ON TOP 200 YEAR WATER LEVEL SECTION C-C 1:50 0.5m HIGH FLOOD WALL WITH -STEEL RAILINGS ON TOP 200 YEAR WATER LEVEL SECTION E-E 1:50

![](_page_17_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_0.jpeg)

**Preferred Option for Edderston Burn** 

Option (Standard of protection)	Properties protected	Environmental implications	Working with natural processes	Constraints/ limitations	Mitigating residual risks	Improved public awareness	Best use of public money	Wider benefits
Property level protection (PLP) (0.5% AP - 200 year)	38	No impact	Natural Flood Management Measures have been identified and, subject to further investigation, could be incorporated within the scheme to provide additional benefits.	Intrusive into people's homes, will require reinstallation every 25 years. Some flood damages are associated with each flood event, as well as clean up cost. Roads and gardens are not protected.	All bar one property could be protected by PLP. A single property will experience flood depths in excess of what PLP can provide. Installing PLP to an additional three properties will protect properties up to the 200 year plus climate change event.	Option should be presented to public for comment. Signage relating to flooding and sand bag stores and work with South Parks residents alongside Resilient Communities programme. Installation of a flow gauge on the Edderston Burn for flood warning, calibration and flow estimates.	Second highest benefit cost ratio options. Benefit cost ratio (BCR) 3.1	None
Online Storage (0.5% AP - 200 year)	39	Implications for RBMP. Some impediment to movement of sediment and fauna but could be designed to minimise this.	Natural Flood Management Measures have been identified and, subject to further investigation, could be incorporated within the scheme to provide additional benefits. Further modelling and discussions with	Wall heights above bank are approximately 1.3m at street level so should not be too much of a visual impact. It requires land from peoples gardens.	Wall height would increase too much to accommodate 200 year climate change flows, but it may be possible to excavate into the hill, continue to utilise the existing diversion channel or increase the pass forward rate and protect those properties left exposed to risk as a result of the higher pass forward flow.		Highest benefit cost ratio of defended options. BCR 3.3	Could be designed to hold some water to increase the amenity value, additional storage capacity would need to be found elsewhere.
Culvert Upgrade – Channel Deepening (0.5% AP - 200 year)	39	Temporary loss of habitat during construction. Shall be undertaken at appropriate time of year. Culverts can be designed to hold a layer of sediment to simulate a more natural river bed and allow for easier movement of river fauna	landowners are required to determine the most appropriate measures and locations for these works and the benefits they may provide. Surface water from the south and south west will be caught and contained by the watercourses Natural	Land take and bridge removal required. Replacement of culverts shall be disruptive to the community for access and noise.	Channel could be made larger now to accommodate further increase in flows. Culverts already designed for the 200 year plus climate change flow.		BCR 1.6	None

Negative

Neutral

Positive

![](_page_19_Picture_7.jpeg)

JBA

consulting

![](_page_20_Picture_0.jpeg)

## **Preferred Option for Edderston Burn**

## Summary of short listed options (Page 2 of 2)

	<i>y</i> ••• ••••			<i>j</i> = = : = <i>j</i>				
Option (Standard of protection)	Properties protected	Environmental implications	Working with natural processes	Constraints/ limitations	Mitigating residual risks	Improved public awareness	Best use of public money	Wider benefits
Culvert Upgrade – Channel Widening (0.5% AP - 200 year)	39	Disruption caused to existing channel however new more naturalised channel will be created. Culverts can be designed to hold a layer of sediment to simulate a more natural river bed and allow for easier movement of river fauna	<ul> <li>Flood Management Measures have been identified and, subject to further investigation, could be incorporated within the scheme to provide additional benefits.</li> <li>Further modelling and discussions with landowners are required to</li> </ul>			Option should be presented to public for comment. Signage relating to flooding and sand bag stores and work with South Parks residents	BCR 0.9	
Culvert Upgrade – Direct defences (0.5% AP - 200 year))	39	Minimal in-channel works.	determine the most appropriate measures and locations for these works and the benefits they may provide. Surface water from the south and south west will be caught and contained by the watercourses	Walls are low so visual impact will be minimal. Replacement of culverts shall be disruptive to the community for access and noise.	Walls could be built higher now with only a small increase in height. Culverts already designed for the 200 year plus climate change flow.	alongside Resilient Communities programme. Installation of a flow gauge on the Edderston Burn for flood warning, calibration and flow estimates.	BCR 1.4	
Secondary Diversion Channel	37	New naturalised river channel and rock pools created.		Land purchase agreement required. The land is steep on approach to the River Tweed so a stepped rock pools will be required. <u>The majority of</u> construction work will be carried out outwith the urban area of South Parks so there should be minimal disturbance to residence.	Channel widening is an easy way to create additional capacity in the future or could be built larger now, however, there is no reduction on flows from the eastern culvert which will cause problems with climate change applied to the flows.		BCR 2.7	Possible scope to improve biodiversity and amenity value through careful design of diversion channel.
Diversion Channel and Online Storage hybrid	39	Some increase in river pressure under RBMP classification as reservoir will act as impendment sediment and fauna.			Can easily be designed to accommodate future flood flows.		Between 1.4 and 2.2	Could be designed to hold some water to increase the amenity value.

Negative Neutral Preferred Options and recommendations The preferred option for South Parks is a hybrid of the bypass channel and the online storage option. This could be implemented alongside natural flood management.

![](_page_20_Picture_5.jpeg)

Positive

![](_page_21_Picture_0.jpeg)

## What can we do in terms of natural flood management?

## What is natural flood management?

Natural flood management (NFM) is when natural processes are used to reduce the risk of flooding by slowing flows and storing water within the catchment. It is however difficult to quantify the reduction in flow that these types of measures can deliver. NFM also offers additional wider benefits by restoring habitats and improving water quality.

NFM opportunities were first identified by examination of aerial photography and were confirmed with a site visit at sample locations. The NFM measures which have been proposed for the Edderston Burn

catchment include:

- Blockage of highly straightened field drainage in the upper catchment.
- Wetland creation in the upper catchment.
- Increase riparian vegetation above South Parks with 5m buffer strips.

The Council will need to investigate the potential benefits before working with other parties on developing these options further.

![](_page_21_Picture_10.jpeg)

**Typical example of in**channel debris barrier

![](_page_21_Picture_12.jpeg)

Typical example of riparian planting

### Location and type of measures suggested for the Edderston Burn catchment

![](_page_21_Figure_19.jpeg)

Contains Ordnance Survey data (C) Crown copyright and database rights (2017) Ordnance Survey (100023423)

![](_page_21_Picture_21.jpeg)

Typical example of a wetland creation

![](_page_21_Picture_23.jpeg)

JBA

![](_page_22_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Picture_1.jpeg)

## The following sets out the Council wide steps required to progress preferred options to a Flood Protection Scheme

Option appraisal and first round of public consultation

• October/November 2018

Schemes prioritised for 2021 FRM cycle

Scheme approval by Council, stakeholders

and public

## These posters and further information are available at: <u>www.bordersfloodstudies.com</u>

SBC Council review and decision to enact preferred options

• January 2019

![](_page_22_Picture_11.jpeg)

Selected Flood **Protection Schemes** taken forward to outline design stage

• 18 months

Further consultation on outline design

![](_page_22_Picture_15.jpeg)

Issue proposed and selected schemes to SEPA for prioritisation

• December 2019

Carry out detailed design of flood protection measures

![](_page_22_Picture_19.jpeg)

Produce tender documents and procure contractor

![](_page_22_Picture_21.jpeg)