Supplementary information for "Urban pluvial flood risk assessment - data resolution and spatial scale when developing screening approaches on the micro scale"

Roland Löwe[1], Karsten Arnbjerg-Nielsen[1]

[1]Section of Urban Water Systems, Department of Environmental Engineering, Technical University of Denmark (DTU), Kgs. Lyngby, Denmark.

Correspondence to: Roland Löwe (rolo@env.dtu.dk)

S1 Relationship between impervious area and building area in the case study

Figure S 1 illustrates scatterplots of total impervious area vs. total building area after aggregating the original polygon data to grids with varying pixel sizes.



Figure S 1. Scatterplots of impervious area vs. total building area after aggregation to different pixel sizes.

S2 Regression coefficients for predicting imperviousness ratios in 2D flood simulations

For 2D flood simulation, impervious areas were calculated based on aggregated building datasets using the regression relationship below. The coefficients were derived with a raster resolution of 400m and the units of both input data and predicted impervious area are [m^2/m^2]. Building types are summarized in Table S 1. Footprint areas for utility buildings were not considered in this relationship because the associate coefficients were consistently found to be insignificant.

$$\begin{aligned} A_{imp} = 2.08A_{bf,commercial} &+ 1.45A_{bf,cultural} + 1.64A_{bf,industrial} + 0.23A_{bf,agricultural} \\ &+ 1.55A_{bf.public\ residence} + 1.99A_{bf,public\ services} + 2.22A_{bf,residential\ block} \\ &+ 1.93A_{bf,residential\ detached} + 2.08A_{bf,residential\ rowhouse} \\ &+ 1.24A_{bf,general\ services} \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

S3 Infiltration rates for 2D flood simulations

Figure S 2 illustrates maps of infiltration rates that were used to parameterize the 2D flood simulations in the baseline simulation and for a situation where the building data were aggregated to a resolution of 500m.



Figure S 2. Infiltration rates $f_t(1 - IS)$ applied in 2D flood simulation considering the baseline dataset (left) and infiltration rates derived from a building dataset that was aggregated to a resolution of 500m (right).

S4 Case study building types

Table S 1. Case study building types and assignment to building classes in the two damage frameworks

Type case study	Damage class in this study	Name in Olsen et al. (2015)	Name in Beckers et al. (2013)
Residential block	Residential	Residential	Residential
Public residence	Residential	Residential	Residential
Residential row-house	Residential	Residential	Residential
Detached residential	Residential	Residential	Residential
Commercial (warehouse, shopping malls and similar)	Commercial	Commercial	Industry and business area
Industrial	Commercial	Commercial	Industry and business area
Commercial services (kiosk, restaurants, etc.)	Commercial	Commercial	Industry and business area
Utility (water treatment facility, transformer building, etc.)	Commercial	Commercial	Industry and business area
Cultural	Public	Public Institution	Governmental utilization
Public services (schools, police, medical facilities, etc.)	Public	Public Institution	Governmental utilization
Agricultural	Commercial with damages from Olsen et al. (2015), excluded otherwise	Commercial	Excluded

S5 Subdivision of the case study area for cross validation in damage regression

Figure S 3 illustrates how our case study area was subdivided into cells with an edge length of 2000m when performing cross-validation during damage regression. Different colours indicate different subareas. Areas were damages were zero were excluded from the dataset. These areas were typically located beyond the watershed and thus not considered in the 2D flood simulation (c.f. Figure S 2).



Figure S 3. Subdivision of the case study area into cells of 2000x2000m for cross validation during damage regression.

S6 Total damage estimates in damage regression

Figure S 4 illustrates the variation of damage ratios DR_{tot} as a function of the data resolution applied when estimating parameters of the damage regression models.



Figure S 4. Median of DR_{tot} obtained during cross validation for flood damage regression models (DMOD1) fitted at different data resolutions Δx_{fit} and considering building data aggregated to different resolutions in m (lines with varying colors). Lines were smoothed while dots indicate the true DR_{tot} values derived for each combination of fitting resolution and building input data resolution. Dots were colored blue for a building data resolution of 200m and grey otherwise.