

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON

Modelling the Effects of Climate Change  
and Sea Level Rise on the Evolution of  
Incised Coastal Gullies.

by

Christopher Hackney

A thesis submitted for the  
degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

in the  
Faculty of Social and Human Sciences  
Geography and Environment

Supervisors:  
Stephen E. Darby and Julian Leyland

March 2013



UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON

ABSTRACT

FACULTY OF SOCIAL AND HUMAN SCIENCES

GEOGRAPHY AND ENVIRONMENT

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

**Modelling the Effects of Climate Change and Sea Level Rise on the Evolution of Incised Coastal Gullies.**

by Christopher Hackney

Under projections of future (next ~100 years) anthropogenic climate change, it is predicted that marked changes in environmental driving conditions, with relation to baseline (1961 - 1990) climates, will be experienced. Such changes have the potential to induce substantial geomorphological and ecological change. Numerical models of landscape evolution provide powerful tools to assess the impacts that environmental changes may have on landscape morphology. Accordingly, this research seeks to utilise landscape evolution models (LEMs) to understand how projected changes in climate will affect the geomorphic response of a series of incised coastal gullies found on the Isle of Wight, UK. Incised coastal gullies are known to be dynamic and sensitive landscape features which intersect the terrestrial - marine boundary; as such their evolution is influenced by changes in both terrestrial (i.e. precipitation) and maritime (i.e. sea level and wave height) climates. In order to ensure the processes driving incised coastal gully evolution are represented within the LEM, an existing LEM was modified to include processes of soft cliff erosion. This represents the first such inclusion of coastal processes within a LEM framework. The modified LEM was forced with ensemble projections of precipitation, sea level and wave height downscaled from HadCM3 and CGCM2 Global Climate Model (GCM) outputs for two emissions scenarios (A2 and B2). Comparison against a baseline scenario based on the 1961-1990 climatology allows for climate induced changes in system response to be quantified. To constrain the uncertainties associated with the application of landscape models and downscaled GCM data, a Monte Carlo analysis framework is employed, resulting in ~22000 model runs. This method also permits the development of probabilistic results describing geomorphological change in gully systems. Results suggest that the likelihood of extreme loss in gully extent will increase by up to 61%. Furthermore, it is projected that extreme rates of coastal erosion will increase by 22% by 2100 (under HadCM3 runs forced with the A2 emissions scenario). However, under certain scenarios the possibility of extension of the gully systems exists, with *likely* (>66% probability) increases in gully length of 13.7 m projected under CGCM2 runs forced with the A2 emissions scenario. The novel application of a Monte Carlo methodology with a LEM framework permits the identification of key climatic parameters responsible for causing extreme changes within these gully systems, allowing the relative importance of each climate parameter in driving incised coastal gully evolution to be assessed. Furthermore, the successful application of this technique suggests it may be applicable to other studies applying LEMs to scenarios of future climate change.



# Contents

<b>Table of Contents</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>List of Figures</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>List of Tables</b>	<b>xix</b>
<b>Declaration of Authorship</b>	<b>xxi</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>xxiii</b>
<b>1 Landscape Response to Climate Change</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1 The importance of climate change in landscape evolution . . . . .	3
1.2 Modelling the effects of changing climate on landscape evolution . . . . .	4
1.3 Gullies as sensitive indicators of climate change . . . . .	5
1.4 Incised coastal gullies . . . . .	7
1.4.1 The Chines of the Isle of Wight . . . . .	8
1.5 Aims of this research . . . . .	10
1.6 Thesis layout . . . . .	11
<b>2 Modelling the processes of incised coastal gully evolution</b>	<b>13</b>
2.1 The state of knowledge regarding incised coastal gullies . . . . .	13
2.1.1 The formation of the Isle of Wight Chines . . . . .	14
2.1.2 Conceptualisation of incised coastal gully evolution . . . . .	16
2.1.3 Identifying the key mechanisms of incised coastal gully evolution . . . . .	17
2.2 The key processes of incised coastal gully evolution . . . . .	18
2.2.1 Cliff Retreat . . . . .	18
2.2.1.1 Waves . . . . .	20
2.2.1.2 Storms . . . . .	24
2.2.1.3 Sea level rise . . . . .	26
2.2.1.4 Summary . . . . .	27
2.2.2 Bedrock incision and knickpoint erosion . . . . .	28
2.2.3 Non-linear process of gully and cliff erosion . . . . .	31
2.3 Drivers of future changes in incised coastal gully processes . . . . .	32
2.4 Modelling landscape evolution: Theory and available models . . . . .	35
2.4.1 Continuity of mass . . . . .	37
2.4.2 Geomorphic transport functions . . . . .	38
2.4.3 Flow routing algorithms . . . . .	40
2.4.4 Numerical solutions to time-step iterations . . . . .	42
2.4.5 Using LEMs to model future landscape evolution . . . . .	43

2.4.6	Reviews of Landscape Evolution Models . . . . .	46
2.4.6.1	Cellular-Automata Evolutionary Slope and River (CAE-SAR) model . . . . .	46
2.4.6.2	Channel-Hillslope Integrated Landscape Development (CHILD) model . . . . .	48
2.4.6.3	Geomorphic/Orogenic Landscape Evolution Model (GOLEM) . . . . .	49
2.4.6.4	The SIBERIA landscape evolution model . . . . .	51
2.4.6.5	Summary of model reviews . . . . .	51
2.4.7	Modelling cliff erosion . . . . .	52
2.4.8	Linking terrestrial and coastal landscape evolution models . . . . .	56
2.5	Conclusion . . . . .	57
<b>3</b>	<b>A new process-based model of soft cliff erosion</b>	<b>61</b>
3.1	Introduction . . . . .	61
3.2	Model development . . . . .	63
3.3	Study sites . . . . .	67
3.3.1	South west Isle of Wight . . . . .	67
3.3.2	Suffolk coast . . . . .	71
3.3.3	Birling Gap . . . . .	72
3.4	Methodology . . . . .	72
3.4.1	Wave energy regimes . . . . .	72
3.4.2	Sea level data . . . . .	79
3.4.3	Quantifying rates of coastal erosion . . . . .	80
3.4.3.1	Isle of Wight . . . . .	80
3.4.3.2	The Suffolk coast . . . . .	82
3.4.3.3	Birling Gap . . . . .	83
3.5	Results . . . . .	84
3.5.1	South west Isle of Wight . . . . .	84
3.5.2	Suffolk coast . . . . .	88
3.5.3	Birling Gap . . . . .	90
3.6	Discussion . . . . .	91
3.7	Limitations . . . . .	96
3.8	Conclusion . . . . .	96
<b>4</b>	<b>An integrated terrestrial-marine landscape evolution model</b>	<b>99</b>
4.1	The Channel Hillslope-Integrated Landform Development Model (CHILD) . . . . .	99
4.1.1	Spatial framework . . . . .	100
4.1.2	Continuity of mass . . . . .	101
4.1.3	Temporal framework . . . . .	102
4.1.4	Process representation . . . . .	103
4.1.4.1	Hillslope transport . . . . .	103
4.1.4.2	Fluvial erosion . . . . .	104
4.1.4.2.1	Transport limited erosion . . . . .	104
4.1.4.2.2	Detachment limited erosion . . . . .	107
4.2	Modelling coastal erosion in a landscape evolution model . . . . .	109
4.2.1	Cliff retreat code verification . . . . .	111
4.3	Validation of the cliff retreat module . . . . .	112
4.3.1	Parameterisation of MT-CHILD . . . . .	113

4.3.1.1	Alluvial erosion . . . . .	113
4.3.1.2	Bedrock erosion . . . . .	114
4.3.1.3	Hillslope processes . . . . .	115
4.3.2	Sherpherds Chine simulation . . . . .	115
4.3.2.1	Deriving historical landscapes and shoreline positions . . . . .	117
4.3.2.2	Developing historical daily rainfall data . . . . .	118
4.3.2.3	Developing historical wave climate data . . . . .	123
4.3.2.4	Developing historical sea level data . . . . .	128
4.3.3	Results and discussion . . . . .	130
4.4	Conclusion . . . . .	143
<b>5</b>	<b>Generating future climate change projections for local scale impact assessment</b>	<b>145</b>
5.1	Introduction . . . . .	146
5.1.1	Observed and future projections of climate change . . . . .	146
5.1.2	SRES emissions scenarios . . . . .	148
5.1.3	Selection of Global Climate Model(s) . . . . .	150
5.2	Downscaling to usable spatial and temporal scales . . . . .	155
5.2.1	Statistical downscaling . . . . .	155
5.2.2	Dynamical downscaling . . . . .	158
5.2.3	Downscaling extremes in climate . . . . .	159
5.2.4	Summary of downscaling techniques . . . . .	159
5.3	The Statistical DownScaling Model . . . . .	160
5.4	Generation of future climate projections for the Isle of Wight . . . . .	163
5.4.1	Data . . . . .	163
5.4.2	SDSM Calibration . . . . .	165
5.4.2.1	Rainfall . . . . .	165
5.4.2.2	Sea level . . . . .	166
5.4.2.3	Wave height . . . . .	168
5.4.3	Downscaled future projections of precipitation, sea level and wave height . . . . .	170
5.5	Refinement of climate projections: Monte Carlo simulation . . . . .	174
5.5.1	Application to the modelling framework . . . . .	178
5.6	Conclusion . . . . .	179
<b>6</b>	<b>The morphodynamic response of incised coastal gullies to future changes in climate</b>	<b>183</b>
6.1	Model set-up . . . . .	184
6.1.1	Selection of study catchment . . . . .	184
6.1.2	Grange/Marsh Chine . . . . .	184
6.1.3	Parameterisation of MT-CHILD . . . . .	187
6.1.4	Climate input files . . . . .	187
6.2	Probabilistic projections of gully morphometry under scenario of future climate change . . . . .	188
6.2.1	Coastal erosion . . . . .	189
6.2.2	Change in gully extent . . . . .	193
6.2.3	Gully mouth elevation . . . . .	194
6.2.4	Gully area . . . . .	196

6.3	Drivers of change in gully morphometry . . . . .	197
6.4	Trajectories of change in gully extent over the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century . . . . .	203
6.5	Discussion . . . . .	210
6.5.1	Large scale changes in gully morphometry . . . . .	210
6.5.2	Climatic controls of gully morphodynamics . . . . .	213
6.6	Conclusion . . . . .	216
<b>7</b>	<b>Synthesis and conclusions</b>	<b>219</b>
7.1	Synthesis of key findings . . . . .	219
7.1.1	A new process-based model of soft-cliff erosion . . . . .	220
7.1.2	The coupled terrestrial-marine landscape evolution model . . . . .	221
7.1.3	Projections of future climate change . . . . .	222
7.1.4	The morphodynamic response of incised coastal gullies to changes in climate . . . . .	223
7.2	The wider implications of this research . . . . .	224
7.2.1	Application of results to other incised coastal gully systems . . . . .	224
7.2.2	The development of tools capable of modelling terrestrial-coastal process interaction . . . . .	228
7.2.3	Gully response to climate change . . . . .	229
7.2.4	Implications for management practices . . . . .	230
7.2.5	Leyland and Darby (2008) revisited . . . . .	231
7.3	Critique of the methodologies . . . . .	233
7.3.1	The model of soft-cliff erosion . . . . .	234
7.3.2	The coupled terrestiral-coastal landscape evolution model . . . . .	236
7.3.3	The numerical modelling . . . . .	238
7.4	Proposals for further research . . . . .	239
7.4.1	Application of LEMs to coastal regions . . . . .	240
7.4.2	Monte Carlo uncertainty analysis . . . . .	240
7.5	Final remarks . . . . .	241
	<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>242</b>



# List of Figures

1.1	Number of journal publications and conference proceedings by year. Numbers obtained the Web of Science search engine (wok.mimas.ac.uk) for the search terms a) Modelling + Climate Change + Geomorphology + Landscape and b) Climate Change + Landscape Response + Geomorphology. .	5
1.2	Location of the Chines along the South West coast of the Isle of Wight overlaid on a British Geological Survey 1:625000 bedrock geology map of the Isle of Wight (adapted from Leyland and Darby (2008).) . . . . .	8
1.3	Conceptual diagram showing the stages involved within the project and necessary tasks for the aims to be achieved. Areas are coloured by the order in which the work was undertaken. . . . .	11
2.1	The relative stability of Isle of Wight Chines in relation to knickpoint recession and cliff recession rates. CR = cliff recession, KR = knickpoint recession, $CR_c$ = critical cliff recession and $KR_c$ = critical knickpoint recession. From Leyland (2009). . . . .	15
2.2	Channel Evolution Model for incised coastal channels on the Isle of Wight (from Leyland and Darby, 2008). . . . .	17
2.3	Factors influencing the rate of cliff erosion. Adapted from Bray and Hooke (1997, their figure 1 p.454). . . . .	19
2.4	Wave pressure on a vertical wall plotted against offshore wave height. Adapted from Homma and Horikawa (1965). . . . .	21
2.5	a) A knickpoint found in Shepherds Chine highlighting the size of such features. b) Conceptual diagram of a knickpoint on a long profile forming the boundary between a disturbed and undisturbed reach (modified from Crosby and Whipple, 2006). c) Models of knickpoint erosion and retreat. Both models of inclination are usually combined together under the overarching term "rotation" (modified from Gardner, 1983). . . . .	29
2.6	Projected sea level based on IPCC scenario A1B showing two different reconstructed historical sea level rates a) Jones and Mann (2004) and Moberg <i>et al.</i> (2005). The black line is the median, the dark grey band is one standard deviation and the light grey band is 5 $\bar{U}$ 95 percentiles. Insets show the projections and fits to the GSL data in greater detail and the boxes in the insets show A1B emission scenario estimates 2090 - 2100 (From Grinsted <i>et al.</i> , 2009). . . . .	35
2.7	Schematic diagram illustrating 'D8' cell-based flow routing in a) a regular grid and b) an irregular Voronoi mesh (From Tucker and Hancock, 2010). . . . .	41
2.8	Flow routing algorithm of Murray and Paola (1994) adapted by Thomas and Nicholas (2002) showing the distribution of discharge between adjoining cells with a downstream gradient (From Nicholas 2005). . . . .	41

2.9	Results from a simple CAESAR demonstration of alluvial fan formation and a confluence section from a larger simulation detailing differences in grain size (from Coulthard, 2001). . . . .	47
2.10	Isometric view of a Whale Chine on the Isle of Wight, showing the irregular mesh used in CHILD. . . . .	48
2.11	Example of GOLEM output simulating gully development through the Holocene. (a), (b) and (c) show the full outputs from the model, highlighting the sea level rise and associated formation and retreat of the cliff profile. (d), (e) and (f) show a cross section of a portion of the cliff profile [indicated with arrows on (a), (b) and (c)], highlighting the development of coastal gullies through time (From Leyland and Darby, 2009). . . . .	50
2.12	Comparison of run times of CHILD and CAESAR. The models were set up to run over the same time period, modelling the same regular grid, using similar transport equations. . . . .	53
3.1	Combined significant wave height and sea level data for a 25 day time period. Differing values of the threshold wave height ( $H_T$ ) are highlighted by the dashed ( $H_{T1} = 5.0$ m) and solid ( $H_{T2} = 6.0$ m) lines. For $H_{T1}$ , the accumulated excess energy (AEE) equates to the light and dark grey areas combined. For $H_{T2}$ , the AEE equates to just the dark grey shaded area. Totals for the AEE are provided for each indicated threshold. $H_{T1}$ has a higher AEE as more events occur above this threshold. . . . .	64
3.2	A simple theoretical model of cliff foot erosion (adapted from Ruggiero et al., 2001; Lee, 2008). . . . .	65
3.3	Geological map of the Isle of Wight from the British Geological Survey 1:625000 bedrock geology map of the Isle of Wight. Cliff Units as described in section 3.1 are identified. . . . .	68
3.4	a) Location of the South West coast of the Isle of Wight highlighting the exposure to storms generated in the North Atlantic Ocean. b) Wave direction rose for 2009 showing a predominant SSW ( $210^\circ$ ) approach. c) Significant wave height (m) against wave direction ( $^\circ$ ) from Milford-on-Sea Wave Buoy for 2009 (Courtesy of the Channel Coastal Observatory). . . . .	69
3.5	Location of the study sites and available sources of wave and sea level data. Solid black dots represent wave buoys used in the analysis in section 4. Hollow dots represent other wave buoys within the proximity of the study sites, but which did not provide long enough data sets for application to this study. Black squares represent available sea level data sets described in section 4. Location of major towns and cities mentioned in the text are represented by black triangles. . . . .	70
3.6	Significant wave height data recorded at a) Channel Light Vessel ( $49^\circ 54' 0''$ N $2^\circ 54' 0''$ W) and b) Rustington Wave Buoy ( $50^\circ 44' 03''$ N $00^\circ 29' 67''$ W) for 2009. Grey lines are the hourly $H_s$ measurements. The thick black line represents the data passed through a low-pass filter. Note the y-axis scale for the two records changes. Areas of similar behaviour are identified by the grey shaded areas. . . . .	74

- 3.7 Wavelet analysis of the CLV and Rustington (RST) wave buoy records between 01/01/2009 and 31/12/2009 a) Continuous Wavelet Transform (CWT) of the CLV  $H_s$  time series. b) CWT of the RST  $H_s$  time series. c) Cross Wavelet Transform (XWT) of both the CLV and RST  $H_s$  time series. d) Wavelet Coherence (WTC) analysis of the CLV and RST  $H_s$  time series. In all graphs the 95% significance level against red noise is shown as the thick black contour. The Cone of Influence (COI) delineating the edge effects is denoted by the lighter shading. The relative phase relationship is shown by the arrows in c) and d), where right-pointing arrows denote in-phase, left-pointing arrows denote anti-phase and the CLV time series leading the RST time series denoted by a  $90^\circ$  arrow pointing straight down. Therefore an arrow of direction  $\swarrow$  symbolises in-phase CLV leading RST, which is to be expected. . . . . 75
- 3.8 Three-hourly  $H_s$  recordings from the a) K13a and b) Southwold North wave buoys for the period 21/08/2003 to 20/08/2004 (grey lines). The black lines represent the data passed through a moving average low-pass filter with a lag of 100 hours. The grey bars delineate periods where the two series appear to behave similarly. Note the scale of the two graphs is different . . . . . 77
- 3.9 Wavelet analysis of the K13a and Southwold North wave buoy records between 01/01/2009 and 31/12/2009 a) Continuous Wavelet Transform (CWT) of the K13a  $H_s$  time series. b) CWT of the Southwold North  $H_s$  time series. c) Cross Wavelet Transform (XWT) of both the K13a and Southwold North  $H_s$  time series. d) Wavelet Coherence (WTC) analysis of the K13a and Southwold North  $H_s$  time series. In all graphs the 95% significance level against red noise is shown as the thick black contour. The Cone of Influence (COI) delineating the edge effects is denoted by the lighter shading. The relative phase relationship is shown by the arrows in c) and d), where right-pointing arrows denote in-phase, left-pointing arrows denote anti-phase and the K13a time series leading the Southwold North time series denoted by a  $90^\circ$  arrow pointing straight down. Therefore an arrow of direction  $\swarrow$  symbolises in-phase K13a leading Southwold North, which is to be expected. The dark blue around December and January in the lower period bands relates to a month of no data in the Southwold North data. . . . . 78
- 3.10 On-foot RTK-GPS survey carried out on the Isle of Wight in March 2011. Cliff foot locations were taken using a Leica Viva RTK-GPS accurate to within 0.005 m. . . . . 81
- 3.11 Example of survey methodology undertaken at Birling Gap on 12-07-2004. The distance from cliff is measured using staff and tape at right angles to the baseline tape. Photo courtesy of Uwe Dornbusch. . . . . 83
- 3.12 Least Median of Squares (LMS) retreat rates ( $\text{ma}^{-1}$ ) for the south west Isle of Wight broken down by geological cliff unit. Geologies are provided in the legend; C = Chalk, WC = Wealden Clays, WM = Wealden Marls, LG = Lower Greensands, UG = Upper Greensands. See section 3.3.1 for more detailed geological descriptions. . . . . 85
- 3.13 Net Shoreline Movement (NSM) for the south west Isle of Wight broken down by geological cliff unit. Geologies are provided in the legend; C = Chalk, WC = Wealden Clays, WM = Wealden Marls, LG = Lower Greensands, UG = Upper Greensands. See section 3.3.1 for more detailed geological descriptions. . . . . 86

3.14	Relationships between accumulated excess sea height energy and amount of retreat for the Isle of Wight. The units refer to differing geological makeup. a) All units, mixed geology, b) Unit 1: Chalk and Wealden Clay, c) and d) Units 2 - 3: Wealden Clays, e) Unit 4: Lower Greensands and f) Unit 5: Lower Greensands and Clay. The regression is a Theil-Sen nonparametric regression which is more robust for samples where $n < 30$ (Theil (1950), Sen (1968), Wilcox (1998)). Note the scale on f) changes. . . . .	87
3.15	Retreat Rates ( $\text{ma}^{-1}$ ) for the Suffolk coast between Southwold and Lowestoft over the period 1993 to 2003 (winter to winter surveys). Error bars represent maximum possible error associated with survey technique (see section 3.4.2.2. for details). Data from Lee (2008). . . . .	89
3.16	Relationships between accumulated excess sea height energy and amount of retreat for the Suffolk Coast. Error bars represent the maximum possible error associated with the survey technique (see section 3.4.2.2). The regression is a Theil-Sen nonparametric regression which is more robust for samples where $n < 30$ (Theil (1950), Sen (1968), Wilcox (1998)). . . . .	90
3.17	Retreat Rates ( $\text{ma}^{-1}$ ) for Birling Gap over the period 1997 to 2003. Error bars are present, representing maximum possible error associated with survey technique (see section 3.4.2.3. for details). Data courtesy of Uwe Dornbusch. . . . .	91
3.18	Relationships between accumulated excess wave energy and amount of retreat for Birling Gap. Error bars are present, however the nature of the survey (see section 3.4.2.3) means that the errors are minimal and may not be visible at the scale presented. The regression is a Theil-Sen nonparametric regression which is more robust for samples where $n < 30$ (Theil (1950), Sen (1968), Wilcox (1998)). . . . .	92
3.19	Summary of the relationships between AEE and net shoreline movement developed in section 3.5 for the three study sites. The Isle of Wight graph represents the relationship for the whole of the coastline. . . . .	94
4.1	Overview of the components in the CHILD model. The state variables W and H represent channel width and channel depth, respectively. CHILD iterates through a discrete series of storm and interstorm periods (see section 4.1.3. for further details regarding the temporal framework of the model). Components in light grey are updated only after every storm event, components in dark grey are updated after every interstorm period whilst components in white are updated after both storm and interstorm periods (if the option for these components is selected). Adapted from Tucker et al. (1997). 100	
4.2	Schematic illustration of CHILD model mesh elements. Nodes (points) are identified by the solid black circles. The Voronoi cell is symbolised by the grey lines. The edges of the TIN cell are symbolised by the black lines. Adapted from Tucker et al. (2001,2001a). . . . .	101
4.3	Flow chart showing the implementation of the marine cliff retreat module. 110	
4.4	Implementation of the cliff retreat module in MT-CHILD. a) initial DEM in isometric view, b) after 100 years in isometric view, c) plan view of initial DEM, d) plan view of DEM after 100 years. Model was run with wave climate of 1995 replicated 100 times to represent a constant $0.9\text{ma}^{-1}$ retreat rate. . . . .	112

- 4.5 One dimensional profiles showing the evolution of a cliff. Each profile corresponds to a change in profile over time during the simulation. The thick black lines relate to the start (right hand bold line,  $y=100$  in figure 4.4 c) and finish (left hand bold line,  $y = 190$  in figure 4.4 d) profiles. . . . . 113
- 4.6 Ordnance Survey map from 1810 (first edition). b) Close-up of Cowleaze and Shepherds Chine from Ordnance Survey map from 1810, showing Chine stream flowing through Cowleaze Chine. c) Ordnance Survey map from 1862 showing how the formation of Shepherds Chine has captured the stream and breached the cliffs to flow to into the English Channel. . . . . 116
- 4.7 Synthetic digital elevation model (DEM) of Shepherds Chine in 1810 derived from LIDAR and OS profile data. Shorelines for 1863 and 2009 show how far the DEM has been extended. The area enclosed by the dashed black lines on the inset delineates the area which has been extended and interpolated. The area to the left of the left-hand dashed line is the coastal section of the gully which was cut and moved. Scale bar relates to the large catchment wide DEM only. . . . . 118
- 4.8 Analysis of the fit of the GPD to observed daily rainfall data from 1990 to 2010. a) Probability plot for the best fit model ( $\theta = -1.2$ ,  $k = 0.110453$  and  $\sigma = 2.9001$ ). Observed data is represented by the black dots. The probability distribution function of the GPD is represented by the solid grey line. b) Yearly moving average of observed rainfall data between the period 1990 and 2010. c) Yearly moving average of the modelled data set over the period 1990 to 2010. d) Residuals between the observed yearly moving average (b) and the modelled yearly moving average (c). . . . . 121
- 4.9 a) 10 year moving average of monthly rainfall totals from simulated rainfall series (blue) and 10 year moving average of observed monthly rainfall totals from 1855 - 2000 from Southampton, which is located  $\sim 35$  km from Shepherds Chine (black). b) Residual plot of modelled and observed 10 year moving average total monthly rainfall over the period 1855 - 2000. . . . . 122
- 4.10 Scatter plot of monthly maxima significant wave height from the CLV wave buoy between 1990 and 2009. Seasonality in  $H_s$  is highlighted by the quadratic trend line, with lower wave heights predominantly occurring during the summer months. . . . . 124
- 4.11 a) Yearly moving average of observed significant wave height record from the CLV for the period 1993 - 1999 (black) and yearly moving average of the modelled daily significant wave height record derived from the time-variant GEV parameters in table 4.5 (blue). b) Residuals of modelled yearly moving average minus observed yearly moving average for the period 1993 - 1999. 126
- 4.12 10 year moving average of 200 year wave climate from the time-dependent GEV distribution whose parameters are detailed in table 4.4 for the period 1810 - 1993 and observed wave climates from the CLV for the period 1993 - 2010. Inset is Hanna et al. (2008) pressure change ( $dp(abs)_{24}$ , hPa) record for Jersey, acting as a storminess proxy for the English Channel. Data begins and ends 10 years earlier and later than actual series because of the nature of the 10 year moving average window. The spike in mean wave height in the 1990s represents the transition from modelled to observed data, a change in mean wave height of 0.002 m is present between the two data sets. . . . . 128

- 4.13 a) Yearly moving average of observed hourly sea level from Southampton the period 1935 - 1960 (black) and yearly moving average of the modelled hourly sea level record derived Eq. 4.20 based on hourly sea level from Brest over the same period. b) Residuals of modelled yearly moving average minus observed yearly moving average for the period 1935 - 1960. Gaps in data represent gaps in the Brest data. . . . . 131
- 4.14 Yearly moving average of 200 year sea level record for Southampton created from a combination of modelled data from the Brest sea level record using Eq. 4.20 (1810 - 1935) and observed Southampton sea level (1935 to 2010). Peaks in moving average between 1940 to 1950 represent the transition to the more variable observed Southampton record. Inset is Hanna et al. (2008) pressure change (dp(abs)24, hPa) record for Jersey, acting as a storminess proxy for the English Channel. Data begins and ends 10 years earlier and later than actual series because of the nature of the 10 year moving average window. . . . . 132
- 4.15 Definition diagram of the metrics used to assess the simulation of Shepherds Chine. The width to depth ratio is calculated from the gully width and gully depth as identified. The gully area (km<sup>2</sup>) is the area of the grey shaded triangle area. Mean bank angles (°) are taken over a 10 m distance inland from the gully mouth. . . . . 134
- 4.16 Ratios of modelled to observed metrics for a) gully mouth elevation, b) width to depth ratio, c) gully area and d) mean bank angle. Reference lines show the perfect fit between modelled and observed values. The Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) in figure e) is calculated from the combined raw values of the metrics, and represents the total deviation from the observed landform for each model scenario. Scenarios *S1* to *S10* represent increase bedrock erodibility coefficients. . . . . 135
- 4.17 Ratios of modelled to observed metrics for a) gully mouth elevation, b) width to depth ratio, c) gully area and d) mean bank angle. Reference lines show the perfect fit between modelled and observed values. The Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) in figure e) is calculated from the combined raw metric values, and represents the total deviation from the observed landform for each model scenario. . . . . 137
- 4.18 Bank slope development characteristics associated with the five stages of the Leyland and Darby (2008) CEM for incised coastal gullies. Note scale is relevant. From Leyland Darby (2008), their figure 7. . . . . 138
- 4.19 Modelled and observed stream profiles of Shepherds Chine. Modelled stream profiles are output every 10 years (in blue). The final model output is shown in black and the observed stream profile of Shepherds Chine is shown in red. 139
- 4.20 Modelled and observed cross-sectional profiles of Shepherds Chine. Modelled cross-sections are shown for every 10 years of the model simulation (blue). The initial model cross-section is depicted by the dashed red line. The final model cross-section is depicted by a solid red line and the observed Shepherds Chine cross-section is shown by the black solid line . . . . . 140

4.21	a) MT-CHILD output of model scenario S2m showing change in elevation (m) from 1810 to present. Cowleaze Chine is on the left and Shepherds is on the right. b) Aerial image of Cowleaze (left) and Shepherds (right) Chine. The A3055 road seen at the top of b) is highlighted by the dashed line in a), likewise the structure of the holiday camp visible in the middle of b) is circled in a). The shaded area in a) and b) represents the area where the model gully course deviates from the observed gully course. . . . .	142
5.1	Observed trends (% per decade) over the period 1951 to 2003 in the contribution to total annual precipitation from very wet days (i.e. 95 <sup>th</sup> percentile or above). White land areas have insufficient data for trend determination. Drying can be seen in southern Africa, north western America and central Asia. Increasing precipitation levels can be seen in South America, eastern North America and north eastern Europe. From Solomon et al. 2007. . . .	147
5.2	Global GHG emissions (GtCO <sub>2</sub> -equivalent per year) in absence of additional climate policies. The coloured lines depict the six SRES base-scenarios. The grey area represents the 80 <sup>th</sup> percentile range of scenarios produced post-SRES. The grey dashed lines depict the full range of post-SRES scenarios (i.e. scenarios produced after the SRES report was published). GHG emissions include CO <sub>2</sub> , CH <sub>4</sub> , N <sub>2</sub> O, and F (Solomon et al. 2007). . . . .	149
5.3	The horizontal and vertical structure of the HadCM3 climate model. From Murphy et al. (2009). . . . .	154
5.4	SDSM Version 4.2 climate scenario generation workflow. Operations in bold represent the key functions SDSM performs. From Wilby and Dawson (2007).161	161
5.5	Relative skill of the calibrated model within SDSM to replicate the three predictand variables. a) Quantile-Quantile plot of the modelled 100 member ensemble (blue dots) and observed (black line) rainfall. b) Probability Density Function of modelled ensemble mean and observed rainfall. c) Quantile-Quantile plot of modelled 100 member ensemble (blue dots) and observed (black line) daily sea-level. d) Probability Density Function of modelled ensemble mean and observed daily sea-level. e) Quantile-Quantile plot of modelled 100 member ensemble (blue dots) and observed (black line) total daily significant wave height. f) Probability Density Function of modelled ensemble mean and observed total daily significant wave height. The insert in f) highlights the upper tail of the PDF, highlighting the fit between of the modelled and observed records to extreme wave events. . .	167
5.6	a) Ensemble means of daily significant wave height for differing ensemble sizes. As can be seen as the number of ensemble members reaches, and exceeds, 100 (indicated by the dashed line), the mean begins to converge around 1.358 m. b) Ensemble standard deviations of daily significant wave heights for differing ensemble sizes. As can be seen, as the number of ensemble members reaches, and exceeds, 100 (indicated by the dashed line), standard deviations begin to converge around 0.965 m. . . . .	171
5.7	Ensemble outputs of daily precipitation (mm) from the differing GCMs and emissions scenarios. Grey band represent the spread of each of the 100 ensemble members. The black line represents the yearly moving average of the ensemble mean, with the red trend line highlighting the trend in the ensemble mean. The blue line represents the trend in the number of days per year in which the 95 <sup>th</sup> percentile event is exceeded. The 95 <sup>th</sup> percentile represents rainfall events greater than 11.7 mm. . . . .	172

- 5.8 Ensemble outputs of mean daily sea-level (m) from the differing GCMs and emissions scenarios. Grey band represent the spread of each of the 100 ensemble members. The black line represents the yearly moving average of the ensemble mean, with the red trend line highlighting the trend in the ensemble mean. The blue line represents the trend in the number of days per year in which the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile event is exceeded. The 95<sup>th</sup> percentile represents sea-levels greater than 3.09 m. . . . . 173
- 5.9 Ensemble outputs of mean daily significant wave height (m) from the differing GCMs and emissions scenarios. Grey band represent the spread of each of the 100 ensemble members. The black line represents the yearly moving average of the ensemble mean, with the red trend line highlighting the trend in the ensemble mean. The blue line represents the trend in the number of days per year in which the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile event is exceeded. The 95<sup>th</sup> percentile represents significant wave heights greater than 2.99 m. Note the scale on the secondary y-axis change. . . . . 174
- 5.10 Stages involved in the generation of multiple time series used in the Monte Carlo analysis of future climate change projections. Stage I - select the GCM outputs to be analysed. Stage II - Select the emissions scenarios under which the GCM is to be run. Stage III - Calibration and validation of predictor/predictand relationships from GCM outputs within the SDSM software. Stage IV - Generation of multiple ensemble runs of future scenarios of change for a given variable within the SDSM software. Stage V - Generation of probability density functions (PDFs) of each time step for all ensemble members (black dots represent random sampling sites of stage VI). Stage VI - Monte Carlo sampling of PDFs produced in Stage V generates synthetic time series for use in MT-CHILD. In the illustrations used here, 15 random samples were taken from the PDFs in Stage V to produce 15 MT-CHILD input time series in Stage VI. . . . . 176
- 6.1 a) Digital Elevation Model of the Grange Chine catchment area, used as the input for the model simulation. The solid line depicts the boundary between LIDAR (to the south west) and OS profile data (to the north east). b) Aerial image of Grange and Marsh Chines taken in 2004 (data courtesy of the Channel Coastal Observatory). Key features are identified in both plots. Individual scale bars and North arrows are provided. . . . 186
- 6.2 Cumulative Probability Density functions of MT-CHILD model outputs of coastal erosion (m). The different GCMs and baseline scenario are shown in different colours; HadCM3 = blue, CGCM2 = red, Baseline = black. A2 emissions scenarios are depicted by solid lines and the B2 emission scenarios are depicted by dashed lines. . . . . 191
- 6.3 Probability density functions of MT-CHILD model outputs for rate of coastal retreat ( $\text{ma}^{-1}$ ) highlighting the shift in probability distribution from baseline climates (solid black) under future scenarios of climate change. The different GCMs and baseline scenario are shown in different colours; HadCM3 = blue, CGCM2 = red. A2 emissions scenarios are depicted by solid lines and the B2 emission scenarios are depicted by dashed lines. The dashed line at  $x = 0.5$  represents the current observed rates of erosion along the south west Isle of Wight coastline. . . . . 192



- 6.4 Cumulative Probability Density Functions of MT-CHILD model outputs for change in gully extent (m). The different GCMs and baseline scenario are shown in different colours; HadCM3 = blue, CGCM2 = red, Baseline = black. A2 emissions scenarios are depicted by solid lines and the B2 emission scenarios are depicted by dashed lines. The dashed black line at  $x = 0$  represents no change in gully extent, where coastal retreat and headwards erosion are equal over the 100 year period. . . . . 194
- 6.5 Probability Density Functions of MT-CHILD model outputs for gully mouth elevation (m). The different GCMs and baseline scenario are shown in different colours; HadCM3 = blue, CGCM2 = red, Baseline = black. A2 emissions scenarios are depicted by solid lines and the B2 emission scenarios are depicted by dashed lines. The dashed line at  $x = 0.9$  represents the current observed gully mouth elevation (m). . . . . 195
- 6.6 Probability Density Functions of MT-CHILD model outputs for gully area ( $\text{km}^2$ ). The different GCMs and baseline scenario are shown in different colours; HadCM3 = blue, CGCM2 = red, Baseline = black. A2 emissions scenarios are depicted by solid lines and the B2 emission scenarios are depicted by dashed lines. The dashed black line at  $x = 0.07$  represents the currently observed gully area. . . . . 196
- 6.7 3-dimensional scatter plots of 95<sup>th</sup> percentile significant wave height value (m) along the x-axis, sea level rise ( $\text{ma}^{-1}$ ) along the y-axis and 95<sup>th</sup> percentile precipitation intensity ( $\text{ma}^{-1}$ ) along the z-axis for a) CGCM2 A2 inputs, b) CGCM B2 inputs, c) HadCM3 A2 inputs and d) HadCM3 B2 inputs. Points are coloured by their respective change in gully extent (m). Note all scales change between each figure. . . . . 199
- 6.8 Change in gully extent (m) against associated sea level rise ( $\text{ma}^{-1}$ ). . . . . 200
- 6.9 Change in gully extent (m) as a function of extreme significant wave heights (m). The larger the value of the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile significant wave height, the more extreme the model runs representation of future wave climate. . . . . 201
- 6.10 Change in gully extent (m) as a function the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile value of precipitation intensity ( $\text{ma}^{-1}$ ). The larger the value of the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile precipitation intensity, the more extreme the model runs representation of precipitation. . . . . 202
- 6.11 Example depicting the selection of the high resolution model runs. Model runs as depicted in figure 6.8 are bounded by a cube, within which all results are contained. The runs which lie closest to the eight corners of the cube are selected (circled black) as well as the mid-point of the model cluster (circled red). The numbers relate to the identification of each point in figure 6.14 and 6.15. Numbers 1 - 8 are the eight corner points, whilst point 9 is the mid-point. . . . . 204
- 6.12 Decadal variations in change in gully extent (m). A2 emissions scenarios are represented by the solid lines, whilst B2 emissions scenarios are represented by the dashed lines. The runs are coloured to identify their respective point locations on figure 6.12, where point 1 = Purple, 2 = Orange, 3 = Magenta, 4 = Yellow, 5 = Cyan, 6 = Red, 7 = Blue, 8 = Green and 9 (the modal run) = Black. . . . . 206

6.13	Decadal variations in gully extent (m) and associated 10 year moving averages of 95 <sup>th</sup> percentile precipitation intensity (ma <sup>-1</sup> ), mean sea level (m) and 95 <sup>th</sup> percentile significant wave height (m) for CGCM2 A2 and B2 input groups. The runs are coloured to identify their respective point locations on figure 6.12, where point 1 = Purple, 2 = Orange, 3 = Magenta, 4 = Yellow, 5 = Cyan, 6 = Red, 7 = Blue, 8 = Green and 9 (the modal run) = Black. . . . .	207
6.14	Decadal variations in gully extent (m) and associated 10 year moving averages of 95 <sup>th</sup> percentile precipitation intensity (ma <sup>-1</sup> ), mean sea level (m) and 95 <sup>th</sup> percentile significant wave height (m) for HadCM3 A2 and B2 input groups. The runs are coloured to identify their respective point locations on figure 6.12, where point 1 = Purple, 2 = Orange, 3 = Magenta, 4 = Yellow, 5 = Cyan, 6 = Red, 7 = Blue, 8 = Green and 9 (the modal run) = Black. . . . .	209
6.15	Projections and likelihood of amounts of coastal retreat as projected by HadCM3 A2 inputs, the more extreme input scenario. The red shaded area represents the likely range of coastal erosion, containing 66% of projections as determined by the Highest Posterior Density region. The solid black line represents current cliff toe position. The dashed black lines represent cliff positions at 2100 at different likelihood bands. Aerial photo courtesy of the Channel Coastal Observatory. . . . .	212
6.16	3-dimensional scatter plots depicting percentage changes from baseline 95 <sup>th</sup> percentile significant wave height value along the x-axis, sea level rise along the y-axis and 95 <sup>th</sup> percentile precipitation intensity along the z-axis for a) CGCM2 A2 inputs, b) CGCM B2 inputs, c) HadCM3 A2 inputs and d) HadCM3 B2 inputs. Points are coloured by their respective change in gully extent (m). Note all scales change between each figure. . . . .	215
7.1	Map showing shoreline positions as projected by HadCM3 A2 outputs. The 2011 current shoreline position is shown in black. The range covered by the likely projections of 2100 shorelines (4.19 m to 113.92 m) is shown by the orange band. The 2100 modal shoreline position (43.28 m) is shown in yellow, and 2100 extreme shoreline position (195 m) is shown in blue. The A3055 Military Road is also shown in red. Key gully features are labelled. . . . .	226
7.2	Aerial photo of a series of incised coastal gullies found along the Canterbury Plain coastline on the south island of New Zealand. Photo courtesy of Google Earth. Image date: 10/09/2011. . . . .	227
7.3	A revised Channel Evolution Model of incised coastal gullies. Modified from Leyland and Darby (2008; their figure 5) to include a new pathway of gully development, termed "Receding Chine" . . . . .	233
7.4	A revised version of the gully stability diagram of Leyland (2009). . . . .	234

# List of Tables

2.1	Summary of landscape evolution model scales (temporal and spatial) and process representation. . . . .	52
3.1	Historic rates of erosion ( $\text{ma}^{-1}$ ) along the South West coast of the Isle of Wight. Unit I - Compton Down to Hanover Point, Unit II - Hanover Point to Barnes High, Unit III - Barnes High to Atherfield Point, Unit IV - Atherfield Point to Cliff Farm, Unit V - Cliff Farm to Blackgang Chine (see figure 3.3) . . . . .	71
3.2	Estimated positional uncertainties for the Isle of Wight cliff toe positions for each shoreline digitisation. Image pixel size reflects the resolution of the LIDAR data. The georeferencing error of the 2001 shoreline is taken from Leyland (2009). n/a = not applicable. . . . .	82
4.1	Functional forms of the seven transport capacity laws (1 to 7) and the two detachment-capacity laws (8 and 9) in CHILD. . . . .	108
4.2	Summary of CHILD parameter values used. . . . .	115
4.3	Descriptive statistics of observed daily rainfall series between 1990-2010 and modelled daily rainfall series over the same period. . . . .	120
4.4	Final results of the time dependendent GEV model for the CLV wave buoy with standard errors in parenthesis. The maximum likelihood estimate (MLE) for the model is also given. . . . .	127
4.5	Descriptive statistics of observed hourly significant wave height series from the CLV between 1993 - 1999 and modelled hourly significant wave height series over the same period. . . . .	129
4.6	Normalised Chine metrics (observed / modelled values) of Shepherds Chine. Obsereved GME = 6 m, W/D ratio = 8.18, Gully area = $0.04\text{km}^2$ and Mean Bank Angle = $20.36^\circ$ . Values closer to one represent better model fit. $K_B$ values represent the value of the bedrock erodibility coefficient ( $K_B$ ) used in the model run. Observed values were taken from 2009 LIDAR data. The width to depth ratio is taken at the mouth of the Chine. Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) provides an aggregated closeness of fit for each model scenario based on the non-normalised metric values. . . . .	133
4.7	Normalised Chine metrics (observed / modelled values) of Shepherds Chine. Obsereved GME = 6 m, W/D ratio = 8.18, Gully area = $0.04\text{km}^2$ and Mean Bank Angle = $20.36^\circ$ . Values closer to one represent better model fit. Critical slope gradient values represent value of the critical slope parameter used in the model run. Observed values were taken from 2009 LIDAR data. The width to depth ratio is taken at the mouth of the Chine. Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) provides an aggregated closeness of fit for each model scenario based on the non-normalised metric values. . . . .	133

4.8	Summary of parameter values from scenario <i>S2m</i> , chosen as the best parameter set to describe the development of Shepherds Chine since 1810. . . . .	141
5.1	Brief description of some widely used GCMs. Adapted from (Prudhomme et al. 2003) and the IPCC Data Distribution Centre ( <a href="http://www.mad.zmaw.de/IPCCDCC.html">www.mad.zmaw.de/IPCCDCC.html</a> ). The 'Data Available' column identifies those models which have data at the temporal resolution detailed in the preceding column available. Models marked with a 7 only provide data at monthly scales. . . . .	151
5.2	A summary of the strengths and weaknesses of the main statistical down-scaling approaches. Adapted from Wilby et al. (2004). . . . .	156
5.3	Coefficients for predictor variables used in model calibration. n/a values represent variables not included in the specific models. All correlations were significant at 95% confidence levels. The $r^2$ of the final regression model is also provided. . . . .	166
5.4	Mean ( $\mu$ ) and standard deviation ( $\sigma$ ) of the time steps displaying the largest range in values calculated from the 100-member ensembles generated in section 5.4. . . . .	178
5.5	Number of simulations needed to constrain the mean of the resulting distribution to within a given percentage (x%) of the sample mean ( $N_x\%$ ). The sample mean and standard deviation values used in the calculations relate to the time step with the largest range within precipitation ensembles, as these were shown to be the most variable (table 5.4). Each ensemble requires different numbers of runs to achieve the given accuracy; the total number of simulations required for a given accuracy is given in the far right column. All values are at 95% confidence levels. . . . .	179
6.1	Overview of the characteristics and morphometrics of named Chines found along the south west Isle of Wight. Geology is simplified into predominant sections: WS = Wealden Shales, WM = Wealden Marls, LGS = Lower Greensands. See figure 1.1 for location map and more detailed geological map. . . . .	185
6.2	Parameter values used in modelling the future evolution of Grange Chine. . . . .	187
6.3	Likelihood scale as used in the IPCC fifth assessment report (AR5). From Mastrandrea et al. (2010). . . . .	189
6.4	Values for metrics extracted from MT-CHILD for the end of the simulation period (2100). . . . .	190

## Declaration of Authorship

I,

**Christopher Hackney**

declare that the thesis entitled

**Modelling the Effects of Climate Change and Sea Level Rise on the Evolution of Incised Coastal Gullies**

and the work presented in the thesis are both my own, and have been generated by me as the result of my own original research. I confirm that:

- this work was done wholly or mainly while in candidature for a research degree at this University;
- where any part of this thesis has previously been submitted for a degree or any other qualification at this University or any other institution, this has been clearly stated;
- where I have consulted the published work of others, this is always clearly attributed;
- where I have quoted from the work of others, the source is always given. With the exception of such quotations, this thesis is entirely my own work;
- I have acknowledged all main sources of help;
- where the thesis is based on work done by myself jointly with others, I have made clear exactly what was done by others and what I have contributed myself;

**Signed:** .....

**Date:** .....



## Acknowledgements

I would like to extend my thanks to the following people:

Firstly, to my partner Heather whose constant belief in me has kept me going and who has unselfishly put up with me during my studies. Secondly, to my parents, David and Julia, who have been a constant source of support. Thirdly, to my two supervisors Steve and Julian. Thank you both for your time, support and guidance, both in the office and on the football pitch. I gratefully acknowledge financial support from the England and Wales Environment Agency and the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust, in particular I would like to thank Tim Sykes and Richard Grogan for all your help. Finally, I wish to thank all of my fellow postgrad students (of whom there are too many to name, but you know who you are) who have helped me in the field and in taking my mind off my work. Thank you all.





*For my Nan, who will be sorely missed.*



