Wave overtopping mitigation by a vertical wall or a wave return wall at the end of a pitched rock slope

**Jentsje van der Meer** Van der Meer Consulting BV; IHE Delft

John Kiong Eunice Chin Yao Ming Yong Martijn Klabbers Junsheng Jiang Hongjuan Han R. Bing







Knowledge

Advisian (Worley), Singapore and Perth, Australia

State Key Laboratory of Coastal and Offshore Engineering; Dalian University of Technology, Dalian, China

### Contents



- Objective
- Mitigation options for sea level rise and wave overtopping
- Stability of pitched rock slopes
- Analysis on wave overtopping
- Practical results along EurOtop

# Objective

#### Situation in Singapore

- Relatively mild (design) wave conditions: H<sub>s</sub> = 1-2.5 m
- Locally generated: steep waves with  $s_{m-1,0} > 0.035$
- Deep water (generally 10-20 m)
- Crest level low and equal to industrial area

Sea level rise will have a significant influence on wave overtopping

What are efficient and practical mitigation options?





# Pitched rock slopes





# Pitched rock slopes







# Pitched rock slopes – single layer, Structure 1







# Mitigation: wave wall





### Mitigation: wave return wall



Knowledge





1.0 or 1.5 m high







20

#### Model tests in China, Dalian University of Technology

#### ICC Institution of Civil Engineers

Knowledge

#### Single layer



Failure

Institution of Civil Engineers

Structure failed



#### Stability – Van der Meer formula

Single layer pitched rock

Wave height H<sub>s</sub> (m)

**Double layer pitched rock** 

Wave height H<sub>e</sub> (m)

8

7

6

5

4

3

2

1

n

0.5

0.6

Damage S<sub>d</sub> (-)

#### Wave overtopping tests



Knowledge

Wave return wall

#### 10-60Kg 100-600kg 10-60kg **2D Wave Model** 2D Wave Model **Tests of Wave Tests of Wave Overtopping and Stability Overtopping and Stability** STRUCTURE 1

Wave wall, with or

without bullnose

### EurOtop equations (gentle slope)







### Double pitched, all data



ice Institution of Civil Engineer

### Single or double pitched - comparison



Institution of Civil Engineers

# Single pitched; wave wall





# Single pitched; wave wall



Relative freeboard  $R_c/(H_{m0}\xi_{m-1.0})$ 



# Single pitched; wall and bullnose 1 m



Institution of Civil Engineers

# Single pitched; wall and bullnose 1.5 m



ice

Institution of Civil Enginee

### Single pitched; wave return wall

Relative overtopping rate q/(gH\_{m0}{}^3)^{0.5} tana^{0.5}/\xi\_{m^{-1},0}



Ī

 $\mathbf{CE}$ 

Institution of Civil Enginee

Relative freeboard  $R_c/(H_{m0}\xi_{m-1,0})$ 



### Double pitched, wave return wall



ICC Institution of Civil Engineers

# **Conclusions on mitigation options**

#### Restrictions

- (Pitched) rock slopes, one or two layers: mild design wave heights
- Only for high wave steepness:  $s_{m-1,0} > 0.035$

#### Conclusions

• Pitched slopes (above water only) have similar stability as randomly placed rock

- Failure for a single pitched slope occurs at  $S_d = 2!$
- Wave wall is very effective, but is an obstacle
- Wave return wall is effective at same crest height
- Model testing gives new influence factors  $\gamma_f$  and  $\gamma_v$  in EurOtop equations

# **Conclusions on mitigation options**



Knowledge

Vertical walls, with or without bullnose; wave return wall; a wave steepness  $s_{m-1.0} > 0.035$ :

$$\frac{q}{\sqrt{g \cdot H_{m0}^3}} = \frac{0.023}{\sqrt{\tan\alpha}} \gamma_b \cdot \xi_{m-1,0} \cdot \exp[-(2.7 \frac{R_c}{\xi_{m-1,0} \cdot H_{m0} \cdot \gamma_b \cdot \gamma_f \cdot \gamma_\beta \cdot \gamma_v})^{1.3}] \quad \text{EurOtop 5.10}$$

$$\frac{\text{EurOtop random}}{\text{EurOtop random}}$$
Single layer of pitched rock:  $\gamma_f = 0.55 \quad 0.6$ 
Double layer of pitched rock:  $\gamma_f = 0.51 \quad 0.55$ 
A vertical wall on top:  $\gamma_v = 1.0$ 
A bullnose on the vertical wall:  $\gamma_v = \gamma_{bn} = 0.85$ 
A wave return wall  $\gamma_v = \gamma_{vrrv} = 0.75$ 

 $\gamma_v = \gamma_{wrw} = 0.75$ 



Knowledge

# Thank you





# Relationship $S_d$ and $N_{od}$ (Van der Meer, JCHS 2021





