

	Risk	Recommendations	
Source of Flooding		Present Day	
Fluvial	Greater than 1 in 100 year (FZ3)	High risk: Residential development on a site in this zone is unlikely to be appropriate unless the site is in an area with reduced risk of flooding due the presence of defences and can be made safe for the intended lifespan.	High risk: Residential development on a site appropriate unless the site is in a the presence of defences. Conside of Protection of existing defences any other measures necessary to protection to proposed development
	Between 1 in 100 and 1 in 1000 year (FZ2)	Medium risk: Residential development may be appropriate, sequential approach should be applied to avoid developing in flood zones as far as reasonable. Parts of the site within flood zone 1 should also be reviewed against the criteria described for low risk sites.	Medium risk: Residential development may be be applied to avoid developing in reasonable. Consideration should of any defences in relation to futu to deliver the required standards.
	Less than 1 in 1000 year	Low risk: Residential development is potentially appropriate in this zone if it is also at low risk from other sources of flooding, however it should be noted that catchments <3km2 in area are not covered by the Environment Agency Flood Zones . Sites should be considered in conjunction with the EA Main River map, OS mapping data and data on other sources of flooding. Surface water mapping in particular often highlights areas at risk of flooding from these smaller watercourses.	Low risk: Residential development is proba however this will depend on the p recommendations
	Applying the sequential and exception tests:	Sites in these categories should be explicitly addressed in a Sequential Test and may require preparation of further evidence in a site specific FRA to substantiate that Exception Test can be satisfied. Evidence from a Level 2 SFRA is required to demonstrate that the principle of development is supported.	Sites in these categories should be Test and may require preparation FRA to substantiate that Exception Level 2 SFRA (including detailed change) is required to demonstration supported.
Surface Water	Greater than 1 in 1000 year	High Risk: Development on a site in this risk area is unlikely to be appropriate unless measures (including drainage) are in place to control overland flow.	High Risk: Development on a site in this risk unless measures (including drain flow.
	Less than 1 in 1000 year	Low risk: Development may be appropriate and consultations should be held with the Lead Local Flood Authority.	Low risk: Development may be appropriate the Lead Local Flood Authority.
	Applying the sequential and exception tests:	Evidence may be required from a site specific FRA to demonstrate that the development will not increase flood risk elsewhere, and that the drainage requirements regarding runoff rates and SuDS for new development are met.	Evidence may be required from a modelling of the risk from climate development will not increase flor requirements regarding runoff rat met.



Future

e in this zone is unlikely to be an area with reduced risk of flooding due leration should be given to the Standard is in relation to future climate change and o provide appropriate standards of ment.

appropriate, sequential approach should the areas at risk of flooding as much as d be given to the Standard of Protection ure climate change and the commitment

ably appropriate in this risk area, present-day fluvial flood zone

be explicitly addressed in a Sequential n of further evidence in a site specific on Test can be satisfied. Evidence from a modelling of the impact of climate ate that the principle of development is

k area is unlikely to be appropriate age) are in place to control overland

and consultations should be held with

a site specific FRA (including detailed e change) to demonstrate that the ood risk elsewhere, and that the drainage ites and SuDS for new development are



Source of Flooding	Risk	Present Day	
Groundwater	Site is >10% within highest risk category in JBA Groundwater map (groundwater is <0.025m below the surface in the 1 in 100-year event)	Development might be appropriate but a site-specific FRA should consider groundwater risk. A high likeliho appropriate and groundwater monitoring should be recommended.	
	Site is <10% within highest risk category in JBA Groundwater map (groundwater is <0.025m below the surface in the 1 in 100-year event)	Development is likely to be appropriate in this risk area, however as groundwater datasets are generally prothat ground investigations are carried out and reported on within a site-specific FRA where this is required on the second se	
	Applying the sequential and exception tests:	Mapping should be considered in conjunction with historic evidence of known problems - a site-specific FRA once groundwater has emerged. It is unlikely that infiltration SuDS will be appropriate and groundwater m	
Sewer	All sites assumed to be at high risk of sewer flooding. Additional information required via the Level 2 assessment	Developers should discuss public sewerage capacity with the water utility company at the earliest possible s Water Drainage Strategy (often undertaken as part of an FRA) shows that this will not increase flood risk el requirements regarding runoff rates and SuDS for new development are met.	
Reservoir	Sites where reservoir flooding is predicted to make fluvial flooding worse for development in high hazard zone to be assessed in a Level 2 SFRA.	Risk of flooding from reservoirs should not rule out development as the likelihood of reservoir breach is low state of repair of the dam and the long term commitment to its management and maintenance. Risk should site-specific FRA stage and an emergency plan is likely to be required. The local authority Emergency Plan development is considered, the local authority Emergency Planning team should be consulted to confirm the	
Historic flood map	Sites where any part of site is within historic flood extents to be assessed in a Level 2 SFRA.	Sites located in areas that have historically flooded might be appropriate for development, however further the severity and frequency of the historic flooding and accuracy of the historic flood extent. This should be Level 1 SFRA to decide whether the site is appropriate for allocation. Technical work will be required to info	
Ordinary Water course	Any part of site contains a Ordinary Watercourse	Sites which contain an ordinary watercourse might be appropriate for dev considered to further determine the effect on development. Additional mo risk (in the present day and from the impacts of climate change) to the d	velopment. The Flood Zones and so odelling may be required at the sit evelopment from the ordinary wat
		Where the watercourse is located away from a site and land slopes down land slopes down towards the watercourse and away from the site. Consi development is designed to ensure existing flow paths are retained.	towards the site, development ma deration must also be given to atte



Future

ood may mean infiltration SuDS are not

roduced nationally it is recommended (known to be a problem locally).

A should consider overland flow paths nonitoring should be recommended.

stage. It is important that a Surface elsewhere, and that the drainage

v, this will be heavily dependent on the d still be considered by the developer at ning team should be consulted. If nat proposals can be safely implemented.

r investigation will be required regarding e used alongside other information in the form this at the site-specific FRA stage.

surface water map should also be te-specific FRA stage to demonstrate the tercourse.

ay be less appropriate than a site where tenuation and flow, ensuring that