

# A SCHEMA TO CATEGORISE RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS IN AUSTRALIAN FLOODPLAINS

T Maqsood<sup>1,2</sup>, M Wehner<sup>1,2</sup>, K Dale<sup>1,2</sup>, M Edwards<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Geoscience Australia, Symonston, ACT

<sup>2</sup>Bushfire & Natural Hazards Cooperative Research Centre, Melbourne, Australia

## Abstract

Recent events in Queensland in 2011 and 2013 have highlighted the vulnerability of housing to flooding and have caused billions of dollars in losses. To reduce future losses there is a significant need for mitigating the risk posed by existing residential buildings in flood prone areas. Therefore, a project is underway within the new Bushfire and Natural Hazards Cooperative Research Centre (BNHCRC) to provide an evidence base to inform decision making on the mitigation of flood risk by providing information on the cost-effectiveness of a range of mitigation strategies.

As an initial step to assess mitigation options, after conducting a review of existing schemas, a new building schema is developed to categorise the Australian residential buildings into a limited number of typical building types for which vulnerability functions can be developed. The proposed schema divides each building into the sub-elements of foundations, bottom floor, upper floors (if any) and roof of the building to describe its vulnerability. The schema classifies each building floor based on the attributes of Construction Period, Fit-out Quality, Storey Height, Floor System, Internal Wall Material and External Wall Material.

The schema defines 60 discrete building/vulnerability classes based on the above mentioned attributes. It excludes combinations that are invalid in an Australian context. Furthermore, the schema proposes 6 roof types based on material and pitch of the roof.

## Introduction

While there is a construction standard issued by the Australian Building Code Board (ABCB, 2012) for new construction in flood prone areas, almost all of the existing building stock in flood prone areas has not benefitted from it. Many communities on those flood plains have been inundated during past flood events. This has resulted in significant logistical challenges for emergency management with damage costs and disruption to communities. It has further resulted in considerable cost to all levels of government to repair damage and enable community recovery.

Recent events in Queensland in 2011 and 2013 have highlighted the vulnerability of housing to flooding and have caused billions of dollars in losses. Geoscience Australia conducted a number of post-disaster surveys to assess building damage due to flood inundation. The surveys consisted of a capture of street view images to obtain an overview of the damage within the flood extents; foot surveys to capture detailed building attributes and damage incurred; and postal surveys to assess building repair costs and social consequences due to floods.

Building schema provide a mechanism by which vulnerability relationships are applied to individual buildings within a study area. That is, during a risk or impact assessment

each entry in an exposure database is assigned a vulnerability curve from a limited suite of available curves. The assignment is based on the type, or class, of building. The class is, in turn, determined by the building attributes held within the exposure database for the building in question. Thus a building schema is a classification of the infinite variety of building forms found in the Australian housing stock into a manageable number of classes for which vulnerability relationships can be developed.

## Existing building schemas

### *United Nations' Global Assessment of Risk: Global*

Geoscience Australia hosted a workshop during November, 2013, to develop regional heuristic vulnerability curves for incorporation into the United Nations' 2015 Global Assessment of Risk (GAR15) report. The workshop considered the vulnerability of buildings in the Asia-Pacific region to five hazards including flood. During the flood sub-workshop a building schema with enhanced detail was developed from the overall GAR15 building schema in an effort to capture the variety of buildings found within the region (Maqsood et al. 2014). An extract of the schema is shown in Table 1.

**Table 1: Extract of building schema developed at the GAR15 Regional Vulnerability Workshop. The dark shaded cells are those classes that are not considered (Maqsood et al. 2014).**

Workshop Label	Description	Storeys	Residential Building usage	Industrial Building usage	Commercial Building usage
W1-NE	Wood, Light Frame ( $\leq 5,000$ sq. ft.) non-elevated	1			
W1-E	Wood, Light Frame ( $\leq 5,000$ sq. ft.) elevated	1			
PB	Pole and beam structure	1			
W1	Wood, Light Frame ( $\leq 5,000$ sq. ft.)	2			
W2	Wood, Commercial and Industrial ( $> 5,000$ sq. ft.)	1			
S3	Steel Light Frame	1			
C3L-1-NS	Concrete Frame with non-susceptible interior walls	1			
C3L-1-S	Concrete Frame with susceptible interior walls	1			
C3L-2-NS	Concrete Frame with non-susceptible interior walls	2			
C3L-2-S	Concrete Frame with susceptible interior walls	2			
C3L-3-NS	Concrete Frame with non-susceptible interior walls	3			
C3L-3-S	Concrete Frame with susceptible interior walls	3			
AD1L	Adobe	1			

The extract captures the building classes relevant to houses. Some of the classes are not well represented in the Australian housing inventory, for example, pole and beam construction and adobe. In the GAR15 schema the variation of vulnerability within a given class of building is captured by the concept of 'water susceptible materials, type of finishes, floor system and number of storeys'.

The schema was developed within two constraints: firstly, the lack of validation data within the region making any attempt to develop vulnerability curves for a more detailed schema problematic; and, secondly, the need for the building classes described by the schema to be identifiable and mappable in the exposure database. It eventuated that the exposure database could not identify the housing stock to the level of detail in the building schema and several classes were combined to an even coarser schema (that was common across hazards) for the purposes of the risk assessment.

### **HAZUS-MH: United States of America**

United States' Federal Emergency management Agency (FEMA) has developed a software package for natural hazard loss estimation called HAZUS-MH. The model is based on GIS technology and it can simulate losses for four hazard types i.e. earthquake, flood, hurricanes and coastal surges (FEMA, 2007). The HAZUS-MH flood model is intended to be used by floodplain managers to make informed decision regarding land use and flood risk management. HAZUS-MH classifies building stock on the basis of these building attributes: Structural System (5 types) and Storey Class (3 types). Table 2 presents the broader building schema used in HAZUS-MH.

**Table 2: Extract of building schema developed by HAZUS (FEMA, 2007).**

<b>Structural System</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Storey Class</b>	<b>Storeys</b>
Wood	Wood light frame		All
Steel	Steel frame structures including those with infill walls and concrete shear walls	Low-rise	1-3
		Mid-rise	4-7
		High-rise	8+
Concrete	Concrete frame or shear walls structures including tilt-up, precast and infill walls	Low-rise	1-3
		Mid-rise	4-7
		High-rise	8+
Masonry	All structures with masonry bearing walls	Low-rise	1-3
		Mid-rise	4-7
		High-rise	8+
MH	Mobile homes		All

### ***RiskScape: New Zealand***

RiskScape is a joint venture between the New Zealand National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research (NIWA) and GNS Science. It is a tool for analysing risks and impacts from five natural hazards i.e. earthquake, flood, tsunami, volcanic ash and windstorm (RiskScape, 2010). It provides detailed building attributes to classify the New Zealand building stock. The classification depends on the building attributes as enlisted in Table 3.


**Table 3: Extract of building attributes utilised by RiskScape for defining vulnerability classes (RiskScape, 2010).**

<b>Attributes</b>	<b>Construction Type</b>	<b>Wall Cladding</b>	<b>Roof Cladding</b>
Construction Type	Reinforced Concrete Shear Wall	Weatherboard	Clay/Concrete Tile
Deprivation Index	Reinforced Concrete Moment Resisting Frame	Roughcast	Concrete Slab
Floor Area Footprint Area	Steel Braced Frame	Stucco	Metal Tile
Floor Height	Steel Moment Resisting Frame	Corrugated Iron	Sheet Metal
Occupancy & Use Category	Light Timber	Fibre Cement Sheet	Other
Replacement Cost	Tilt Up Panel	Fibre Cement Plank	
Roof Cladding Class & Roof Pitch	Light Industrial	Reinforced Concrete	
Storeys	Brick or Concrete Masonry	Brick or Concrete Masonry	
Wall Cladding Class	Other	Glass or Metal	
Year of Construction			

### ***Earthquake Damage Analysis Center: Germany***

Schwarz and Maiwald (2008) adopted the concept of the European Macroseismic Scale-1998 (Grünthal et al. 1998) to classify the building types for flood vulnerability. Based on the research on several floods in Germany (2002, 2005 and 2006) they developed the most likely vulnerability classes for 7 building types with probable and less probable ranges. Table 4 presents the building type classification and typical flood vulnerability classes for the German building stock. Five Flood Vulnerability Classes (HW-A to HW-E) were identified covering a range from low resistance or high vulnerability (HW-A) to a flood resistant class (HW-E).

**Table 4: Classification of building types and vulnerability classes (Schwarz and Maiwald, 2008).**



### Greater Metro Manila Area Risk Assessment Project: Philippines

Within the Greater Metro Manila Risk Assessment Project, Pacheco et al. 2013 developed a building schema for flood vulnerability and risk assessment in the Metro Manila area in the Philippines (see Table 5). The schema was adapted from the HAZUS's earthquake schema and is tailored for flood hazard and predominant building types in the Metro Manila. The schema classified the building stock by building material and number of storeys. A separate class was assigned for one and two storey buildings within some building types to differentiate the level of exposure for a certain flood event.

**Table 5: Classification of building types for the Greater Metro Manila Area (Pacheco et al., 2013).**

Building Material	Building Type	Description	Building Type Code	Storeys
Wood	W1	Wood light frame	W1-L-1	1
			W1-L-1	2
	W3	Bamboo	W3L	Low-rise
	N	Makeshift	N-L-1	1
N-L-2			2	
Masonry	MWS	Concrete hollow blocks with wood or light metal	MWS-L	Low-rise
	CHB	Concrete hollow blocks	CHB-L-1	1
			CHB-L-2	2
Concrete	CWS	Reinforced concrete moment frames with wood or light metal	CWS-L	Low-rise
	C1	Reinforced concrete moment frames	C1-L-1	1
			C1-L-2	2
			C1-M	Mid-rise
Steel	S1	Steel moment frames	S1-L-1	1
			S1-L-2	2
			S1-M	Mid-rise

NSW-OEH: Australia

New South Wales Office of Environment and Heritage (NSW-OEH) in Australia produced a guideline to assess building damage cost for residential structures within the state of New South Wales (Mcluckie, 2007). Three types of residential structures were selected and stage-damage curves were produced. The structures were:

- Single storey slab-on-grade/Low-set residential
- Single storey high-set residential
- Two storey residential

### ***Geoscience Australia: Australia***

After 2011 Queensland floods, Geoscience Australia conducted damage surveys to record damage to residential buildings. The data captured during the surveys facilitated the development of a building schema for flood damage assessment. A building schema with 11 generic building types was developed by Wehner et al. (2012) by considering several key building attributes such as bottom floor system, number of storeys, external wall material, internal wall material and the presence of a garage.

The building schema was extended (see Table 6) in another project in the Alexandra Canal Catchment area in South Sydney by including Victorian terrace houses and non-residential buildings to encompass/include the local building stock (Maqsood et al. 2013).

**Table 6: Classification of building types in southeast Queensland and Sydney (Maqsood et al. 2013).**

<b>Region</b>	<b>Costing Module</b>	<b>Building Type</b>	<b>Description</b>
Sydney	ACFS1a	Residential: Victorian terrace	1 storey, without basement
Sydney	ACFS1b	Residential: Victorian terrace	1 storey, with basement
Sydney	ACFS2a	Residential: Victorian terrace	2 storey, without basement
Sydney	ACFS2b	Residential: Victorian terrace	2 storey, with basement
Sydney	ACFS3	Mixed use: retail/residential	1 storey, without basement
Sydney	ACFS4	Commercial: Showroom/Office	2 storey, without basement
Sydney	ACFS5	Commercial: Warehouse/Garage	2 storey, without basement
Sydney	ACFS6	Industrial: Factory	1 storey, without basement
South-east Queensland	FCM1	Residential	1 storey, Raised Floor, Weatherboard or panel cladding, no garage, Hardboard lining

**Table 6 (Cont.): Classification of building types in southeast Queensland and Sydney (Maqsood et al. 2013).**

Region	Costing Module	Building Type	Description
South-east Queensland	FCM3	Residential	2 storey, Slab-on-Grade, Cavity Masonry lower storey, Weatherboard upper storey, metal roof, no garage, Plasterboard lining
South-east Queensland	FCM4	Residential	2 storey, Slab-on-Grade, Cavity Masonry lower storey, Weatherboard upper storey, metal roof, garage, Plasterboard lining
South-east Queensland	FCM5	Residential	2 storey, Slab-on-Grade, Weatherboard cladding, partial lower floor, Plasterboard lining
South-east Queensland	FCM6	Residential	2 storey, Raised Floor, Weatherboard cladding, no garage, v lining
South-east Queensland	FCM7	Residential	1 storey, Slab-on-Grade, Brick Veneer, garage, Plasterboard lining
South-east Queensland	FCM8	Residential	1 storey, Slab-on-Grade, Brick Veneer, no garage, Plasterboard lining
South-east Queensland	FCM9	Residential	1 storey, Raised Floor, Brick Veneer, no garage, Plasterboard lining
South-east Queensland	FCM10	Residential	1 storey, Slab-on-Grade, Cavity Masonry, no garage
South-east	FCM11	Residential	1 storey, Raised Floor, Cavity Masonry, no garage


### **Proposed schema for the BNHCRC Project**

The aim of the BNHCRC is to develop cost effective mitigation strategies to improve the vulnerability of Australian housing exposed to flood hazard. As discussed earlier, post-disaster damage survey activity has identified that the severity of damage is strongly influenced by the nature of bottom floor construction and internal wall construction. Thus it is anticipated that the project's research will focus on at least these aspects of built environment. Hence, the building schema must distinguish, at a minimum, between houses with different floor types and external wall materials to establish what proportion of the housing stock within a study area may benefit from the mitigation strategies developed by the project. Other attributes that are known to affect a house's vulnerability to flood are considered to be building age, fit-out quality, storey height and internal wall material.

Moreover, the schema should also differentiate between buildings with different construction material used in floor systems. Therefore, in the proposed schema there is a fundamental shift from describing the building to one that focuses on sub-components. In turn, there is a corresponding change in the way to assess building vulnerability and potential losses in flood events. In this new approach the schema divides a building into its main components i.e. substructure and superstructure. The superstructure is divided into ground floor, upper floors (if any) and roof (see Figure 1).

Each floor is then classified by six attributes given below with further sub-classifications as presented in Table 7.

- Building age (construction period)
- Fit-out quality
- Storey height
- Floor system
- Internal wall material and
- External wall material



**Figure 1: Building structure divided into main components**

The proposed schema is set out in Table 7. The proposed schema contains 60 possible combinations of the 6 building attributes for a floor. From these a limited suite will be selected for the BNHCRC research project representing those contributing most to community flood risk through their vulnerability and predominance.

The roof sub-component is classified by construction material and pitch (slope). The roof material can be either concrete tile or metal sheet and pitch can either be low (typically less than 8 degree), medium (typically between 17 to 25 degree) or high (typically between 35 to 45 degree).

**Table 7: Proposed building storey type schema for flood hazard. The dark shaded cells are poorly represented in the Australian building stock.**

Const. Period	Fit out Quality	Storey Height (m)	Floor System	Internal Wall Material	External Wall Material		
					Brick Veneer	Weatherboard / Timber / Fibro	Solid Brick / Cavity Brick / Concrete
Pre 1960	Standard	2.7	Slab-on-grade	Masonry			
				Plasterboard / Hard Board			
				Timber			
			Raised: Timber	Masonry			
				Plasterboard / Hard Board			
				Timber			
		3.0	Slab-on-grade	Masonry			
				Plasterboard / Hard Board			
				Timber			
			Raised: Timber	Masonry			
				Plasterboard / Hard Board			
				Timber			
	Low	2.7	Slab-on-grade	Masonry			
				Plasterboard / Hard Board			
				Timber			
			Raised: Timber	Masonry			
				Plasterboard / Hard Board			
				Timber			
		3.0	Slab-on-grade	Masonry			
				Plasterboard / Hard Board			
				Timber			
			Raised: Timber	Masonry			
				Plasterboard / Hard Board			
				Timber			

**Table 7 (Cont.): Proposed building storey type schema for flood hazard. The dark shaded cells are poorly represented in the Australian building stock.**

Const. Period	Fit out Quality	Storey Height (m)	Floor System	Internal Wall Material	External Wall Material		
					Brick Veneer	Weatherboard / Timber / Fibro	Solid Brick / Cavity Brick / Concrete
Post 1960	Standard	2.4	Slab-on-grade	Masonry			
				Plasterboard / Hard Board			
			Raised: Timber	Masonry			
				Plasterboard / Hard Board			
			Raised: Chipboard	Masonry			
				Plasterboard / Hard Board			
		2.7	Slab-on-grade	Masonry			
				Plasterboard / Hard Board			
			Raised: Timber	Masonry			
				Plasterboard / Hard Board			
			Raised: Chipboard	Masonry			
				Plasterboard / Hard Board			
	Low	2.4	Slab-on-grade	Masonry			
				Plasterboard / Hard Board			
			Raised: Timber	Masonry			
				Plasterboard / Hard Board			
			Raised: Chipboard	Masonry			
				Plasterboard / Hard Board			
		2.7	Slab-on-grade	Masonry			
				Plasterboard / Hard Board			
			Raised: Timber	Masonry			
				Plasterboard / Hard Board			
			Raised: Chipboard	Masonry			
				Plasterboard / Hard Board			

## Summary

The risk posed by flood hazard to housing in Australia is disproportionately influenced by legacy housing. The development of a building schema which categorises the Australian housing stock into classes with distinctive vulnerabilities is an integral part of the risk and impact assessment process. The schema must capture the wide range of housing types extant in the country together with the variation in vulnerabilities observed in outwardly similar houses.

The proposed schema divides each building into its main components i.e. foundation, bottom floor, upper floors (if they exist) and roof. It is proposed to develop vulnerability knowledge for each of these building components separately to make possible vulnerability assessment of buildings with mixed construction material at different floor levels. The approach facilitates the development of vulnerability curves for taller buildings, buildings with basements, and buildings with mixed usages.

The schema categorises each floor level by the building attributes: Construction Period, Fit-out Quality, Storey Height, Internal Wall Material and External Wall Material. As the project progresses it is expected that the results of the research will drive modifications to the schema proposed herein. The research may indicate little or no variation in vulnerability between some proposed classes thus enabling the combining of two or more classes in the schema. Conversely the research may identify different types of buildings within a single class in the proposed schema that demonstrate significantly different vulnerabilities. This would necessitate an expansion of the proposed schema, and, possibly, the capture of further building attributes into the exposure database to enable the new house classes to be identified within the Australian housing stock. Furthermore, the research will examine the population of houses across Australia that fall into the various classes. Some classes may be so poorly represented that they may be removed from the schema.

## Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge the support of the residents of Brisbane, Ipswich, Bundaberg and South Sydney who made their time available to answer questions during the field and postal surveys. The authors also acknowledge the City of Sydney, the Sydney Coastal Council Group, the Department of Climate Change and Energy Efficiency, the Bushfire and Natural Hazards Cooperative Research Centre and the office of United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction for their research support.

The support of the Commonwealth of Australia through the Cooperative Research Centre program is acknowledged.

This paper is published with the permission of the CEO, Geoscience Australia.

## References

- Australian Building Code Board (ABCB). 2012. Construction of buildings in flood hazard areas. Standard Version 2012.2. Canberra, Australia.
- Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). 2007. Multi-hazard loss estimation methodology, flood model, HAZUS, technical manual. Developed by the Department of Homeland Security, Washington DC.

- Grünthal, G. (ed.), Musson, R., Schwarz, J. and Stucchi, M. 1998. European Macroseismic Scale 1998. Cahiers du Centre Européen de Géodynamique et de Séismologie: Volume 15 – European Center for Geodynamics and Seismology, Luxembourg.
- Maqsood, S.T., Senthilvasan, M., Corby, N., Wehner, M. and Edwards, M. 2013. Improved assessment of flood impact: an urban storm water case study of a City of Sydney catchment. Proc. Floodplain Management Association National Conference, Tweed Heads, Australia.
- Maqsood, T., Wehner, M., Ryu, H., Edwards, M., Dale, K. and Miller, V., 2014. GAR15 Vulnerability Functions: Reporting on the UNISDR/GA SE Asian Regional Workshop on Structural Vulnerability Models for the GAR Global Risk Assessment, 11–14 November, 2013, Geoscience Australia, Canberra, Australia. Record 2014/38. Geoscience Australia: Canberra. <http://dx.doi.org/10.11636/Record.2014.038>
- McLuckie, D. 2007. Floodplain risk management guideline. Department of Environment and Climate Change. NSW Government. 25 October 2007.
- Pacheo, B., Hernandez, H., Castro, P., Tingatinga, E., Suiza, R., Tan, L., Lonalong, R., Vreon, M., Aquino, H., Macuha, R., Mata, W., Villalba, I., Pascua, M., Ignacio, U., Germar, F., Dino, J., Reyes, G., Tirao, J. and Zarco, M. 2013. Development of vulnerability curves of key building types in the Greater Metro Manila Area, Philippines. Institute of Civil Engineering. University of the Philippines Diliman.
- RiskScape. 2010. Riskscape User Manual Version 0.2.30. A joint venture between GNS Science and NIWA New Zealand. <https://riskscape.niwa.co.nz/>
- Schwarz, J. and Maiwald, H. 2008. Damage and loss prediction model based on the vulnerability of building types. Proc. 4th International Symposium on Flood Defence. Toronto, Canada.
- Wehner, M., Maqsood, T., Corby, N., Edwards, M. and Middelman-Fernandes, M. 2012. Augmented vulnerability models for inundation. Technical report submitted to DCCEE. Geoscience Australia, Canberra, Australia.

