

In partnership with:

Medway Council

Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment

Medway Council

Medway Council **Gun Wharf** Dock Road Chatham Kent

ME4 4TR





CANTERBURY | LONDON | CAMBRIDGE | BRISTOL | LEEDS

Tel 01227 833855 www.herringtonconsulting.co.uk

This report has been prepared by Herrington Consulting Ltd in accordance with the instructions of their client, **Medway Council**, for their sole and specific use. Any other persons who use any information contained herein do so at their own risk.

© Herrington Consulting Limited 2025

Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment **Medway Council**

Contents Amendment Record

This report has been issued and amended as follows:

Issue	Revision	Description	Date	Written by	Checked by
1	0	Draft report	May 2025	AB	AW



This page is left intentionally blank



Contents Page

1.	Sco	1	
2.	Def	inition of Assessment Criteria	3
	2.1.	Assessment Criteria	3
	2.2.	Table of Individual Sites	7
3.	Site	e Summary Tables	8
	3.1.	Medium Risk Areas	9
	3.2.	High Risk Areas	29
Α.	Арр	pendices	



1. Scope and Summary of Appraisal

This report has been prepared to accompany the document titled 'Medway Council Sequential Test Report' prepared by Herrington Consulting in March 2025 and should be read in conjunction with this report.

Paragraph 177 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2024) states that; "Having applied the sequential test, if it is not possible for development to be located in areas with a lower risk of flooding (taking into account wider sustainable development objectives), the exception test may have to be applied. The need for the exception test will depend on the potential vulnerability of the site and of the development proposed, in line with the Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification set out in Annex 3."

Paragraph 178 of the NPPF 2024 reads;

Exception Test Part B – To pass the Exception Test it should be demonstrated that "the
development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without
increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall."

Therefore, this document applies Part B of the Exception Test to the sites identified within the Medway Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) preferred development option, which did not pass the Sequential Test.

A high-level application of Part B of the Exception Test has been carried out for all sites within Flood Zones 2 and 3, and for sites in any Flood Zone where over 5% of the gross site area is at 'high' risk of surface water flooding, and where over 40% of the gross area is at 'medium' risk of surface water flooding. In total, **52 sites** were taken forward for the application of the Exception Test Part B, with the breakdown of the sites as follows:

- 11 sites within Flood Zone 1, that have been identified to have a 'high' surface water risk which covers greater than 5% of the gross site area, and a 'medium' surface water risk which covers greater than 40% of the gross site area.
- 4 sites within both Flood Zone 1 and 2, which have less than 10% of the gross area located within Flood Zone 2, that have been identified to have a 'high' surface water risk which covers less than 5% of the gross site area, and a 'medium' surface water risk which covers less than 40% of the gross site area.
- 37 sites within Flood Zone 3 or partly within Flood Zone 3.

The aim of this appraisal is to inform the evidence base for the Sustainability Appraisal and Infrastructure Development Plan, to support the final allocation of sites within the Medway Local Plan and to inform 'Part A' of the Exception Test at a strategic level. The document will also be

Medway Council Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment



used to assist developers in undertaking site-specific application of 'Part B' of the Exception Test. Recommendations are made on the basis of the best available information at this time and in absence of detailed proposals or Site Investigation data. Therefore, the suitability of any proposals is subject to appropriate Flood Risk Assessments in the context of wider planning objectives.



2. Definition of Assessment Criteria

2.1. Assessment Criteria

This section outlines the information and datasets that have been referenced in the process of applying the Exception Test Part B to the individual sites:

Site Reference - The assigned site reference, as provided by Medway Council

Site Area - The area of the site in hectares (ha).

Existing Land Use – States whether the site is currently a brownfield site (i.e., previously developed), or a greenfield site (i.e., undeveloped).

Proposed Land Use - States the proposed land use of the site (i.e., residential or commercial).

Flood Zone Classification – States the percentage of the site within each flood zone based on the Environment Agency's (EA) 'Flood Map for Planning'. The definition of each flood zone is as follows:

Zone $1 - Low \ probability \ of \ flooding -$ This zone is assessed as having less than a 1 in 1000 annual probability of river or sea flooding in any one year.

Zone 2 – *Medium probability of flooding* – This zone comprises land assessed as having between a 1 in 100 and 1 in 1000 annual probability of river flooding or between 1 in 200 and 1 in 1000 annual probability of sea flooding in any one year.

Zone 3a – *High probability of flooding* - This zone comprises land assessed as having a 1 in 100 or greater annual probability of river flooding or 1 in 200 or greater annual probability of sea flooding in any one year.

Zone 3b – *The Functional Floodplain* – This zone comprises land where water has to flow or be stored in times of flood and can be defined as land which would flood during an event having an annual probability of 1 in 30 or greater. This zone can also represent areas that are designed to flood in an extreme event as part of a flood alleviation or flood storage scheme.

In some instances, a site is shown to be located within the functional floodplain, when in reality this is considered not to be the case, with this inaccuracy attributed to the outputs of the hydrodynamic flood modelling that is currently available. The North Kent Coast (NKC) Modelling Study (2018) was released *prior* to the completion of a number of defence upgrades, most recently at Jane's Creek and Strood Riverside. The impact that these defence upgrades will have is therefore not accounted for within the model and as a consequence, there are sites that are shown to be located within the functional floodplain but would actually benefit from new defences. It is intended that further modelling refinements are undertaken as part of the Council's forthcoming Strood Flood Strategy

Page 3

Medway Council Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment



to determine the true flood zone classification, and ultimately, to determine whether the site would pass the Exception Test. Where this is the case, an * is located next to the Flood Zone 3b percentage stated. Further guidance is included in the 'Exception Test Required' and 'Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures' sections.

In cases where less than ~10% of the site is shown to be located within the functional floodplain, the site is not considered to be wholly within Flood Zone 3b. Instead, it is recommended that for these sites the *Sequential Approach* is applied, and development within the area of site shown to be within Flood Zone 3b should be avoided. This is listed as a recommendation within the 'Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures' section.

Development Lifetime – States the anticipated lifetime of the development. The NPPF and 'Flood and Coastal Change' Planning Practice Guidance states that residential development should be considered for a minimum of 100 years, but that the lifetime of a non-residential development depends on the characteristics of the development. For commercial development, a 75 year design life is typically assumed.

Exception Test Required – This section considers whether the development falls into a category that requires the Exception Test to be undertaken and is based on the flood zone classification and flood risk vulnerability classification. The application of the Exception Test has been summarised in Table 2.1 below.



Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3a	Zone 3b
Essential Infrastructure – Essential transport infrastructure, strategic utility infrastructure, including electricity generating power stations.	✓	✓	е	е
High Vulnerability – Emergency services, basement dwellings, caravans and mobile homes intended for permanent residential use.	✓	е	×	×
More Vulnerable – Hospitals, residential care homes, buildings used for dwelling houses, halls of residence, pubs, hotels, non-residential uses for health services, nurseries and education.	√	√	е	×
Less Vulnerable – Shops, offices, restaurants, general industry, agriculture, sewerage treatment plants.	√	✓	√	×
Water Compatible Development – Flood control infrastructure, sewerage infrastructure, docks, marinas, ship building, water-based recreation etc.	√	√	√	√
Key:				
✓ Development is appropriate				
x Development should not be permitted				
€ Exception Test required				

Table 2.1 - Flood risk vulnerability and flood zone incompatibility.

Flood History – Based on historic flood records provided by Medway Council and the EA's 'Historic Flood Outlines' GIS layer, analysis was carried out for each site to identify if there were any recorded flood events from any source, both on site, or within 100m of the site. If incidents were present, a brief description has been provided.

Watercourse/Rivers – Identifies any main rivers, ordinary or man-made watercourses near to the site. Based on the EA's 'Statutory Main River Map', OS mapping and satellite imagery.

Percentage of site at risk of flooding from tidal sources and/or surface water – For tidal flooding, analysis was undertaken using the NKC Modelling Study (2018 – provided by the EA) to identify the percentage of each site within the extent of flooding for a range of return period events. The analysis was carried out for the 'defended'. The maximum flood level on site was also extracted and is shown in brackets within the table.

It should be acknowledged that for sites where defences have recently been improved, these levels were modelled *prior* to the installation of new defences (particularly Jane's Creek and Strood Riverside), which may account for the anomalous values.



With regard to surface water flooding, the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water' maps formed the basis of the analysis. The EA's mapping shows three modelled scenarios; 'low', 'medium' and 'high', and where an area is not shown to flood from surface water, this is classified as 'very low' risk (as described below). The percentage of the site at risk of flooding during each modelled scenario was extracted and recorded in the table of results.

- 'Very Low' risk means that each year this area has less than 0.1% chance of flooding.
- 'Low' risk means that each year this area has between 0.1% and 1% chance of flooding.
- 'Medium' risk means that each year this area has between 1% and 3.3% chance of flooding.
- 'High' risk means that each year this area has greater than 3.3% chance of flooding

Description of surface water flow paths – Describes any surface water flow path or identifies areas where surface water could accumulate on site during the 'low', 'medium' and/or 'high' risk scenarios.

Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure – A summary of the existing defence infrastructure which is based on the Medway Flood Defence High Level Appraisal (2011) and the EA's 'Spatial Flood Defence Dataset' (last updated in June 2024). Where available, the Standard of Protection (SoP) as provided by Medway Council has been listed.

High Level Indicative Defence Cost – Where consideration should be given to upgrading existing defences, a high-level estimation of the costs associated with carrying out the works has been provided. This section assesses the cost of upgrading all defences that have an impact on each individual site with the aim of providing an indication of the cost to be shared amongst beneficiaries or defence upgrades.

All estimates have been based on the information contained within 'Cost Estimation for Coastal Protection – Summary of Evidence – Report SC080039/R7' and 'Cost Estimation for fluvial defences – Summary of Evidence – Report SC080039/R2' previously provided by the EA. The estimates do not account for inflation since the documents were published in March 2015, and the cost for the individual sites do include 'double counting' of defence costs where multiple sites benefit from the same defences. All figures are basic estimates based on available data, and further detailed analysis will be required to determine a more accurate cost to upgrade the defences. Further data on costs is available within MEASS which considers the costs of options throughout a Benefit Area, which may be referred to where a scheme is considered to benefit a wider area and multiple beneficiaries. It is advised that as well as obtaining pre-app advice from the Council, that applicants also seek pre-app advice from the EA who can provide further advice on their implementation plans for MEASS and how this may relate to development proposals.

Flood Warning Area – States whether the site is wholly or partially within a Flood Alert Area or Flood Warning Area based on the EA's 'Flood Warning Area's' dataset.



Hazard Rating – The hazard rating classification outputs, provided as part of the NKC Modelling Study (2018), have been analysed and the percentage of the site which falls within each classification has been listed. There are four hazard rating classifications, as defined in Table 2.2 below, and the dominant Hazard Rating has been coloured within each site summary table (in the corresponding hazard rating colour) to allow for ease of comparison between sites.

Hazard Rating (HR)	Degree of Flood Hazard	Description				
< 0.75	Low	Caution – shallow flowing water or deep standing water				
0.75 to 1.25	Moderate	Dangerous for some, i.e., children – deep or fast flowing water				
1.25 to 2.0	Significant	Dangerous for most people – deep fast flowing water				
> 2.0	Extreme	Dangerous for all – extreme danger with deep and fast flowing water				

Table 2.2 – Classification of Hazard Rating Thresholds.

Geology – The underlying bedrock geology and any overlying superficial deposits have been extracted from mapping provided by the British Geological Society (BGS) and recorded.

Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures – The section highlights where a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and/or Surface Water Management Strategy (SWMS) would be required. In addition, this section summarises the recommendations and mitigation requirements to be considered as part of an FRA, and/or SWMS.

2.2. Table of Individual Sites

The table below lists the sites that have been assessed as part of this appraisal alongside the flood zone classification. Appendix A.1 shows the location of these sites within Medway.





3. Site Summary Tables

3.1. Medium Risk Areas



AS2									
Site Area (l	На): 0.341	Exis	sting Land Use: Brownf	ield	Proposed Land Use: Residential				
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Flood	l Zone 2	Flood	Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	100.0%	0	1.0%	0.0	0%	0.0%			
Development lifetime	100 years	00 years							
Exception Test required?	The Exception Test is not required to be	applied for any vulnera	ability classification.						
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the sit	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site: None.							
Watercourses/Rivers	There is a drainage ditch along the south	hern border.							
Geology	Bedrock: London Clay Formation - Clay and Silt Superficial deposits: Head - Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel								
	Percentage of site at risk of fl	looding from tidal sou	rces during the defend	ed scenario for key ret	urn period events. Ma	eximum flood level on site shown in brackets.			
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year return	n period event - 2070	1 in 200-year return	period event - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event			
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.0m AODN)	0.00% (0.0m AODN) 0.0			Om AODN)	0.00% (0.0m AODN)			
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'								
	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	ım' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario			
	15.2%			4.3%		7.0%			
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	During all modelled scenarios, water is s	shown to accumulate or	nsite attributed to topogra	phic depressions					
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset standard of protection is 1 in 1000 years		ences consist of an emba	ankment with an effective	e crest level of 5.08m /	AODN, and has a condition rating of 3. The design			
High-Level Indication of Defence	N/A – The site is predicted to remain una	affected from the River	Medway and the sea for	the lifetime of any devel	opment.				
Costs Flood Warning Area?	N/A								
	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2115) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)								
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mode	rate' Hazard Rating	'Significa	ant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating			
	0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	0.00%			
Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	The site is located is at risk of flooding from surface water. As a result, a FRA, is required to be undertaken. SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. Floor levels should be raised above the maximum depth of flooding from surface water, including an additional freeboard where practicable. Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion. The LPA should be consulted prior to the commencement of any works to obtain consent for any development proposed within 8m of any ordinary watercourse. Where the watercourse falls within the RSIDB area, the RSIDB should be consulted to obtain consent.								





CCB15							
Site Area (I	На): 0.337	Existing Land Use: Brown	ïeld	Propos	sed Land Use: Residential		
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Flood Zone 2	Flood Zone 3		Flood Zone 3b		
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	91.9%	8.1%	0.0%		0.0%		
Development lifetime	100 years			1			
Exception Test required?	The Exception Test is not required to be a	pplied for development classified as 'more vul	nerable'.				
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	None.					
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway is approximately 485m	northwest of the site.					
Geology		Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation – Chalk Superficial deposits: Head - Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel					
	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from tidal sources during the defenced scenario for key return period events. Maximum flood level on site shows						
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year return period event - 2070 1 in 200-year re		ent - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event		
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.0m AODN)	7.21% (5.46m AODN)	19.36% (6.12m AOD	N)	7.21% (5.40m AODN)		
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage	of site at risk of flooding from surface wat	er based on the EA's 'Risk of Fl	ooding from Sur	face Water Map'		
	'High' risk scenario	'Medi	ium' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario		
	1.6%		0.0%		99.6%		
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	During the 'high' and 'medium' risk scenar surface water flow path.	o, surface water is shown to encroach onto th	e northern corner. Under the 'low'	risk scenario, the	entire site is shown to be affected by a		
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	· ·	hows the existing defences consist of natural esign standard of protection is 1 in 100 years.		as an actual cres	t level between 4.60m and 5.49m AODN. The		
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,152/m to the lifetime of any development.	raise an existing embankment, it is estimated	to cost in the region of £550,000 t	o upgrade the 450	Om of defences in order to protect the site for		
Flood Warning Area?	Yes						
	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2115) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)						
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Moderate' Hazard Rating	'Significant' Hazar	d Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating		
	3.34%	9.27%	5.39%		0.00%		





Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures

The site is located in Flood Zones 2 and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.

SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require a Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site.

The development should meet the requirements of the EA's Flood Risk Standing Advice, which applies for 'less vulnerable' and 'more vulnerable' development within Flood Zone 2.

Floor levels should be raised above the maximum depth of flooding from surface water, including an additional freeboard where practicable.

The Sequential Approach should be applied to the layout of the site by locating the most vulnerable elements in the lowest risk areas. The Sequential Approach should also be applied to the internal layout of buildings, in particular where floor levels cannot be raised.

Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

Flood Hazard should be appraised against the proposed development layout to ensure that users and occupants of the site can achieve safe access and egress.



ННН24									
Site Area (l	На): 3.183	Ex	isting Land Use: Greenf	ield	Pro	pposed Land Use: Residential			
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	Flood Zone 2		Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	100.0%	(0.0%	0	.0%	0.0%			
Development lifetime	100 years								
Exception Test required?	The Exception Test is not required to be applied for any vulnerability classification.								
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site: EA Recorded Flood datasets shows the site was affected from the sea in 1953 due to waves overtopping the defences.								
Watercourses/Rivers	The Hoo Flats are located approximately	/ 1,150m south of the	site.						
Geology	Bedrock: London Clay Formation - Clay and Silt Superficial deposits: Head - Clay and Silt								
	Percentage of site at risk of fl	looding from tidal so	urces during the defenc	ed scenario for key re	turn period events. Ma	ximum flood level on site shown in brackets.			
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year retu	1 in 200-year return period event - 2070 1 in 20		n period event - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event			
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0	0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0.00m AODN)		0.00% (0.00m AODN)			
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'								
	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	ım' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario			
	6.9%			0.0%					
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	During all modelled scenarios, there is a eastern boundary, however, this is due to			site following the acces	s road. Under all model	led scenarios, water is shown to flow along the			
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset standard of protection is 1 in 1000 years		efences consist of an emba	ankment with an effectiv	ve crest level of 5.03m A	AODN, and has a condition rating of 3. The design			
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	N/A – The site is predicted to remain una	affected from the River	r Medway and the sea for	the lifetime of any deve	elopment.				
Flood Warning Area?	N/A								
	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2115) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the								
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mode	respective col erate' Hazard Rating	our – Refer to Table 2	.2) eant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating			
	-	Wood	0.00%	Olgriino		0.00%			
Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	The site is at risk of flooding from surface SuDS should be considered to be includ Surface Water Management Strategy to Floor levels should be raised above the respective should be supported by the support of the su	0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% The site is at risk of flooding from surface water and greater than 1ha. As a result, a FRA is required to be undertaken. BuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require a surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site. Blood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.							



LW10									
Site Area (Existing Land	Use: Brownfi	eld	Pro	posed Land Use: Residential				
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Flood Zone 2		Flood	Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	100.0%	0.0%		0	.0%	0.0%			
Development lifetime	100 years	years							
Exception Test required?	The Exception Test is not required to be	The Exception Test is not required to be applied for any vulnerability classification.							
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the sit	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site: None.							
Watercourses/Rivers	No watercourses/rivers are located within	n close proximity to the site.							
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formatic Superficial deposits: Head - Clay, Silt, Sa								
	Percentage of site at risk of fl	ooding from tidal sources durin	g the defence	ed scenario for key re	turn period events. Ma	ximum flood level on site shown in brackets.			
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year return period ev	ent - 2070	1 in 200-year retur	n period event - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event			
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0.00m AODN)		0.00% (0.00m AODN)		0.00% (0.00m AODN)			
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'								
	'High' risk scenario	io 'Medium' risk scen				'Low' risk scenario			
	7.1%	% 15.3% 56.7%							
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under the 'high' risk scenario, surface wa	ater is shown to accumulate within	the north of th	ne site. Under the 'med	lium' and 'low' risk scena	rios, there is a surface water flow path onsite.			
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset	shows no existing defences nearly	py.						
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	N/A - There are no defences near to the	site and the site is predicted to rea	main unaffecte	ed from the River Medw	vay for the lifetime of dev	velopment based on current data.			
Flood Warning Area?	No								
	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2115) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)								
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Moderate' Hazar	d Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating			
	0.00%	0.00%			0.00%	0.00%			
Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	The site is at risk of flooding from surface water. As a result, a FRA is required to be undertaken. SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site. Floor levels should be raised above the maximum depth of flooding from surface water, including an additional freeboard where practicable. Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.								





ннн6							
Site Area (F	la): 30.050	E	xisting Land Use: Greenf	eld	Proj	oosed Land Use: Residential	
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Flood Zone 2		Flood	Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b	
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	100.0%		0.0%	0.	0%	0.0%	
Development lifetime	100 years	L					
Exception Test required?	The Exception Test is not required to be	applied for any vulne	erability classification.				
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	e: None.					
Watercourses/Rivers	There are multiple drainage ditches onsit	te. The River Medwa	y (Upnor Reach) is located	approximately 920m so	outh of the site.		
Geology	Bedrock: London Clay Formation - Clay and Silt Superficial deposits: Head - Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel						
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	ooding from tidal so	ources during the defence	ed scenario for key re	turn period events. Max	imum flood level on site shown in brackets.	
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year ret	urn period event - 2070	1 in 200-year returi	n period event - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event	
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0.0	00m AODN)	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'						
	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario			'Low' risk scenario	
	13.8%			5.1%		7.6%	
Description of Surface Water Flow			mulate within the southeas	tern corner of the site.	Also, due to multiple drai	nage ditches onsite, surface water is shown to	
Paths	accumulate under all modelled scenarios						
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset rating is unknown. The design standard of			iigh ground with an acti	ual crest level between 4	67m and 5.82m AODN. The current condition	
High-Level Indication of Defence	N/A - The site is predicted to remain una	ffected from the Rive	r Medway and the sea for t	he lifetime of developm	ent based on current dat	a.	
Costs Flood Warning Area?	N/A						
Flood Walling Alea!			lenio e de alaciera da cal		4		
	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2115) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)						
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	lerate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	ant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating	
	0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	0.00%	
Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	SuDS should be considered to be include Surface Water Management Strategy to Floor levels should be raised above the raised resistance and resilience measure The LPA should be consulted prior to the	0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00%					





RN23									
Site Area (l	Existing	Land Use: Mostly Gre	enfield	Proposed Land Use: Residential					
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Flood .	Flood Zone 2		Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	100.0%	0.0	0%	0	.0%	0.0%			
Development lifetime	100 years								
Exception Test required?	The Exception Test is not required to be	The Exception Test is not required to be applied for any vulnerability classification.							
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the sit	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site: None.							
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway is located approxima	tely 525m north of the si	ite.						
Geology	Bedrock: Seaford Chalk Formation – Chalk Superficial deposits: Head - Clay and Silt								
	Percentage of site at risk of fl	looding from tidal sour	ces during the defence	ed scenario for key re	turn period events. M	aximum flood level on site shown in brackets.			
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year return	period event - 2070	1 in 200-year retur	n period event - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event			
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0.00m AODN)		0.00% (0.00m AODN)		0.00% (0.00m AODN)			
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'								
	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	ım' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario			
	5.8%	4.2%				8.8%			
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, there are	localised areas of surfac	ce water across the site.		·				
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset has a condition rating of 3. The design s	•	•	• •	nbankment with an effe	ctive crest level of 4.37m and 5.10m AODN, and			
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	N/A - The site is predicted to remain una	affected from the River M	ledway and the sea for t	he lifetime of developm	nent based on current d	ata.			
Flood Warning Area?	N/A								
	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2115) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)								
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Modera	ate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	ant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating			
	0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	0.00%			
Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	SuDS should be considered to be includ Surface Water Management Strategy to Floor levels should be raised above the	ne site is at risk of flooding from surface water and greater than 1ha. As a result, a FRA is required to be undertaken. aDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require a surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site. soor levels should be raised above the maximum depth of flooding from surface water, including an additional freeboard where practicable. sood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.							





SR4								
Site Area (На): 6.290	Existing Land Use: Gree	nfield	Propos	ed Land Use: Residential			
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Flood Zone 2	Flood Zone 3		Flood Zone 3b			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%		0.0%			
Development lifetime	100 years			1				
Exception Test required?	The Exception Test is not required to be	applied for any vulnerability classification.						
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	e: None.						
Watercourses/Rivers	There is a drainage ditch along the north	ern border.						
Geology		Bedrock: London Clay Formation - Clay and Silt Superficial deposits: No Superficial deposits						
	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from tidal sources during the defenced scenario for key return period events. Maximum flood level on site shown in brackets.							
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year return period event - 2070	1 in 200-year return period even	nt - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event			
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0.00m AODN)		0.00% (0.00m AODN)			
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'							
	'High' risk scenario	'Ме	'Medium' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario			
	8.9%		0.6%		15.4%			
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, water is sh	own to accumulate in the south of the site. T	nere are also small areas along the no	rthern and west	tern borders.			
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset	shows no existing defences nearby.						
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	N/A - There are no defences near to the	site and the site is predicted to remain unaffe	cted from the River Medway and the se	ea for the lifetim	ne of any development.			
Flood Warning Area?	N/A							
115 17 . 2	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rati respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	ng Classification during the design flood	event (2115) (The dominant hazard r	rating on the s	ubject site has been highlighted in the			
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Moderate' Hazard Rating	'Significant' Hazard F	Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating			
	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		0.00%			





Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures

The site is at risk of flooding from surface water and greater than 1ha. As a result, a FRA is required to be undertaken.

SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require a Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site.

Floor levels should be raised above the maximum depth of flooding from surface water, including an additional freeboard where practicable.

Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

The LPA should be consulted prior to the commencement of any works to obtain consent for any development proposed within 8m of any ordinary watercourse. Where the watercourse falls within the RSIDB area, the RSIDB should be consulted to obtain consent.



CCB1									
Site Area (На): 0.232	Exis	ting Land Use: Brownf	ield	P	roposed Land Use: Residential			
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Flood .	Flood Zone 2		I Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	100.0%	0.0	0%	0	.0%	0.0%			
Development lifetime	100 years	rears							
Exception Test required?	The Exception Test is not required to be	he Exception Test is not required to be applied for any vulnerability classification.							
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the sit	ncidents within the site: None. ncidents within close proximity of the site: None.							
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway is located approxima	itely 220m north of the si	ite.						
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation – Chalk Superficial deposits: Head - Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel								
	Percentage of site at risk of fl	looding from tidal sour	rces during the defence	ed scenario for key re	eturn period events. M	laximum flood level on site shown in brackets.			
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year return	period event - 2070	1 in 200-year retur	n period event - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event			
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0.00m AODN)		0.00% (0.00m AODN)		0.00% (0.00m AODN)			
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'								
	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	ım' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario			
	20.1%			32.3%					
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, surface w	rater is shown to accumu	ulate onsite.						
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset AODN. The current condition rating is ur				ered high ground with	an actual crest level of between 4.60m and 5.49m			
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	N/A - The site is predicted to remain una	affected from the River M	ledway and the sea for t	he lifetime of developm	nent based on current o	data.			
Flood Warning Area?	N/A								
	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2115) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)								
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Modera	ate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating			
	0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	0.00%			
Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	SuDS should be considered to be includ Surface Water Management Strategy to Floor levels should be raised above the	0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% e site is at risk of flooding from surface water. As a result, a FRA is required to be undertaken. DS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require a rface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site. Food levels should be raised above the maximum depth of flooding from surface water, including an additional freeboard where practicable. Food resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.							





RWB19									
Site Area (l	Ha): 1.567	Ex	isting Land Use: Brown	ield	Pro	posed Land Use: Residential			
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	d Zone 2	Flood Z	Cone 3	Flood Zone 3b			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	100.0%	(0.0%	0.0	%	0.0%			
Development lifetime	100 years								
Exception Test required?	The Exception Test is not required to be	The Exception Test is not required to be applied for any vulnerability classification.							
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the sit	e: None.							
Watercourses/Rivers	River Medway approximately 120m east	of the site							
Geology		Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation – Chalk Superficial deposits: Alluvium - Clay, Silt, Sand and Peat, Head - Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel							
	Percentage of site at risk of fl	ooding from tidal so	urces during the defenc	ed scenario for key retu	ırn period events. Max	imum flood level on site shown in brackets.			
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year retu	rn period event - 2070	1 in 200-year return	period event - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event			
om tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0	0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0.00)m AODN)	0.00% (0.00m AODN)			
ased off mapping available from the EA	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'								
	'High' risk scenario 'Medium			ım' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario			
	47.3%	47.3% 19.9% 25.4%							
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, surface wa	ater could accumulate	on the majority of the site).	,				
existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset unknown. The design standard of protection	-		ith an actual crest level o	f between 5.77m and 6	.40m AODN. The current condition rating is			
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	N/A - The site is predicted to remain una	ffected from the River	Medway and the sea for	the lifetime of developme	nt based on current dat	a.			
Flood Warning Area?	N/A								
Harand Dating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rat respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2,	_	uring the design flood ev	rent (2115) (The domina	nt hazard rating on th	e subject site has been highlighted in the			
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mode	erate' Hazard Rating	'Significal	nt' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating			
	0.00%		0.00%	0.00%		0.00%			
Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	SuDS should be considered to be includ Surface Water Management Strategy to Floor levels should be raised above the	The site is at risk of flooding from surface water and greater than 1ha. As a result, a FRA is required to be undertaken. SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site. Sloor levels should be raised above the maximum depth of flooding from surface water, including an additional freeboard where practicable. Slood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.							



REWW3									
Site Area (На): 0.341	Exis	sting Land Use: Brown	ield	Pro	posed Land Use: Residential			
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Flood	I Zone 2	Flood Zone 3		Flood Zone 3b			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	100.0%	0	.0%	0.0	9%	0.0%			
Development lifetime	100 years								
Exception Test required?	The Exception Test is not required to be	The Exception Test is not required to be applied for any vulnerability classification.							
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the sit	ncidents within the site: None.							
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway is located approxima	tely 720m northeast of	the site.						
Geology		Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation – Chalk Superficial deposits: Head - Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel							
	Percentage of site at risk of fl	looding from tidal sou	rces during the defenc	ed scenario for key retu	urn period events. Max	imum flood level on site shown in brackets.			
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year retur	n period event - 2070	1 in 200-year return	period event - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event			
om tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0.00m AODN) 0.00% (0.00m AODN)				0.00% (0.00m AODN)			
ased off mapping available from the EA	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'								
	'High' risk scenario	'High' risk scenario 'Medium' risk scenar				'Low' risk scenario			
	17.9%	17.9% 10.8% 21.2%							
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, there is a	surface water flow path	across the site.		,				
existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset unknown. The design standard of protection	_		ith an actual crest level c	of between 5.77m and 5	.79m AODN. The current condition rating is			
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	N/A - The site is predicted to remain una	affected from the River	Medway and the sea for	he lifetime of developme	ent based on current da	а			
Flood Warning Area?	No								
Harrard Detina	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rat respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2	_	ring the design flood ev	ent (2115) (The domina	nnt hazard rating on th	e subject site has been highlighted in the			
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mode	rate' Hazard Rating	'Significant' Hazard Ratir		'Extreme' Hazard Rating			
	0.00%		0.00%	0.00%		0.00%			
Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	SuDS should be considered to be includ Surface Water Management Strategy to Floor levels should be raised above the	The site is at risk of flooding from surface water. As a result, a FRA is required to be undertaken. SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site. Sloor levels should be raised above the maximum depth of flooding from surface water, including an additional freeboard where practicable.							





SNF8								
Site Area (I	На): 0.264	Exi	sting Land Use: Brownf	ield	Prop	osed Land Use: Residential		
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Flood	d Zone 2	Flood	d Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b		
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	96.9%	3	3.1%		0.0%	0.0%		
Development lifetime	100 years							
Exception Test required?	The Exception Test is not required to be applied for development classified as 'more vulnerable'.							
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site: None.							
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Bridge Reach) is loc	The River Medway (Bridge Reach) is located approximately 185m southeast of the site.						
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation, Seaford Chalk Formation and Newhaven Chalk Formation (undifferentiated) – Chalk Superficial deposits: Head - Clay and Silt							
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	ooding from tidal sou	urces during the defence	ed scenario for key re	eturn period events. Maxi	mum flood level on site shown in brackets.		
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year return period event - 2070		1 in 200-year return period event - 2115		1 in 1000-year return period event		
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	2.75% (5.47m AODN) 11.		11.83% (6	6.10m AODN)	2.75% (5.42m AODN)		
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'							
	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario			'Low' risk scenario		
	0.0%			0.0%		0.0%		
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, the entire	site is shown to remair	n dry.					
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset condition rating is unknown. The design	_		nd natural high ground	with an actual crest level o	of between 4.05m and 4.10m AODN. The current		
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to the lifetime of any development.	o raise an existing defe	ence wall, it is estimated t	o cost in the region of £	£475,000 to upgrade the 3	00m of defences in order to protect the site for		
Flood Warning Area?	Yes							
	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2115) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)							
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mode	erate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating		
	4.20%		7.04%		1.40%	0.00%		





Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures

The site is located in Flood Zones 2, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.

SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require a Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site.

The development should meet the requirements of the EA's Flood Risk Standing Advice, which applies for 'less vulnerable' and 'more vulnerable' development within Flood Zone 2.

The Sequential Approach should be applied to the layout of the site by locating the most vulnerable elements in the lowest risk areas. The Sequential Approach should also be applied to the internal layout of buildings, in particular where floor levels cannot be raised.

Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

Flood Hazard should be appraised against the proposed development layout to ensure that users and occupants of the site can achieve safe access and egress.





SNF5									
Site Area (I	На): 0.353	Existing Land Use: Mostly Gr	reenfield	Proposed Land Use: Residential					
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Flood Zone 2	Flood	Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b				
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	100.0%	0.0%	0.0	0%	0.0%				
Development lifetime	100 years	00 years							
Exception Test required?	The Exception Test is not required to be	The Exception Test is not required to be applied for any vulnerability classification.							
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	Incidents within the site: None.							
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Bridge Reach) is loc	ated approximately 790m southeast of the site							
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation, Seaford Chalk Formation and Newhaven Chalk Formation (undifferentiated) – Chalk Superficial deposits: No Superficial deposits								
	Percentage of site at risk of fl	ooding from tidal sources during the defend	ced scenario for key ret	turn period events. Max	imum flood level on site shown in brackets.				
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year return period event - 2070	1 in 200-year return	period event - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event				
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0.0	00m AODN)	0.00% (0.00m AODN)				
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'								
	'High' risk scenario	'Med	ium' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario				
	12.0%		8.2%		18.5%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, surface wa	ater is shown to accumulate onsite.							
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):		shows the existing defences consist of natural standard of protection is 1 in 50 and 1 in 200 y		vith an actual crest level	of between 4.50m and 5.20m AODN. The curren				
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,152/m to the lifetime of any development	o raise an existing embankment, it is estimated	to cost in the region of £	2475,000 to upgrade the	400m of defences in order to protect the site for				
Flood Warning Area?	No No								
	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rat respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2,	ing Classification during the design flood e	vent (2115) (The domin	ant hazard rating on th	e subject site has been highlighted in the				
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Moderate' Hazard Rating	'Significa	ant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating				
	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		0.00%				
Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	SuDS should be considered to be include Surface Water Management Strategy to Floor levels should be raised above the r	The site is at risk of flooding from surface water. As a result, a FRA is required to be undertaken. SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require a Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site. Floor levels should be raised above the maximum depth of flooding from surface water, including an additional freeboard where practicable. Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.							





CCB20									
Site Area (l	На): 0.498	Ex	cisting Land Use: Brown	ield	Prop	osed Land Use: Residential			
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood Zone	3	Flood Zone 3b			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	94.2%		5.8%	0.0%		0.0%			
Development lifetime	100 years								
Exception Test required?	The Exception Test is not required to be applied for development classified as 'more vulnerable'.								
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site: None.							
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway is located approximate	The River Medway is located approximately 620m northwest of the site.							
Geology		Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation – Chalk Superficial deposits: Head - Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel							
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	oding from tidal so	ources during the defenc	ed scenario for key return	period events. Maxii	mum flood level on site shown in brackets.			
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year retu	ırn period event - 2070	1 in 1000-year return period event					
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	8.10% (5.47m AODN)	8.64% (6.12m	AODN)	5.65% (5.40m AODN)			
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage	of site at risk of fl	ooding from surface wat	er based on the EA's 'Risk	of Flooding from S	urface Water Map'			
	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	ım' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario			
	0.0%			0.1%		2.0%			
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under the 'high' and 'medium' risk scenar corner of the site.	io, the entire site is s	shown to remain dry. Unde	the 'low' risk scenario, surfa	ace water could accu	mulate over a small portion of the northern			
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset strating is unknown. The design standard of	-		nigh ground with an actual cr	est level of between	4.75m and 4.93m AODN. The current condition			
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,152/m to the lifetime of any development	Based on an average cost of £1,152/m to raise an existing embankment, it is estimated to cost in the region of £250,000 to upgrade the 200m of defences in order to protect the site for							
Flood Warning Area?	Yes								
	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2115) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)								
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Significant' I	lazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating			
	0.93%		1.65%	6.5	2%	0.00%			





Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures

The site is located in Flood Zones 2, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.

SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require a Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site.

The development should meet the requirements of the EA's Flood Risk Standing Advice, which applies for 'less vulnerable' and 'more vulnerable' development within Flood Zone 2.

The Sequential Approach should be applied to the layout of the site by locating the most vulnerable elements in the lowest risk areas. The Sequential Approach should also be applied to the internal layout of buildings, in particular where floor levels cannot be raised.

Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

Flood Hazard should be appraised against the proposed development layout to ensure that users and occupants of the site can achieve safe access and egress.





SNF17									
Site Area (l	На): 0.024	Ex	isting Land Use: Brownf	eld	Propo	sed Land Use: Residential			
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	d Zone 2	Flood Zone 3		Flood Zone 3b			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	99.0%		1.0%	0.0%		0.0%			
Development lifetime	100 years								
Exception Test required?	The Exception Test is not required to be a	The Exception Test is not required to be applied for development classified as 'more vulnerable'.							
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site: None.							
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Bridge Reach) is local	The River Medway (Bridge Reach) is located approximately 235m southeast of the site.							
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation Superficial deposits: Head - Clay and Silt	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation, Seaford Chalk Formation and Newhaven Chalk Formation (undifferentiated) – Chalk Superficial deposits: Head - Clay and Silt							
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	oding from tidal so	urces during the defence	ed scenario for key return per	od events. Maxim	um flood level on site shown in brackets.			
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year retu	ırn period event - 2070	2070 1 in 200-year return period event - 2115 1 in 1000-year return					
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	0.33% (5	5.47m AODN)	35.88% (6.10m AO	DN)	0.33% (5.42m AODN)			
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage	of site at risk of flo	ooding from surface wat	er based on the EA's 'Risk of I	Flooding from Su	rface Water Map'			
	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	'Medium' risk scenario 'Low' risk scenario					
	3.0%			1.3%		0.0%			
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under the 'high' and 'medium' risk scenari from the 'medium' risk scenario.	o, surface water is s	hown to accumulate withir	a small area in the north of the	site. Under the 'lov	w' risk scenario, the extent does not increase			
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset s condition rating is unknown. The design s				ctual crest level of	between 4.50m and 5.20m AODN. The current			
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,152/m to the lifetime of any development.	Based on an average cost of £1,152/m to raise an existing embankment, it is estimated to cost in the region of £300,000 to upgrade the 250m of defences in order to protect the site for the lifetime of any development.							
Flood Warning Area?	Yes								
11	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2115) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)								
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mode	erate' Hazard Rating	'Significant' Haza	rd Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating			
	10.42%		23.00%	0.00%		0.00%			





Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures

The site is located in Flood Zones 2, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.

SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require a Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site.

The development should meet the requirements of the EA's Flood Risk Standing Advice, which applies for 'less vulnerable' and 'more vulnerable' development within Flood Zone 2.

The Sequential Approach should be applied to the layout of the site by locating the most vulnerable elements in the lowest risk areas. The Sequential Approach should also be applied to the internal layout of buildings, in particular where floor levels cannot be raised.

Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

Flood Hazard should be appraised against the proposed development layout to ensure that users and occupants of the site can achieve safe access and egress





FP25									
Site Area (Ha): 2.590	Existing Land Use: Brown	field	Proposed Land Use: Residential					
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Flood Zone 2	Flood	Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b				
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	100.0%	0.0%	0.0	0%	0.0%				
Development lifetime	100 years	100 years							
Exception Test required?	The Exception Test is not required to be	The Exception Test is not required to be applied for any vulnerability classification.							
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	Incidents within the site: None.							
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway is located approxima	tely 270m north of the site.							
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation – Chalk Superficial deposits: Head - Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel								
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	ooding from tidal sources during the defend	ed scenario for key ret	urn period events. Max	imum flood level on site shown in brackets.				
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year return period event - 2070	1 in 200-year return	period event - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event				
from tidal sources and surface water, based off mapping available from the EA	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0.00m AODN)		0.00% (0.00m AODN)				
	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'								
	'High' risk scenario	'Med	ium' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario				
	17.4%		14.8%						
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, surface wa	ater is shown to accumulate onsite. However, t	nis is likely due to the low	vered land for the railway	/ line.				
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):		shows the existing defences consist of engined design standard of protection is 1 in 100 and 1		all with an actual crest l	evel of between 4.60m and 5.49m AODN. The				
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to the lifetime of any development	o raise an existing defence wall, it is estimated	to cost in the region of £	550,000 to upgrade the	350m of defences in order to protect the site for				
Flood Warning Area?	No								
W I D. C	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2115) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)								
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Moderate' Hazard Rating	'Significa	ant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating				
	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		0.00%				
Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	The site is at risk of flooding from surface water and greater than 1ha. As a result, a FRA is required to be undertaken. SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require a Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site. Floor levels should be raised above the maximum depth of flooding from surface water, including an additional freeboard where practicable. Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.								





3.2. High Risk Areas





CHR14								
Site Area (H	Ha): 11.396	Existing Land Us	e: Brownfiel	d	Propo	sed Land Use: Residential		
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Flood Zone 2		Flood Zo	one 3	Flood Zone 3b		
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	36.4%	1.6%		62.0	%	~40.0% *refer to text below		
Development lifetime	100 years		·					
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulnerable' classification will be subject to the Exception Test. *Although the NKC modelling shows the site to be within the functional floodplain, the modelling study does not take into account the recently completed defences. These defences would likely reduce the extent of flooding during a 1 in 30 year return period event, and further analysis is recommended to determine the true extent of the functional floodplain onsite. Any development classified as 'Less Vulnerable', 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b). Development which is classified as 'essential infrastructure' will be subject to the Exception Test. Development that is classified as 'water-compatible' should be designed and constructed to: remain operational and safe for users in times of flood; result in no net loss of floodplain storage; and not impede water flows and not increase flood risk elsewhere.							
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site: None.							
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Wickham Reach) is located along the southern border.							
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation - Chalk, New Pit Chalk Formation – Chalk Superficial deposits: Alluvium - Clay, Silt, Sand and Peat, Beach and Tidal Flat Deposits (undifferentiated) - Clay, Silt and Sand, Head - Clay and Silt							
	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from tidal sources during the defenced scenario for key return period events. Maximum flood level on site shown in brackets.							
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year return period event	- 2070	1 in 200-year return p	period event - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event		
from tidal sources and surface water,	58.74% (4.98m AODN)	61.61% (5.48m AODN)		64.43% (6.11m AODN)		61.61% (5.42m AODN)		
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage	of site at risk of flooding from se	ırface water l	based on the EA's 'Ri	isk of Flooding from Sເ	ırface Water Map'		
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Medium'	n' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario		
	2.1%		(0.7%		23.1%		
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	During all modelled scenarios, a small are portion of the site.	a of localised flooding could occur i	n the southwe	est of the site. Under the	e 'low' risk scenario, surf	ace water could accumulate in the northeast		
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	•	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset shows the existing defences consist of an embankment and naturally elevated ground. The defences have an actual crest level between 3.58 - 5.21m AODN. The current condition rating is unknown. The design standard of protection is between 1 in 5 and 1 in 200 years.						
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,152/m to for the lifetime of any development.	Based on an average cost of £1,152/m to raise an existing embankment, it is estimated to cost in the region of £1,500,000 to upgrade the 1300m of defences in order to protect the site for the lifetime of any development.						
Flood Warning Area?	Yes							
Hazard Bating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Ratin respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	g Classification during the desig	n flood even	t (2115) (The dominar	nt hazard rating on the	subject site has been highlighted in the		
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Moderate' Hazard F	ating	'Significan	t' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating		
	1.82%	2.01%			8.22%	52.17%		





Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures

The site is located in Flood Zones 2 and 3, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.

SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require a Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site.

Floor levels should be raised above the design flood level, including the Environment Agency's recommended additional freeboard requirements where practicable. Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

The Sequential Approach should be applied to the layout of the site by locating the most vulnerable elements in the lowest risk areas. The Sequential Approach should also be applied to the internal layout of buildings, in particular where floor levels cannot be raised.

Flood Hazard should be appraised against the proposed development layout to ensure that users and occupants of the site can achieve safe access and egress.

The EA should be consulted where development is proposed within 16m of a tidal waterbody or tidal defence infrastructure to obtain consent via a Flood Risk Activity Permit (FRAP).





ННН32									
Site Area (На): 0.787	Ex	cisting Land Use: Brown	field	ı	Proposed Land Use: Residential			
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood	I Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.0%		0.0%	10	0.0%	0.0%			
Development lifetime	100 years								
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulneral	ble' classification will	be subject to the Exception	n Test.					
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the sit	e: EA Recorded Floo	d datasets shows the site	was affected from the so	ea in 1953 due to wav	ves overtopping the defences.			
Watercourses/Rivers	The Hoo Flats are located approximately	e Hoo Flats are located approximately 490m south of the site.							
Geology		Bedrock: London Clay Formation - Clay and Silt Superficial deposits: River Terrace Deposits, 1 - Clay and Silt							
	Percentage of site at risk of fl	ooding from tidal so	ources during the defenc	ed scenario for key re	eturn period events.	Maximum flood level on site shown in brackets.			
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year retu	urn period event - 2070	1 in 200-year retur	n period event - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event			
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	100.00%	100.00% (5.43m AODN) 100.00% (6.05m			100.00% (5.26m AODN)			
based off mapping available from the EA	based off mapping available from the Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'								
	'High' risk scenario		'Medi	um' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario			
	0.0%			0.0%		0.0%			
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, the site is	shown to remain dry							
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset standard of protection is 1 in 1000 years	_	efences consist of an emb	ankment with an effectiv	ve crest level of 5.05n	n AODN, and has a condition rating of 3. The design			
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,152/m to for the lifetime of any development.	o raise an existing en	nbankment, it is estimated	to cost in the region of	£1,400,000 to upgrad	e the 1200m of defences in order to protect the site			
Flood Warning Area?	Yes								
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rat respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2,	_	uring the design flood ev	vent (2115) (The domir	nant hazard rating o	n the subject site has been highlighted in the			
riazaiu itatilig	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Moo	lerate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating			
	0.00%		0.00%		1.96%	98.04%			
Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	Surface Water Management Strategy to Floor levels should be raised above the cresilience measures should be considered	ed within the develop be produced to show design flood level, inc ed for inclusion. lied to the layout of the lar where floor levels	ment where possible, in and how SuDS will be include cluding the Environment Agence site by locating the most cannot be raised.	ccordance with the NPF d to manage surface wa gency's recommended a t vulnerable elements in	ater runoff from the sit additional freeboard re n the lowest risk areas	equirements where practicable. Flood resistance and The Sequential Approach should also be applied to			



HHH12										
Site Area (H	a): 131.268	Exist	ing Land Use: Mostly Gre	enfield	Prop	oosed Land Use: Residential				
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood	l Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b				
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	98.1%		0.6%	1	.3%	~1.0% *refer to text below				
Development lifetime	100 years									
Exception Test required?	modelling study does not take into account further analysis is recommended to deter vulnerable' uses should not be permitted. Test. Development that is classified as 'we're	Development which has a 'more vulnerable' classification will be subject to the Exception Test. *Although the NKC modelling shows the site to be within the functional floodplain, the modelling study does not take into account the recently completed defences. These defences would likely reduce the extent of flooding during a 1 in 30 year return period event, and further analysis is recommended to determine the true extent of the functional floodplain onsite. Any development classified as 'Less Vulnerable', 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b). Development which is classified as 'essential infrastructure' will be subject to the Exception Test. Development that is classified as 'water-compatible' should be designed and constructed to: remain operational and safe for users in times of flood; result in no net loss of floodplastorage; and not impede water flows and not increase flood risk elsewhere.								
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	dents within the site: None. dents within close proximity of the site: EA Recorded Flood datasets shows the site was affected from the sea in 1953 due to waves overtopping the defences.								
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Upnor Reach and Sh	e River Medway (Upnor Reach and Short Reach) is located along the southern border of the site.								
Geology	•	edrock: London Clay Formation - Clay and Silt, Lambeth Group - Sand, Silt and Clay uperficial deposits: Head - Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel, River Terrace Deposits, 1 - Clay and Silt								
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	ooding from tidal so	ources during the defence	ed scenario for key re	eturn period events. Max	imum flood level on site shown in brackets.				
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year return period event - 2070 1 i		1 in 200-year retur	n period event - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event				
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.10% (5.04m AODN)	0.10% (5.43m AODN)		0.84% (6.	00m AODN)	0.10% (6.06m AODN)				
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'									
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario			'Low' risk scenario				
	2.1%			0.3%		1.4%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	During all modelled scenarios, there are	localised areas of su	rface water flooding across	the site attributed to lo	ocalised depressions.					
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset The current condition rating is unknow. T	•				crest level between 4.07m and 6.00m AODN.				
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,152/m to for the lifetime of any development.	o raise an existing en	nbankment, it is estimated	to cost in the region of	£3,150,000 to upgrade the	e 2700m of defences in order to protect the site				
Flood Warning Area?	Yes									
Hazard Patina	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rate respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	_	uring the design flood ev	ent (2115) (The domii	nant hazard rating on th	e subject site has been highlighted in the				
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	lerate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating				
	1.14%		0.58%		1.59%	0.02%				





The site is located in Flood Zones 3, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.

SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require a Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site.

Floor levels should be raised above the design flood level, including the Environment Agency's recommended additional freeboard requirements where practicable. Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

The Sequential Approach should be applied to the layout of the site by locating the most vulnerable elements in the lowest risk areas. The Sequential Approach should also be applied to the internal layout of buildings, in particular where floor levels cannot be raised.

Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

Flood Hazard should be appraised against the proposed development layout to ensure that users and occupants of the site can achieve safe access and egress.

The EA should be consulted where development is proposed within 16m of a tidal waterbody or tidal defence infrastructure to obtain consent via a Flood Risk Activity Permit (FRAP).





SNF41									
Site Area (На): 4.972	Existing Land Use	e: Brownfield	Prop	posed Land Use: Residential				
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Flood Zone 2	Floo	nd Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b				
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	5.2%	1.3%	Ş	93.5%	~85.0% *refer to text below				
Development lifetime	100 years								
Exception Test required?	modelling study does not take into accour further analysis is recommended to deter Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted	nt the recently completed defences. I mine the true extent of the functional within the Functional Floodplain (Floo rater-compatible' should be designed	hese defences would likely red floodplain onsite. Any developm od Zone 3b). Development which	uce the extent of flooding on nent classified as 'Less Vul h is classified as 'essentia	site to be within the functional floodplain, the during a 1 in 30 year return period event, and Inerable', 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly I infrastructure' will be subject to the Exception in times of flood; result in no net loss of floodplain				
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	cidents within the site: None.							
Watercourses/Rivers	ne River Medway (Limehouse Reach) is located along the southeastern border of the site.								
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation, Seaford Chalk Formation and Newhaven Chalk Formation (undifferentiated) - Chalk, Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation – Chalk Superficial deposits: Head - Clay and Silt, Alluvium - Clay, Silt, Sand and Peat								
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	ooding from tidal sources during th	e defenced scenario for key r	eturn period events. Max	imum flood level on site shown in brackets.				
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year return period event	2070 1 in 200-year retu	ırn period event - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event				
from tidal sources and surface water,	90.74% (5.06m AODN)	93.09% (5.48m AODN)	97.28% (6.12m AODN)	92.98% (5.43m AODN)				
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'								
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario				
	3.8%		2.1%		7.7%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	During all modelled scenarios, there are	ocalised areas of surface water flood	ng across the site attributed to	localised depressions.					
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset condition rating of 3. The design standard	-		all with an actual crest lev	el of 3.75m and 5.50m AODN, and has a				
High-Level Indication of Defence	-	raise an existing defence wall, it is e	stimated to cost in the region of	£925,000 to upgrade the	600m of defences in order to protect the site for				
Costs	the lifetime of any development.								
Flood Warning Area?	Yes								
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rati respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)		n flood event (2115) (The dom	inant hazard rating on th	e subject site has been highlighted in the				
- Industry	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Moderate' Hazard Ra	nting 'Signif	icant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating				
	1.75%	2.56%		24.96%	69.85%				





The site is located in Flood Zones 2 and 3, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.

SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require a Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site.

Floor levels should be raised above the design flood level, including the Environment Agency's recommended additional freeboard requirements where practicable. Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

The Sequential Approach should be applied to the layout of the site by locating the most vulnerable elements in the lowest risk areas. The Sequential Approach should also be applied to the internal layout of buildings, in particular where floor levels cannot be raised.

Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

Flood Hazard should be appraised against the proposed development layout to ensure that users and occupants of the site can achieve safe access and egress.

The EA should be consulted where development is proposed within 16m of a tidal waterbody or tidal defence infrastructure to obtain consent via a Flood Risk Activity Permit (FRAP).





SNF35										
Site Area (l	Ha): 2.649	Ex	isting Land Use: Brownf	ield	Proposed Land Use: Residential					
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	d Zone 2	Floo	d Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b				
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.0%	(0.0%	10	00.0%	~95.0% *refer to text below				
Development lifetime	100 years									
Exception Test required?	*Although the NKC modelling shows the si likely reduce the extent of flooding during a development classified as 'Less Vulnerable is classified as 'essential infrastructure' will	Development which has a 'more vulnerable' classification will be subject to the Exception Test. In FZ3b, development classified as 'more vulnerable' use should not be permitted. 'Although the NKC modelling shows the site to be within the functional floodplain, the modelling study does not take into account the recently completed defences. These defences would ikely reduce the extent of flooding during a 1 in 30 year return period event, and further analysis is recommended to determine the true extent of the functional floodplain onsite. Any development classified as 'Less Vulnerable', 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b). Development which is classified as 'essential infrastructure' will be subject to the Exception Test. Development that is classified as 'water-compatible' should be designed and constructed to: remain operational and safe for users in times of flood; result in no net loss of floodplain storage; and not impede water flows and not increase flood risk elsewhere.								
Flood History	cidents within the site: None. cidents within close proximity of the site: None.									
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Bridge Reach) is locat	e River Medway (Bridge Reach) is located approximately 25m southeast of the site.								
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation - Chalk Superficial deposits: Alluvium - Clay, Silt, Sand and Peat									
	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from tidal sources during the defenced scenario for key return period events. Maximum flood level on site shown in brackets.									
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year retu	rn period event - 2070	1 in 200-year retu	rn period event - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event				
from tidal sources and surface water,	99.89% (5.02m AODN)	99.92% (5.46m AODN)	99.97% (6	6.09m AODN)	99.92% (5.42m AODN)				
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage	of site at risk of flo	ooding from surface wate	er based on the EA's	'Risk of Flooding from S	urface Water Map'				
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	ım' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario				
	0.0%			0.1%		15.4%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	During all modelled scenarios, there are lo	calised areas of sur	face water flooding across	the site attributed to I	ocalised depressions.					
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset sh condition rating of 3. The design standard	•		• •	all with an actual crest leve	of 3.75m and 5.50m AODN, and has a				
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to the lifetime of any development.	raise an existing def	ence wall, it is estimated to	o cost in the region of	£925,000 to upgrade the 6	00m of defences in order to protect the site for				
Flood Warning Area?	Yes									
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2115) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)									
Tiuzuid Nating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mode	erate' Hazard Rating	'Signifi	cant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating				
	1.75%		2.56%		24.96%	69.85%				





The site is located in Flood Zones 3, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.

SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require a Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site.

Floor levels should be raised above the design flood level, including the Environment Agency's recommended additional freeboard requirements where practicable. Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

The Sequential Approach should be applied to the layout of the site by locating the most vulnerable elements in the lowest risk areas. The Sequential Approach should also be applied to the internal layout of buildings, in particular where floor levels cannot be raised.

Flood Hazard should be appraised against the proposed development layout to ensure that users and occupants of the site can achieve safe access and egress.





SMI6										
Site Area (F	ła): 57.714	Ex	cisting Land Use: Brownf	ield		Propos	ed Land Use: Residential			
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Floo	d Zone 3		Flood Zone 3b			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	23.6%		9.5%	6	66.9%		~10.0% *refer to text below			
Development lifetime	100 years									
Exception Test required?	modelling study does not take into accour further analysis is recommended to deter Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted Test. Development that is classified as 'we	Development which has a 'more vulnerable' classification will be subject to the Exception Test. *Although the NKC modelling shows the site to be within the functional floodplain, the modelling study does not take into account the recently completed defences. These defences would likely reduce the extent of flooding during a 1 in 30 year return period event, and further analysis is recommended to determine the true extent of the functional floodplain onsite. Any development classified as 'Less Vulnerable', 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b). Development which is classified as 'essential infrastructure' will be subject to the Exception Test. Development that is classified as 'water-compatible' should be designed and constructed to: remain operational and safe for users in times of flood; result in no net loss of floodplain storage; and not impede water flows and not increase flood risk elsewhere.								
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	cidents within the site: None.								
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Gillingham Reach) is	e River Medway (Gillingham Reach) is located along the northeastern border of the site.								
Geology	Bedrock: Thanet Formation - Sand, Silt and Clay, Seaford Chalk Formation - Chalk Superficial deposits: Alluvium - Clay, Silt, Sand and Peat									
	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from tidal sources during the defenced scenario for key return period events. Maximum flood level on site shown in brackets.									
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year ret	urn period event - 2070	1 in 200-year retu	rn period event - 2	2115	1 in 1000-year return period event			
from tidal sources and surface water,	46.15% (5.02m AODN)	68.93% (5.32m AODN)		82.54% (6	82.54% (6.06m AODN)		66.51% (5.30m AODN)			
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'									
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	ım' risk scenario			'Low' risk scenario			
	9.6%			3.8%			6.8%			
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, there are n	umerous localised a	reas of surface water onsit	e attributed to localise	d depressions.					
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset sidesign standard of protection is 1 in 1000	_	efences consist of a wall w	ith an effective crest le	evel of between 4.6	.60m AODN.	The current condition rating is unknown. The			
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to the site for the lifetime of any development	-	fence wall, it is estimated t	o cost in the region of	£2,400,000 to upg	grade approx	ximately 1550m of defences in order to protect			
Flood Warning Area?	Yes									
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2115) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)									
Hazaru Natiliy	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	lerate' Hazard Rating	'Signifi	icant' Hazard Ratir	ing	'Extreme' Hazard Rating			
	2.10%		1.07%		25.16%		51.19%			





The site is located in Flood Zones 2 and 3, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.

SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require a Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site.

Floor levels should be raised above the design flood level, including the Environment Agency's recommended additional freeboard requirements where practicable. Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

The Sequential Approach should be applied to the layout of the site by locating the most vulnerable elements in the lowest risk areas. The Sequential Approach should also be applied to the internal layout of buildings, in particular where floor levels cannot be raised.

Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

Flood Hazard should be appraised against the proposed development layout to ensure that users and occupants of the site can achieve safe access and egress.

The EA should be consulted where development is proposed within 16m of a tidal waterbody or tidal defence infrastructure to obtain consent via a Flood Risk Activity Permit (FRAP).





FP11									
Site Area (F	Ha): 57.714	E	kisting Land Use: Brownf	ield	Prop	osed Land Use: Residential			
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood	l Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	52.8%		1.3%	93	3.5%	~10.0% *refer to text below			
Development lifetime	100 years								
Exception Test required?	modelling study does not take into account further analysis is recommended to deten Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted	unt the recently comp rmine the true extent d within the Functiona water-compatible' sho	leted defences. These defe of the functional floodplain al Floodplain (Flood Zone 3 ould be designed and const	ences would likely redu onsite. Any developme b). Development which	ce the extent of flooding dent classified as 'Less Vulinis classified as 'essential	uring a 1 in 30 year return period event, and nerable', 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly infrastructure' will be subject to the Exception in times of flood; result in no net loss of floodplain			
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the sit	idents within the site: None. idents within close proximity of the site: None.							
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway is located along the r	e River Medway is located along the northern border of the site.							
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation - Chalk Superficial deposits: Alluvium - Clay, Silt, Sand and Peat, Beach and Tidal Flat Deposits (undifferentiated) - Clay, Silt and Sand								
	Percentage of site at risk of fl	ooding from tidal s	ources during the defence	ed scenario for key re	eturn period events. Maxi	mum flood level on site shown in brackets.			
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year ret	urn period event - 2070	1 in 200-year retur	n period event - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event			
from tidal sources and surface water,	5.40% (5.10m AODN)	21.83% (5.48m AODN)		60.83% (6	.12m AODN)	21.83% (5.42m AODN)			
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'								
- A	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	m' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario			
	5.6%			6.1%		4.8%			
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, surface was shown to accumulate within the centre or		mulate in the northern corr	er of the site. Under th	e 'medium' and 'low' scen	arios, there is a localised area of surface water			
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset 5.49m AODN. The current condition ratir	•				with an actual crest level between 4.14m and			
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to the lifetime of any development.	o raise an existing de	fence wall, it is estimated t	cost in the region of £	£400,000 to upgrade the 2	50m of defences in order to protect the site for			
Flood Warning Area?	Yes								
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2115) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)								
riazaid itating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	lerate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating			
	2.56%		21.11%		34.18%	0.00%			





The site is located in Flood Zones 2 and 3, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.

SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require a Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site.

Floor levels should be raised above the design flood level, including the Environment Agency's recommended additional freeboard requirements where practicable. Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

The Sequential Approach should be applied to the layout of the site by locating the most vulnerable elements in the lowest risk areas. The Sequential Approach should also be applied to the internal layout of buildings, in particular where floor levels cannot be raised.

Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

Flood Hazard should be appraised against the proposed development layout to ensure that users and occupants of the site can achieve safe access and egress.

The EA should be consulted where development is proposed within 16m of a tidal waterbody or tidal defence infrastructure to obtain consent via a Flood Risk Activity Permit (FRAP).





AS28										
Site Area (F	la): 57.714	E	xisting Land Use: Greenf	ield	Prop	posed Land Use: Residential				
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood	d Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b				
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	62.2%		6.5%	3.	1.3%	0.0%				
Development lifetime	100 years									
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulneral	Development which has a 'more vulnerable' classification will be subject to the Exception Test.								
Flood History		ncidents within the site: EA Recorded Flood datasets shows the southern corner of the site was affected from the sea in 1953 due to waves overtopping the defences. ncidents within close proximity of the site: EA Recorded Flood datasets shows the surrounding area was affected from the sea in 1953 due to waves overtopping the defences.								
Watercourses/Rivers	The coastline is located approximately 23	ne coastline is located approximately 235m east of the site.								
Geology	edrock: London Clay Formation - Clay and Silt uperficial deposits: Head - Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel, Alluvium - Clay, Silt, Sand and Peat									
	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from tidal sources during the defenced scenario for key return period events. Maximum flood level on site shown in brackets.									
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year return period event - 2070 1 in 200-year return period even			n period event - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event				
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.0% (0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	12.07% (3	.50m AODN)	0.00% (0.00m AODN)				
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'									
LA	'High' risk scenario		'Media	m' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario				
	2.0%			0.3%		1.6%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, surface wa	ater is shown to accu	mulate in the southern cor	ner of the site.						
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset protection is 1 in 1000 years.	shows the existing d	efences consist of a wall w	ith an effective crest le	vel of 5.70m AODN, and h	nas a condition rating of 3. The design standard of				
High-Level Indication of Defence	_	o raise an existing de	fence wall, it is estimated t	o cost in the region of	£625,000 to upgrade the 4	100m of defences in order to protect the site for				
Costs Flood Warning Area?	the lifetime of any development. Yes									
-	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2115) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)									
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating		lerate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating				
	3.46%		4.07%		5.11%	0.00%				





The site is located in Flood Zones 2 and 3, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.

SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require a Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site.

Floor levels should be raised above the design flood level, including the Environment Agency's recommended additional freeboard requirements where practicable. Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

The Sequential Approach should be applied to the layout of the site by locating the most vulnerable elements in the lowest risk areas. The Sequential Approach should also be applied to the internal layout of buildings, in particular where floor levels cannot be raised.

Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

Flood Hazard should be appraised against the proposed development layout to ensure that users and occupants of the site can achieve safe access and egress.



CCB27									
Site Area (На): 0.062	Ex	kisting Land Use: Brownt	field	Pr	oposed Land Use: Residential			
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood	I Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.0%		0.0%	10	0.0%	0.0%			
Development lifetime	100 years								
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulneral	ble' classification will	be subject to the Exception	n Test.					
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the sit	e: None.							
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway is located approxima	tely 625m northwest	of the site.						
Geology		edrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation - Chalk uperficial deposits: Head - Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel							
	Percentage of site at risk of fl	ooding from tidal so	ources during the defenc	ed scenario for key re	eturn period events. Ma	aximum flood level on site shown in brackets.			
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year ret	urn period event - 2070	1 in 200-year retur	n period event - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event			
from tidal sources and surface water,	98.18% (4.48m AODN)	100.00%	(5.47m AODN)	100.00% (6	6.12m AODN)	100.00% (5.40m AODN)			
based off mapping available from the	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'								
EA	'High' risk scenario	o 'Medium' risk scenario				'Low' risk scenario			
	76.1%			20.5%		3.4%			
Description of Surface Water Flow		ater is shown to accu	mulate on the vast majority	of the site. Under the	'medium' and 'low' risk s	scenario, the surface water extent is shown to			
Paths Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure	increase slightly.	about the evicting d	ofonoso consist of natural l	aigh ground with an act	rual areat level of 4.75m	AODN. The current condition rating is unknown.			
(inc. SoP):	The design standard of protection is 1 in		elefices collsist of flatural i	ligh ground with an act	ual crest level of 4.75m	AODN. THE current conduitor rating is unknown.			
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,152/m to the lifetime of any development.	o raise an existing en	nbankment, it is estimated	to cost in the region of	£350,000 to upgrade th	e 300m of defences in order to protect the site for			
Flood Warning Area?	Yes								
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rat respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2,	_	uring the design flood ev	rent (2115) (The domir	nant hazard rating on t	the subject site has been highlighted in the			
Tiuzura rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	lerate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating			
	0.00%		0.00%		63.90%	36.10%			
Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	Surface Water Management Strategy to Floor levels should be raised above the cresilience measures should be considered	ed within the develop be produced to show design flood level, inc ed for inclusion. lied to the layout of the lar where floor levels	oment where possible, in according to the Environment According the Environment According to the most cannot be raised.	ccordance with the NPF d to manage surface way gency's recommended a	PF and its planning prace ater runoff from the site. additional freeboard required the lowest risk areas.	tice guidance. All major development will require a uirements where practicable. Flood resistance and The Sequential Approach should also be applied to			





GN6										
Site Area (На): 3.860	Ex	cisting Land Use: Brownf	ield	Prop	oosed Land Use: Residential				
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood	d Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b				
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	30.9%		14.4%	54	4.7%	~15.0% *refer to text below				
Development lifetime	100 years									
Exception Test required?	modelling study does not take into accour further analysis is recommended to deter Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted Test. Development that is classified as 'w	Development which has a 'more vulnerable' classification will be subject to the Exception Test. *Although the NKC modelling shows the site to be within the functional floodplain, the modelling study does not take into account the recently completed defences. These defences would likely reduce the extent of flooding during a 1 in 30 year return period event, and further analysis is recommended to determine the true extent of the functional floodplain onsite. Any development classified as 'Less Vulnerable', 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b). Development which is classified as 'essential infrastructure' will be subject to the Exception Test. Development that is classified as 'water-compatible' should be designed and constructed to: remain operational and safe for users in times of flood; result in no net loss of floodplain storage; and not impede water flows and not increase flood risk elsewhere.								
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	idents within the site: None. idents within close proximity of the site: None.								
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Gillingham Reach) is	e River Medway (Gillingham Reach) is located along the northern border of the site.								
Geology	Bedrock: Thanet Formation - Sand, Silt and Clay Superficial deposits: Alluvium - Clay, Silt, Sand and Peat, Beach and Tidal Flat Deposits (undifferentiated) - Clay, Silt and Sand									
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	ooding from tidal so	ources during the defenc	ed scenario for key re	eturn period events. Max	imum flood level on site shown in brackets.				
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year retu	ırn period event - 2070	1 in 200-year retur	rn period event - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event				
from tidal sources and surface water,	47.35% (5.03m AODN)	68.98% ((5.43m AODN)	88.54% (6	6.05m AODN)	62.61% (5.38m AODN)				
based off mapping available from the	Percentag	e of site at risk of fl	ooding from surface wat	er based on the EA's	'Risk of Flooding from S	Surface Water Map'				
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	ım' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario				
	9.3%			4.8%		15.5%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, surface wa	ater is shown to accu	mulate onsite.		'					
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset standard of protection is 1 in 200 years.	shows the existing de	efences consist of a wall w	ith an actual crest leve	l of 5.38m AODN. The cur	rent condition rating is unknown. The design				
High-Level Indication of Defence		raise an existing de	fence wall, it is estimated t	o cost in the region of	£625,000 to upgrade the 2	100m of defences in order to protect the site for				
Costs	the lifetime of any development.									
Flood Warning Area?	Yes									
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2115) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)									
Tiuzui d Tuuliig	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	lerate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating				
	1.78%		9.30%		71.39%	6.19%				





The site is located in Flood Zones 2 and 3, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.

SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require a Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site.

Floor levels should be raised above the design flood level, including the Environment Agency's recommended additional freeboard requirements where practicable. Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

The Sequential Approach should be applied to the layout of the site by locating the most vulnerable elements in the lowest risk areas. The Sequential Approach should also be applied to the internal layout of buildings, in particular where floor levels cannot be raised.

Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

Flood Hazard should be appraised against the proposed development layout to ensure that users and occupants of the site can achieve safe access and egress.

The EA should be consulted where development is proposed within 16m of a tidal waterbody or tidal defence infrastructure to obtain consent via a Flood Risk Activity Permit (FRAP).





SR49										
Site Area (На): 0.235	Ex	xisting Land Use: Brownf	ield	Prop	osed Land Use: Residential				
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood Zone	e 3	Flood Zone 3b				
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	44.7%		16.6%	38.7%		0.0%				
Development lifetime	100 years									
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulneral	evelopment which has a 'more vulnerable' classification will be subject to the Exception Test.								
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	cidents within the site: None.								
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Upnor Reach) is loca	e River Medway (Upnor Reach) is located approximately 12m southeast of the site.								
Geology	·	edrock: Lambeth Group - Sand, Silt and Clay uperficial deposits: No Superficial deposits								
	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from tidal sources during the defenced scenario for key return period events. Maximum flood level on site shown in bracket									
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year retu	urn period event - 2070	1 in 200-year return per	od event - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event				
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	46.77% ((5.45m AODN)	68.00% (6.08m	AODN)	46.77% (5.40m AODN)				
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentag	e of site at risk of fl	looding from surface wat	er based on the EA's 'Risk	of Flooding from S	Surface Water Map'				
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario			'Low' risk scenario				
	17.4%			9.0%		11.0%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, water is sh	nown to accumulate a	along the southeastern bor	der of the site.						
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset condition rating is unknown. The design	_		nigh ground and a wall with a	an actual crest level o	of between 5.39m and 6.24m AODN. The current				
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to the lifetime of any development.	o raise an existing de	efence wall, it is estimated t	o cost in the region of £250,	000 to upgrade the 1	50m of defences in order to protect the site for				
Flood Warning Area?	Yes									
	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2115) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)									
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating		lerate' Hazard Rating	'Significant' I	Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating				
	10.72%		28.26%		56%	1.06%				





The site is located in Flood Zones 2 and 3, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.

SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require a Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site.

Floor levels should be raised above the design flood level, including the Environment Agency's recommended additional freeboard requirements where practicable. Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

The Sequential Approach should be applied to the layout of the site by locating the most vulnerable elements in the lowest risk areas. The Sequential Approach should also be applied to the internal layout of buildings, in particular where floor levels cannot be raised.

Flood Hazard should be appraised against the proposed development layout to ensure that users and occupants of the site can achieve safe access and egress.

The EA should be consulted where development is proposed within 16m of a tidal waterbody or tidal defence infrastructure to obtain consent via a Flood Risk Activity Permit (FRAP).





SNF15										
Site Area (l	На): 2.368	E	cisting Land Use: Brownf	ield		Propos	ed Land Use: Residential			
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Floo	d Zone 3		Flood Zone 3b			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	37.3%		7.0%	5	55.7%		~40.0% *refer to text below			
Development lifetime	100 years									
Exception Test required?	modelling study does not take into account further analysis is recommended to determine the vulnerable uses should not be permitted. Test. Development that is classified as 'w	Development which has a 'more vulnerable' classification will be subject to the Exception Test. *Although the NKC modelling shows the site to be within the functional floodplain, the modelling study does not take into account the recently completed defences. These defences would likely reduce the extent of flooding during a 1 in 30 year return period event, and further analysis is recommended to determine the true extent of the functional floodplain onsite. Any development classified as 'Less Vulnerable', 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b). Development which is classified as 'essential infrastructure' will be subject to the Exception Test. Development that is classified as 'water-compatible' should be designed and constructed to: remain operational and safe for users in times of flood; result in no net loss of floodplain storage; and not impede water flows and not increase flood risk elsewhere.								
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	cidents within the site: None.								
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Bridge Reach) is loca	e River Medway (Bridge Reach) is located approximately 155m southeast of the site.								
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation, Seaford Chalk Formation and Newhaven Chalk Formation (undifferentiated) - Chalk Superficial deposits: Head - Clay and Silt									
	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from tidal sources during the defenced scenario for key return period events. Maximum flood level on site shown in brackets.									
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year ret	ırn period event - 2070	1 in 200-year retu	rn period event - 21	115	1 in 1000-year return period event			
from tidal sources and surface water,	53.52% (5.00m AODN)	60.36% (5.47m AODN) 65.67% (6.		65.67% (6.10m AODN)		60.36% (5.42m AODN)				
based off mapping available from the	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'									
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	ım' risk scenario			'Low' risk scenario			
	27.7%			10.5%			11.4%			
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, surface wa	ter is shown to accu	mulate across the southerr	n portion of the site.						
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset s condition rating is unknown. The design s	_			l with an actual cres	st level of b	netween 4.50m and 5.20m AODN. The current			
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to the lifetime of any development.	raise an existing de	fence wall, it is estimated t	o cost in the region of	£1,125,000 to upgr	ade the 70	00m of defences in order to protect the site for			
Flood Warning Area?	Yes									
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2115) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)									
Hazara Nating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Мос	lerate' Hazard Rating	'Signifi	icant' Hazard Rating	g	'Extreme' Hazard Rating			
	1.85%		3.54%		20.46%		41.31%			





The site is located in Flood Zones 2 and 3, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.

SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require a Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site.

Floor levels should be raised above the design flood level, including the Environment Agency's recommended additional freeboard requirements where practicable. Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

The Sequential Approach should be applied to the layout of the site by locating the most vulnerable elements in the lowest risk areas. The Sequential Approach should also be applied to the internal layout of buildings, in particular where floor levels cannot be raised.

Flood Hazard should be appraised against the proposed development layout to ensure that users and occupants of the site can achieve safe access and egress.





SNF23										
Site Area (I	На): 0.059	E	kisting Land Use: Brownf	ield	Prop	osed Land Use: Residential				
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood	Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b				
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.0%		0.0%	10	0.0%	~40.0% *refer to text below				
Development lifetime	100 years									
Exception Test required?	modelling study does not take into account further analysis is recommended to deter Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted Test. Development that is classified as 'w	Development which has a 'more vulnerable' classification will be subject to the Exception Test. *Although the NKC modelling shows the site to be within the functional floodplain, the modelling study does not take into account the recently completed defences. These defences would likely reduce the extent of flooding during a 1 in 30 year return period event, and curther analysis is recommended to determine the true extent of the functional floodplain onsite. Any development classified as 'Less Vulnerable', 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly vulnerable' uses should not be permitted within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b). Development which is classified as 'essential infrastructure' will be subject to the Exception rest. Development that is classified as 'water-compatible' should be designed and constructed to: remain operational and safe for users in times of flood; result in no net loss of floodplain torage; and not impede water flows and not increase flood risk elsewhere.								
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	idents within the site: None. idents within close proximity of the site: None.								
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Bridge Reach and Lir	e River Medway (Bridge Reach and Limehouse Reach) is located approximately 235m southeast of the site.								
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation, Seaford Chalk Formation and Newhaven Chalk Formation (undifferentiated) - Chalk Superficial deposits: Head - Clay and Silt									
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	ooding from tidal so	ources during the defence	ed scenario for key re	turn period events. Max	mum flood level on site shown in brackets.				
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year ret	urn period event - 2070	1 in 200-year returi	n period event - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event				
from tidal sources and surface water,	100.00% (5.00m AODN)	100.00% (5.47m AODN) 10		100.00% (6	3.10m AODN)	100.00% (5.42m AODN)				
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'								
LA	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario			'Low' risk scenario				
	0.0%			0.0%		0.0%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, the entire s	site is shown to rema	ain dry.							
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset so condition rating is unknown. The design s	_			with an actual crest level	of between 4.50m and 5.20m AODN. The current				
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to the lifetime of any development.	raise an existing de	fence wall, it is estimated t	o cost in the region of £	2400,000 to upgrade the 2	50m of defences in order to protect the site for				
Flood Warning Area?	Yes									
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2115) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)									
Tiuzui a Italing	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	lerate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	ant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating				
	0.00%		0.00%		100.00%	0.00%				





The site is located in Flood Zones 3, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.

SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require a Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site.

Floor levels should be raised above the design flood level, including the Environment Agency's recommended additional freeboard requirements where practicable. Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

The Sequential Approach should be applied to the layout of the site by locating the most vulnerable elements in the lowest risk areas. The Sequential Approach should also be applied to the internal layout of buildings, in particular where floor levels cannot be raised.

Flood Hazard should be appraised against the proposed development layout to ensure that users and occupants of the site can achieve safe access and egress.





SNF32							
Site Area (H	Ha): 0.025	Ex	kisting Land Use: Brownf	ield	Pro	posed Land Use: Residential	
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood	I Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b	
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	66.5%		0.0%	33	3.5%	0.0%	
Development lifetime	100 years						
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulneral	ble' classification will	be subject to the Exception	n Test.			
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the sit	e: None.					
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Limehouse Reach) i	s located approximat	ely 390m southeast of the	site.			
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formatio Superficial deposits: Head - Clay and Sil		mation and Newhaven Cha	alk Formation (undiffere	entiated) - Chalk		
	Percentage of site at risk of fl	ooding from tidal so	ources during the defenc	ed scenario for key re	eturn period events. Max	ximum flood level on site shown in brackets.	
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year ret	urn period event - 2070	1 in 200-year retur	n period event - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event	
from tidal sources and surface water,	9.36% (4.93m AODN)	40.64%	(5.47m AODN)	100.00% (6	6.12m AODN)	40.64% (5.42m AODN)	
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentag	e of site at risk of fl	looding from surface wat	er based on the EA's	'Risk of Flooding from	Surface Water Map'	
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	ım' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario	
	60.6%			1.6%		3.4%	
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under the 'high' scenario, surface water increase slightly.	is shown to accumula	ate in the northern portion of	of the site. Under the 'm	nedium' and 'low' risk sce	nario, the surface water extent is shown to	
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure		shows the existing d	efences consist of natural h	nigh ground and a wall	with an actual crest level	of between 4.08m and 4.49m AODN, and the	
(inc. SoP):	condition rating is 4. The design standard	_				,	
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to the lifetime of any development.	o raise an existing de	fence wall, it is estimated t	o cost in the region of £	£250,000 to upgrade the	150m of defences in order to protect the site for	
Flood Warning Area?	Yes						
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rat respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2,	_	uring the design flood ev	ent (2115) (The domir	nant hazard rating on th	ne subject site has been highlighted in the	
Tidzara Nating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	lerate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating	
	21.52%		67.92%		10.56%	0.00%	
Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	Surface Water Management Strategy to Floor levels should be raised above the cresilience measures should be considered.	ed within the developed be produced to show design flood level, included for inclusion. It is to the layout of the layout of the layout levels	oment where possible, in ac or how SuDS will be included cluding the Environment Ag one site by locating the most cannot be raised.	ccordance with the NPF d to manage surface wa ency's recommended a vulnerable elements in	ater runoff from the site. additional freeboard requ n the lowest risk areas. Tl	ce guidance. All major development will require a irements where practicable. Flood resistance and he Sequential Approach should also be applied to safe access and egress.	





CCB21								
Site Area (На): 0.035	Ex	xisting Land Use: Brownf	ield	Proposed Land Use: Residential			
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood	Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b		
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.0%	,	98.8%	1.	2%	0.0%		
Development lifetime	100 years							
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulnera	ble' classification will	be subject to the Exception	n Test.				
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the sit	e: None.						
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway is located approxima	tely 575m northwest	of the site.					
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formatic Superficial deposits: Head - Clay, Silt, Sa							
	Percentage of site at risk of fl	looding from tidal so	ources during the defence	ed scenario for key re	turn period events. Max	rimum flood level on site shown in brackets.		
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year retu	ırn period event - 2070	1 in 200-year returi	n period event - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event		
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	100.00%	(5.47m AODN)	100.00% (6	5.12m AODN)	100.00% (5.42m AODN)		
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentag	ge of site at risk of fl	ooding from surface wat	er based on the EA's	Risk of Flooding from	Surface Water Map'		
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	ım' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario		
	0.0%			0.0%		99.2%		
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under the 'high' and 'medium' risk scena	ario, the entire site is s	shown to remain dry. Unde	r the 'low' risk scenario,	surface water could acc	umulate across the entire site.		
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset The design standard of protection is 1 in	_	efences consist of natural h	nigh ground with an acti	ual crest level of 4.75m A	ODN. The current condition rating is unknown.		
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,152/m to the lifetime of any development.	o raise an existing en	nbankment, it is estimated	to cost in the region of s	£250,000 to upgrade the	200m of defences in order to protect the site for		
Flood Warning Area?	Yes							
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rat respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2,	_	uring the design flood ev	ent (2115) (The domin	nant hazard rating on th	e subject site has been highlighted in the		
mazaru Nating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	lerate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	ant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating		
	0.00%		0.00%		100.00%	0.00%		
Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	Surface Water Management Strategy to Floor levels should be raised above the resilience measures should be considered	led within the develop be produced to show design flood level, inc ed for inclusion. blied to the layout of the lar where floor levels	ment where possible, in according to the Environment Agone site by locating the most cannot be raised.	cordance with the NPP d to manage surface wa ency's recommended a vulnerable elements in	ater runoff from the site. additional freeboard requ the lowest risk areas. The	ce guidance. All major development will require a irements where practicable. Flood resistance and he Sequential Approach should also be applied to safe access and egress.		





CCB24						
Site Area (На): 0.021	Ex	kisting Land Use: Brownf	ield	P	roposed Land Use: Residential
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood	Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.0%		3.0%	97	'.0%	0.0%
Development lifetime	100 years					·
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulneral	ble' classification will	be subject to the Exception	n Test.		
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the sit	e: None.				
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway is located approxima	tely 615m northwest	of the site.			
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formatio Superficial deposits: Head - Clay, Silt, Sa					
	Percentage of site at risk of fl	ooding from tidal so	ources during the defenc	ed scenario for key re	turn period events. I	Maximum flood level on site shown in brackets.
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year ret	urn period event - 2070	1 in 200-year returi	n period event - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event
from tidal sources and surface water,	50.05% (4.48m AODN)	100.00%	(5.47m AODN)	100.00% (6	5.12m AODN)	100.00% (5.42m AODN)
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentag	e of site at risk of f	looding from surface wat	er based on the EA's	Risk of Flooding fro	m Surface Water Map'
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	um' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario
	100.0%			0.0%		0.0%
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, surface wa	ater is shown to accu	mulate on the entire site.			
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure			efences consist of natural l	nigh ground with an act	ual crest level of 4.75r	n AODN. The current condition rating is unknown.
(inc. SoP):	The design standard of protection is 1 in	•				
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,152/m to the lifetime of any development.	o raise an existing er	nbankment, it is estimated	to cost in the region of	£250,000 to upgrade t	he 200m of defences in order to protect the site for
Flood Warning Area?	Yes					
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rat respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2,	_	uring the design flood ev	rent (2115) (The domin	aant hazard rating on	the subject site has been highlighted in the
riazara italing	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	lerate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	ant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating
	0.00%		0.00%		100.00%	0.00%
Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	Surface Water Management Strategy to Floor levels should be raised above the cresilience measures should be considered	ed within the developed be produced to show design flood level, included for inclusion. Ited to the layout of the lar where floor levels	oment where possible, in according to the Environment Agence site by locating the most cannot be raised.	ccordance with the NPP d to manage surface wa gency's recommended a s vulnerable elements in	ater runoff from the site additional freeboard re the lowest risk areas	equirements where practicable. Flood resistance and a contract to the Sequential Approach should also be applied to





SNF30										
Site Area (l	На): 0.112	Ex	cisting Land Use: Brownf	ield		Propose	ed Land Use: Residential			
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Floo	d Zone 3		Flood Zone 3b			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.0%		0.0%	10	00.0%		100.0% *refer to text below			
Development lifetime	100 years					·				
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulnerable' classification will be subject to the Exception Test. *Although the NKC modelling shows the site to be within the functional floodplain, the modelling study does not take into account the recently completed defences. These defences would likely reduce the extent of flooding during a 1 in 30 year return period event, and further analysis is recommended to determine the true extent of the functional floodplain onsite. Any development classified as 'Less Vulnerable', 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b). Development which is classified as 'essential infrastructure' will be subject to the Exception Test. Development that is classified as 'water-compatible' should be designed and constructed to: remain operational and safe for users in times of flood; result in no net loss of floodplain storage; and not impede water flows and not increase flood risk elsewhere.									
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	cidents within the site: None.								
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Bridge Reach) is loca	The River Medway (Bridge Reach) is located approximately 160m southeast of the site.								
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation, Seaford Chalk Formation and Newhaven Chalk Formation (undifferentiated) - Chalk Superficial deposits: Alluvium - Clay, Silt, Sand and Peat									
	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from tidal sources during the defenced scenario for key return period events. Maximum flood level on site shown in brackets.									
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year ret	urn period event - 2070	1 in 200-year retu	rn period event - 21	115	1 in 1000-year return period event			
from tidal sources and surface water,	100.00% (4.99m AODN)	% (4.99m AODN) 100.00% (5.47m AODN) 100.00% (6.10m AODN) 100.00% (5.42m AODN)		100.00% (5.42m AODN)						
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage	e of site at risk of fl	ooding from surface wat	er based on the EA's	'Risk of Flooding	from Surf	ace Water Map'			
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	ım' risk scenario			'Low' risk scenario			
	12.9%			9.7%			74.8%			
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	on the majority of the site.			·			enario, surface water is shown to accumulate			
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset sunknown. The design standard of protect	_	efences consist of a wall w	ith an actual crest leve	el of between 4.07m	and 5.20n	n AODN. The current condition rating is			
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to the lifetime of any development.	raise an existing de	fence wall, it is estimated t	o cost in the region of	£250,000 to upgrad	de the 150r	m of defences in order to protect the site for			
Flood Warning Area?	Yes									
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rati respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	_	uring the design flood ev	ent (2115) (The domi	inant hazard rating	g on the su	ubject site has been highlighted in the			
Hazara Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	lerate' Hazard Rating	'Signifi	icant' Hazard Rating	9	'Extreme' Hazard Rating			
	0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		100.00%			





The site is located in Flood Zones 3, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.

SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require a Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site.

Floor levels should be raised above the design flood level, including the Environment Agency's recommended additional freeboard requirements where practicable. Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

The Sequential Approach should be applied to the layout of the site by locating the most vulnerable elements in the lowest risk areas. The Sequential Approach should also be applied to the internal layout of buildings, in particular where floor levels cannot be raised.

Flood Hazard should be appraised against the proposed development layout to ensure that users and occupants of the site can achieve safe access and egress.





CCB31							
Site Area (l	Ha): 0.795	Ex	kisting Land Use: Brownf	ield	Proposed Land Use: Residential		
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood Z	one 3	Flood Zone 3b	
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	82.6%		13.5%	3.9	%	0.0%	
Development lifetime	100 years						
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulnerate	ole' classification will	be subject to the Exception	n Test.			
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	e: None.					
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway is located approximat	tely 545m northwest	of the site.				
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation Superficial deposits: No Superficial deposits						
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	ooding from tidal so	ources during the defence	ed scenario for key retu	rn period events. Max	imum flood level on site shown in brackets.	
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year retu	urn period event - 2070	1 in 200-year return p	period event - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event	
from tidal sources and surface water,	3.65% (4.48m AODN)	19.91% ((5.47m AODN)	26.68% (6.12	2m AODN)	17.62% (5.40m AODN)	
based off mapping available from the	Percentag	e of site at risk of fl	ooding from surface wate	er based on the EA's 'R	isk of Flooding from S	Surface Water Map'	
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	ım' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario	
	0.1%			1.5%		18.1%	
Description of Surface Water Flow	Under the 'high' risk scenario, the entire	site is shown to rema	in dry. Under the 'medium'	risk scenario, a small po	rtion of the northwester	n corner is shown to be affected by surface water.	
Paths	Under the 'low' risk scenario, the extent of						
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset The design standard of protection is 1 in	_	efences consist of natural h	nigh ground with an actua	I crest level of 4.75m A	ODN. The current condition rating is unknown.	
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs		•	nbankment, it is estimated	to cost in the region of £3	00,000 to upgrade the	250m of defences in order to protect the site for	
Flood Warning Area?	Yes						
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rati respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	_	uring the design flood ev	ent (2115) (The domina	nt hazard rating on the	e subject site has been highlighted in the	
Tiazara Nating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	lerate' Hazard Rating	'Significar	nt' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating	
	1.57%		6.69%		17.50%	0.63%	
Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	Surface Water Management Strategy to I Floor levels should be raised above the c resilience measures should be considered	ed within the develop be produced to show design flood level, inc ed for inclusion. lied to the layout of the lar where floor levels	ment where possible, in ac how SuDS will be included cluding the Environment Ag ne site by locating the most cannot be raised.	cordance with the NPPF d to manage surface wate ency's recommended ad vulnerable elements in the	er runoff from the site. ditional freeboard requi	re guidance. All major development will require a rements where practicable. Flood resistance and re Sequential Approach should also be applied to safe access and egress.	





RWB2											
Site Area (I	На): 1.775	Ex	Existing Land Use: Brownfield			Propose	ed Land Use: Residential				
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flo	od Zone 3		Flood Zone 3b				
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	31.5%		6.8%		61.7%		~60.0% *refer to text below				
Development lifetime	100 years										
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulnerable' classification will be subject to the Exception Test. *Although the NKC modelling shows the site to be within the functional floodplain, the modelling study does not take into account the recently completed defences. These defences would likely reduce the extent of flooding during a 1 in 30 year return period event, and further analysis is recommended to determine the true extent of the functional floodplain onsite. Any development classified as 'Less Vulnerable', 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b). Development which is classified as 'essential infrastructure' will be subject to the Exception Test. Development that is classified as 'water-compatible' should be designed and constructed to: remain operational and safe for users in times of flood; result in no net loss of floodplain storage; and not impede water flows and not increase flood risk elsewhere.										
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site:	ncidents within the site: None. ncidents within close proximity of the site: None.									
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Wickham Reach) is lo	cated along the nor	thwestern border of the site	Э.							
Geology		Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation - Chalk Superficial deposits: Head - Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel, Alluvium - Clay, Silt, Sand and Peat, Beach and Tidal Flat Deposits (undifferentiated) - Clay, Silt and Sand									
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	oding from tidal so	ources during the defence	ed scenario for key	return period ev	ents. Maximur	m flood level on site shown in brackets.				
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year ret	ırn period event - 2070	1 in 200-year ret	urn period event -	- 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event				
from tidal sources and surface water,	58.87% (5.00m AODN)	68.15% (5.48m AODN) 76.42% (6.11m AODN)			66.28% (5.43m AODN)						
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage	of site at risk of fl	ooding from surface water	er based on the EA	s 'Risk of Floodi	ing from Surf	ace Water Map'				
<u> </u>	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	ım' risk scenario			'Low' risk scenario				
	3.8%			0.0%			1.4%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under the 'high' risk scenario, there is one area appears in the northeastern corner o		urface water flooding. Unde	er the 'medium' and 'l	ow' risk scenario,	this localised	area increases as well as another localised				
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	•	_					9m and 8.91m AODN. The current condition e providing little/no benefit to the site itself.				
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	N/A – Existing defences are behind the sit for this site.	e, as such the defe	nces provide little/no benef	it to the site itself. Th	erefore, it is not co	onsidered app	propriate to consider upgrading the defences				
Flood Warning Area?	Yes										
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Ratin respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	ng Classification d	uring the design flood ev	ent (2115) (The don	ninant hazard rat	ing on the su	bject site has been highlighted in the				
Hazara Nauriy	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	lerate' Hazard Rating	'Sign	'Significant' Hazard Rating		'Extreme' Hazard Rating				
	3.60%		5.26%		21.16%		45.47%				





The site is located in Flood Zones 2 and 3, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.

SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require a Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site.

Floor levels should be raised above the design flood level, including the Environment Agency's recommended additional freeboard requirements where practicable. Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

The Sequential Approach should be applied to the layout of the site by locating the most vulnerable elements in the lowest risk areas. The Sequential Approach should also be applied to the internal layout of buildings, in particular where floor levels cannot be raised.

Flood Hazard should be appraised against the proposed development layout to ensure that users and occupants of the site can achieve safe access and egress.

The EA should be consulted where development is proposed within 16m of a tidal waterbody or tidal defence infrastructure to obtain consent via a Flood Risk Activity Permit (FRAP).





SNF34										
Site Area (l	На): 0.172	E	xisting Land Use: Brownt	ïeld	Proposed Land Use: Residential					
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Flo	od Zone 2	Flood	d Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b				
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.0%		0.0%	10	0.0%	100.0% *refer to text below				
Development lifetime	100 years									
Exception Test required?	modelling study does not take into account further analysis is recommended to determine the vulnerable uses should not be permitted. Test. Development that is classified as 'we're	Development which has a 'more vulnerable' classification will be subject to the Exception Test. *Although the NKC modelling shows the site to be within the functional floodplain, the modelling study does not take into account the recently completed defences. These defences would likely reduce the extent of flooding during a 1 in 30 year return period event, and further analysis is recommended to determine the true extent of the functional floodplain onsite. Any development classified as 'Less Vulnerable', 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b). Development which is classified as 'essential infrastructure' will be subject to the Exception Test. Development that is classified as 'water-compatible' should be designed and constructed to: remain operational and safe for users in times of flood; result in no net loss of floodplain storage; and not impede water flows and not increase flood risk elsewhere.								
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	cidents within the site: None.								
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Bridge Reach and Li	he River Medway (Bridge Reach and Limehouse Reach) is located approximately 210m southeast of the site.								
Geology		Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation - Chalk Superficial deposits: Alluvium - Clay, Silt, Sand and Peat								
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	ooding from tidal s	ources during the defenc	ed scenario for key re	eturn period events. N	aximum flood level on site shown in brackets.				
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year ret	urn period event - 2070	1 in 200-year retur	n period event - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event				
from tidal sources and surface water,	100.00% (4.99m AODN)	100.00%	(5.46m AODN)	100.00% (6	6.09m AODN)	100.00% (5.42m AODN)				
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentag	e of site at risk of f	looding from surface wat	er based on the EA's	'Risk of Flooding from	n Surface Water Map'				
LA	'High' risk scenario		'Media	ım' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario				
	10.9%			9.6%		79.5%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under the 'high' and 'medium' risk scenar to be affected by surface water.	rio, surface water is	shown to accumulate withir	n the southwestern corr	ner of the site. Under th	e 'low' risk scenario, the majority of the site is shown				
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset unknown. The design standard of protect	· ·	efences consist of a wall w	ith an actual crest leve	l of between 4.42m and	4.78m AODN. The current condition rating is				
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to the lifetime of any development	o raise an existing de	efence wall, it is estimated t	o cost in the region of	£625,000 to upgrade th	e 400m of defences in order to protect the site for				
Flood Warning Area?	Yes									
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rati respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	_	luring the design flood ev	rent (2115) (The domii	nant hazard rating on	the subject site has been highlighted in the				
nazara Nating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Мос	derate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating				
	0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	100.00%				





The site is located in Flood Zones 2 and 3, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.

SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require a Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site.

Floor levels should be raised above the design flood level, including the Environment Agency's recommended additional freeboard requirements where practicable. Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

The Sequential Approach should be applied to the layout of the site by locating the most vulnerable elements in the lowest risk areas. The Sequential Approach should also be applied to the internal layout of buildings, in particular where floor levels cannot be raised.

Flood Hazard should be appraised against the proposed development layout to ensure that users and occupants of the site can achieve safe access and egress.





SR48										
Site Area (I	На): 0.245	Exist	ng Land Use: Brownfie	ld	Proposed Land Use: Residential					
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Flood 2	one 2	Flood	Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b				
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.0%	44.5	5%	55	5.5%	~1.0% *refer to text below				
Development lifetime	100 years									
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulnerable' classification will be subject to the Exception Test. *Although the NKC modelling shows the site to be within the functional floodplain, the modelling study does not take into account the recently completed defences. These defences would likely reduce the extent of flooding during a 1 in 30 year return period event, and further analysis is recommended to determine the true extent of the functional floodplain onsite. Any development classified as 'Less Vulnerable', 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b). Development which is classified as 'essential infrastructure' will be subject to the Exception Test. Development that is classified as 'water-compatible' should be designed and constructed to: remain operational and safe for users in times of flood; result in no net loss of floodplain storage; and not impede water flows and not increase flood risk elsewhere.									
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	cidents within the site: None. cidents within close proximity of the site: None.								
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Upnor Reach) is loca	The River Medway (Upnor Reach) is located along the southeastern border of the site.								
Geology	Bedrock: Thanet Formation - Sand, Silt and Clay Superficial deposits: Beach and Tidal Flat Deposits (undifferentiated) - Clay, Silt and Sand									
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	oding from tidal source	es during the defenced	scenario for key re	eturn period events. Maxi	mum flood level on site shown in brackets.				
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year return	period event - 2070	1 in 200-year retur	n period event - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event				
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.63% (5.06m AODN)	99.91% (5.4	5m AODN)	100.00% (6	6.08m AODN)	99.91% (5.40m AODN)				
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage	e of site at risk of flood	ling from surface water	based on the EA's	'Risk of Flooding from S	urface Water Map'				
LA	'High' risk scenario		'Medium	ı' risk scenario	sk scenario 'Low' risk scenar					
	0.3%			0.5%		63.3%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure	to be affected by surface water.					w' risk scenario, the majority of the site is shown 54m AODN. The current condition rating is				
(inc. SoP):	unknown. The design standard of protecti	_	iodo doniciot di a maii mai	ramadian croot level	or both our croom and on	o minited and the contained fracting to				
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	the lifetime of any development.	Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to raise an existing defence wall, it is estimated to cost in the region of £250,000 to upgrade the 150m of defences in order to protect the site for the lifetime of any development.								
Flood Warning Area?	Yes									
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rational respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	ng Classification durir	ng the design flood ever	nt (2115) (The domin	nant hazard rating on the	e subject site has been highlighted in the				
	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Modera	te' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating				
	0.00%		0.00%		99.20%	0.80%				





The site is located in Flood Zones 2 and 3, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.

SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require a Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site.

Floor levels should be raised above the design flood level, including the Environment Agency's recommended additional freeboard requirements where practicable. Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

The Sequential Approach should be applied to the layout of the site by locating the most vulnerable elements in the lowest risk areas. The Sequential Approach should also be applied to the internal layout of buildings, in particular where floor levels cannot be raised.

Flood Hazard should be appraised against the proposed development layout to ensure that users and occupants of the site can achieve safe access and egress.

The EA should be consulted where development is proposed within 16m of a tidal waterbody or tidal defence infrastructure to obtain consent via a Flood Risk Activity Permit (FRAP).





CCB7						
Site Area (На): 0.049	Ex	kisting Land Use: Brownt	ield	Pro	pposed Land Use: Residential
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood	Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.0%		41.9%	58	3.1%	0.0%
Development lifetime	100 years					
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulneral	ble' classification will	be subject to the Exception	n Test.		
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the sit	e: None.				
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway is located approxima	tely 235m northwest	of the site.			
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formatio Superficial deposits: Alluvium - Clay, Silt					
	Percentage of site at risk of fl	ooding from tidal so	ources during the defenc	ed scenario for key re	turn period events. Ma	ximum flood level on site shown in brackets.
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year ret	urn period event - 2070	1 in 200-year returi	n period event - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.63% (4.48m AODN)	100.00%	(5.46m AODN)	100.00% (6	5.11m AODN)	100.00% (5.40m AODN)
based off mapping available from the	Percentag	e of site at risk of fl	looding from surface wat	er based on the EA's	Risk of Flooding from	Surface Water Map'
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Medit	um' risk scenario	'Low' risk scenario	
	35.1%			0.0%		64.1%
Description of Surface Water Flow	Under the 'medium' risk scenario, the en	tire site is shown to r	emain dry. Under the 'high'	risk scenario over a thi	rd of the site could be a	ffected by surface water. Under the 'low' risk
Paths	scenario, more than half of the site could	•				
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure				nigh ground with an act	ual crest level of betwee	n 4.75m and 4.93m AODN. The current condition
(inc. SoP):	rating is unknown. The design standard of	•	•	to post in the region of	C200 000 to ungrade the	e 150m of defences in order to protect the site for
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	the lifetime of any development	o raise an existing en	ilbankment, it is estimated	to cost in the region or:	£200,000 to apgrade the	e 130m of defences in order to protect the site for
Flood Warning Area?	Yes					
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rat respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2,	_	uring the design flood ev	rent (2115) (The domin	nant hazard rating on t	he subject site has been highlighted in the
Tiuzura raung	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	lerate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	ant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating
	0.00%		0.00%		84.86%	15.14%
Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	Surface Water Management Strategy to Floor levels should be raised above the cresilience measures should be considered	ed within the develop be produced to show design flood level, inc ed for inclusion. lied to the layout of the lar where floor levels	oment where possible, in according to the Environment According the Environment According the Most cannot be raised.	ccordance with the NPP d to manage surface wa gency's recommended a s vulnerable elements in	ater runoff from the site. additional freeboard requ the lowest risk areas. T	uirements where practicable. Flood resistance and The Sequential Approach should also be applied to





FP14							
Site Area (На): 0.011	Ex	cisting Land Use: Brownf	ïeld	Pı	oposed Land Use: Residential	
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood	Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b	
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	96.8 %		0.0%	3.	.2%	0.0%	
Development lifetime	100 years						
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulnerate	ole' classification will	be subject to the Exception	n Test.			
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	e: None.					
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway is located approximat	ely 70m north of the	site.				
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation Superficial deposits: No Superficial deposits						
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	ooding from tidal so	ources during the defence	ed scenario for key re	turn period events. M	aximum flood level on site shown in brackets.	
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year retu	urn period event - 2070	1 in 200-year returi	n period event - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event	
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	6.36% (6.	11m AODN)	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentag	e of site at risk of fl	ooding from surface wat	er based on the EA's	'Risk of Flooding from	n Surface Water Map'	
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	ım' risk scenario	'Low' risk scenario		
	0.0%			0.0%		0.0%	
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, the entire	site is shown to rema	in dry.				
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure	•	_	-	red high ground with ar	actual crest level of b	etween 4.60m and 5.49m AODN. The current	
(inc. SoP):	condition rating is unknown. The design s	•	•				
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,152/m to the lifetime of any development	o raise an existing en	nbankment, it is estimated	to cost in the region of f	£200,000 to upgrade th	e 150m of defences in order to protect the site for	
Flood Warning Area?	Yes						
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rati respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	_	uring the design flood ev	ent (2115) (The domin	nant hazard rating on	the subject site has been highlighted in the	
Tidzura rading	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Moo	lerate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	eant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating	
	5.20%		0.00%		0.62%	0.00%	
Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	Surface Water Management Strategy to I Floor levels should be raised above the c resilience measures should be considered	ed within the develop be produced to show design flood level, inc ed for inclusion. lied to the layout of the lar where floor levels	ment where possible, in ac how SuDS will be included cluding the Environment Ag ne site by locating the most cannot be raised.	ccordance with the NPP d to manage surface wa ency's recommended a vulnerable elements in	ater runoff from the site additional freeboard red additional freeboard red at the lowest risk areas.	quirements where practicable. Flood resistance and The Sequential Approach should also be applied to	





SNF38										
Site Area (l	На): 0.069	Ex	cisting Land Use: Brownf	ield		Propos	ed Land Use: Residential			
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Floo	d Zone 3		Flood Zone 3b			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.0 %		0.0%	10	00.0%		100.0% *refer to text below			
Development lifetime	100 years									
Exception Test required?	·	nt the recently comp mine the true extent within the Functiona ater-compatible' sho	leted defences. These defe of the functional floodplain I Floodplain (Flood Zone 3 uld be designed and const	ences would likely redu onsite. Any developm b). Development whic	uce the extent of flo nent classified as 'Le h is classified as 'es	ooding durir ess Vulnera ssential infr	ng a 1 in 30 year return period event, and			
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	: None.								
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Limehouse Reach) is	River Medway (Limehouse Reach) is located approximately 50m east of the site.								
Geology	edrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation - Chalk uperficial deposits: Alluvium - Clay, Silt, Sand and Peat									
	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from tidal sources during the defenced scenario for key return period events. Maximum flood level on site shown in brackets.									
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year ret	ırn period event - 2070	1 in 200-year retu	rn period event - 21	115	1 in 1000-year return period event			
from tidal sources and surface water,	100.00% (5.03m AODN)	100.00% (5.46m AODN) 100.00°		100.00% (100.00% (6.10m AODN)		100.00% (5.42m AODN)			
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'									
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	ım' risk scenario			'Low' risk scenario			
	0.0%			7.7%			74.9%			
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure	Under the 'high' risk scenario, the entire s scenario, surface water is shown to accur The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset s	mulate across the m	ajority of the site.				is shown to be affected. Under the 'low' risk m AODN. The current condition rating is			
(inc. SoP):	unknown. The design standard of protecti	on is 1 in 20 years.								
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to the lifetime of any development.	raise an existing de	fence wall, it is estimated t	o cost in the region of	£250,000 to upgrad	de the 150i	m of defences in order to protect the site for			
Flood Warning Area?	Yes									
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2115) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)									
nazara naung	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Signifi	icant' Hazard Rating	g	'Extreme' Hazard Rating			
	0.00%		0.00%		3.14%		96.86%			





The site is located in Flood Zones 3, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.

SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require a Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site.

Floor levels should be raised above the design flood level, including the Environment Agency's recommended additional freeboard requirements where practicable. Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

The Sequential Approach should be applied to the layout of the site by locating the most vulnerable elements in the lowest risk areas. The Sequential Approach should also be applied to the internal layout of buildings, in particular where floor levels cannot be raised.

Flood Hazard should be appraised against the proposed development layout to ensure that users and occupants of the site can achieve safe access and egress.





CCB25											
Site Area (I	На): 0.069	Existing Land Use: Brown	field	Propos	ed Land Use: Residential						
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Flood Zone 2	Flood Zone 3		Flood Zone 3b						
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.0 %	1.9%	98.1%		~1.0% *refer to text below						
Development lifetime	100 years										
Exception Test required?	modelling study does not take into accour further analysis is recommended to detern Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted		fences would likely reduce the extent on onsite. Any development classified a 3b). Development which is classified a	of flooding duri as 'Less Vulner as 'essential inf	ng a 1 in 30 year return period event, and able', 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly						
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	dents within the site: None. dents within close proximity of the site: None.									
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Chatham Reach) is lo	e River Medway (Chatham Reach) is located along the northwestern border of the site.									
Geology	edrock: Seaford Chalk Formation - Chalk uperficial deposits: Alluvium - Clay, Silt, Sand and Peat										
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	oding from tidal sources during the defen	ced scenario for key return period e	vents. Maximu	ım flood level on site shown in brackets.						
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year return period event - 2070	1 in 200-year return period event	t - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event						
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	100.00% (6.09m AODN)		0.00% (0.00m AODN)						
based off mapping available from the	Percentage	e of site at risk of flooding from surface wa	ter based on the EA's 'Risk of Flood	ding from Sur	face Water Map'						
EA	'High' risk scenario	'Med	ium' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario						
	1.4%		4.4%		5.9%						
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, there are a	few localised areas of surface water flooding									
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset sunknown. The design standard of protection	shows the existing defences consist of a wall on is 1 in 1000 years.	with an actual crest level of between 5.	.60m and 6.00i	m AODN. The current condition rating is						
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to the lifetime of any development.	raise an existing defence wall, it is estimated	to cost in the region of £475,000 to up	ograde the 300	m of defences in order to protect the site for						
Flood Warning Area?	Yes										
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2115) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)										
razara raung	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Moderate' Hazard Rating	'Significant' Hazard R	Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating						
	0.00%	0.00%	22.78%		77.22%						





The site is located in Flood Zones 2 and 3, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.

SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require a Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site.

Floor levels should be raised above the design flood level, including the Environment Agency's recommended additional freeboard requirements where practicable. Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

The Sequential Approach should be applied to the layout of the site by locating the most vulnerable elements in the lowest risk areas. The Sequential Approach should also be applied to the internal layout of buildings, in particular where floor levels cannot be raised.

Flood Hazard should be appraised against the proposed development layout to ensure that users and occupants of the site can achieve safe access and egress.

The EA should be consulted where development is proposed within 16m of a tidal waterbody or tidal defence infrastructure to obtain consent via a Flood Risk Activity Permit (FRAP).





SNF31										
Site Area (I	На): 0.032	Exis	Existing Land Use: Brownfield			osed Land Use: Residential				
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Flood	l Zone 2	Floor	d Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b				
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.0 %	0	.0%	10	00.0%	100.0% *refer to text below				
Development lifetime	100 years									
Exception Test required?	modelling study does not take into accou further analysis is recommended to deter Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted	nt the recently comple mine the true extent o within the Functional vater-compatible' shou	ted defences. These defe f the functional floodplain Floodplain (Flood Zone 3 ld be designed and const	ences would likely redu onsite. Any developm b). Development which	uce the extent of flooding on ent classified as 'Less Vul n is classified as 'essential	uring a 1 in 30 year return period event, and nerable', 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly infrastructure' will be subject to the Exception in times of flood; result in no net loss of floodplain				
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	e: None.								
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Bridge Reach and Li	River Medway (Bridge Reach and Limehouse Reach) is located approximately 350m southeast of the site.								
Geology	edrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation, Seaford Chalk Formation and Newhaven Chalk Formation (undifferentiated) - Chalk uperficial deposits: Alluvium - Clay, Silt, Sand and Peat									
	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from tidal sources during the defenced scenario for key return period events. Maximum flood level on site shown in brackets.									
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year retur	n period event - 2070	1 in 200-year retui	rn period event - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event				
from tidal sources and surface water,	100.00% (4.99m AODN)	100.00% (5.47m AODN) 100.00% (6		6.10m AODN)	100.00% (5.42m AODN)					
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'									
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	ım' risk scenario	k scenario 'Low' risk scenario					
	0.0%			25.0%		70.9%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under the 'high' risk scenario, the entire s' 'low' risk scenario, the majority of the site		-	risk scenario, surface	water is shown to accumu	late along the southeastern boundary. Under the				
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset so condition rating is unknown. The design s	-			with an actual crest level	of between 4.50m and 5.20m AODN. The current				
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to the lifetime of any development.	raise an existing defe	ence wall, it is estimated t	o cost in the region of	£250,000 to upgrade the	50m of defences in order to protect the site for				
Flood Warning Area?	Yes									
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2115) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)									
Tiuzura Nating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mode	rate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating				
	0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	100.00%				





The site is located in Flood Zones 3, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.

SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require a Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site.

Floor levels should be raised above the design flood level, including the Environment Agency's recommended additional freeboard requirements where practicable. Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

The Sequential Approach should be applied to the layout of the site by locating the most vulnerable elements in the lowest risk areas. The Sequential Approach should also be applied to the internal layout of buildings, in particular where floor levels cannot be raised.

Flood Hazard should be appraised against the proposed development layout to ensure that users and occupants of the site can achieve safe access and egress.





SNF24										
Site Area (Ha): 0.052	Ex	isting Land Use: Brownf	eld		Propose	ed Land Use: Residential			
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	nd Zone 2	Floo	d Zone 3		Flood Zone 3b			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.0 %		0.0%	10	00.0%		~95.0% *refer to text below			
Development lifetime	100 years									
Exception Test required?	·	t the recently compl nine the true extent within the Functiona ater-compatible' sho	eted defences. These defe of the functional floodplain I Floodplain (Flood Zone 3 uld be designed and const	nces would likely redu onsite. Any developm o). Development whic	uce the extent of floo ent classified as 'Le h is classified as 'es	oding durir ess Vulnera ssential infr	ng a 1 in 30 year return period event, and			
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site:	None.								
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Bridge Reach and Lim	River Medway (Bridge Reach and Limehouse Reach) is located approximately 470m southeast of the site.								
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation, Seaford Chalk Formation and Newhaven Chalk Formation (undifferentiated) - Chalk Superficial deposits: Head - Clay and Silt									
	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from tidal sources during the defenced scenario for key return period events. Maximum flood level on site shown in brackets.									
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year retu	ırn period event - 2070	1 in 200-year retu	rn period event - 21	115	1 in 1000-year return period event			
from tidal sources and surface water,	100.00% (4.99m AODN)	100.00%	(5.47m AODN)	100.00% ((6.10m AODN)		100.00% (5.42m AODN)			
based off mapping available from the	Percentage	of site at risk of fl	ooding from surface wate	er based on the EA's	'Risk of Flooding	from Surf	face Water Map'			
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	m' risk scenario			'Low' risk scenario			
	59.5%			11.2%			16.7%			
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, surface wat	er is shown to accu	mulate across the majority	of the site.	·					
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset si	hows the existing de	efences consist of natural h	igh ground and a wall	with an actual cres	st level of b	etween 4.50m and 5.20m AODN. The current			
(inc. SoP):	condition rating is unknown. The design st	andard of protection	n is 1 in 50 and 1 in 200 ye	ars.						
High-Level Indication of Defence		raise an existing de	fence wall, it is estimated to	cost in the region of	£250,000 to upgrad	de the 150r	m of defences in order to protect the site for			
Costs	the lifetime of any development.									
Flood Warning Area?	Yes									
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2115) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)									
	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Signifi	icant' Hazard Rating	g	'Extreme' Hazard Rating			
	0.00%		0.00%		14.48%		85.52%			





The site is located in Flood Zones 3, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.

SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require a Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site.

Floor levels should be raised above the design flood level, including the Environment Agency's recommended additional freeboard requirements where practicable. Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

The Sequential Approach should be applied to the layout of the site by locating the most vulnerable elements in the lowest risk areas. The Sequential Approach should also be applied to the internal layout of buildings, in particular where floor levels cannot be raised.

Flood Hazard should be appraised against the proposed development layout to ensure that users and occupants of the site can achieve safe access and egress.





CCB8						
Site Area (На): 0.157	Ex	cisting Land Use: Brownf	ïeld	Pr	oposed Land Use: Residential
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood	Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.0 %		0.0%	10	0.0%	0.0%
Development lifetime	100 years					
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulneral	ble' classification will	be subject to the Exception	n Test.		
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the sit	e: None.				
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway is located approxima	tely 180m northwest	of the site.			
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation Superficial deposits: Alluvium - Clay, Silt					
	Percentage of site at risk of fl	ooding from tidal so	ources during the defenc	ed scenario for key re	turn period events. Ma	aximum flood level on site shown in brackets.
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year retu	urn period event - 2070	1 in 200-year retur	n period event - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event
from tidal sources and surface water,	100.00% (4.64m AODN)	100.00%	(5.46m AODN)	100.00% (6	6.11m AODN)	100.00% (5.40m AODN)
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentag	e of site at risk of fl	ooding from surface wat	er based on the EA's	'Risk of Flooding from	Surface Water Map'
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	ım' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario
	0.0%			0.0%		100.0%
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under the 'high' and 'medium' risk scena	rio, the entire site is s	shown to remain dry. Unde	r the 'low' risk scenario,	, surface water is showr	n to accumulate across the entire site.
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset	shows the existing de	efences consist of natural I	nigh ground with an act	ual crest level of betwee	en 4.75m and 4.93m AODN. The current condition
(inc. SoP):	rating is unknown. The design standard	•				
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,152/m to the lifetime of any development.	o raise an existing en	nbankment, it is estimated	to cost in the region of	£200,000 to upgrade th	e 150m of defences in order to protect the site for
Flood Warning Area?	Yes					
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rat respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2,	_	uring the design flood ev	rent (2115) (The domir	nant hazard rating on t	the subject site has been highlighted in the
riazara itating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Moo	lerate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating
	0.00%		0.00%		30.59%	69.41%
Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	Surface Water Management Strategy to Floor levels should be raised above the cresilience measures should be considered	ed within the develop be produced to show design flood level, inc ed for inclusion. lied to the layout of the lar where floor levels	ment where possible, in ac how SuDS will be included cluding the Environment Ag ne site by locating the most cannot be raised.	ccordance with the NPF d to manage surface wa ency's recommended a vulnerable elements in	ater runoff from the site. additional freeboard req	uirements where practicable. Flood resistance and The Sequential Approach should also be applied to





GN15											
Site Area (I	На): 5.869	Ex	cisting Land Use: Brownf	ield		Propose	ed Land Use: Residential				
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flo	od Zone 3		Flood Zone 3b				
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	1.4 %		1.8%		96.8%		~40.0% *refer to text below				
Development lifetime	100 years										
Exception Test required?	•	It the recently comp nine the true extent within the Functiona ater-compatible' sho	leted defences. These defe of the functional floodplain I Floodplain (Flood Zone 3 uld be designed and const	ences would likely red onsite. Any develop b). Development whi	duce the extent of floo ment classified as 'Les ch is classified as 'ess	oding durin ss Vulnera sential infr	ng a 1 in 30 year return period event, and				
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site:	None.									
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Gillingham Reach) is	River Medway (Gillingham Reach) is located along the northern border of the site.									
Geology	edrock: Thanet Formation - Sand, Silt and Clay, Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation, Seaford Chalk Formation and Newhaven Chalk Formation (undifferentiated) - Chalk uperficial deposits: Beach and Tidal Flat Deposits (undifferentiated) - Clay, Silt and Sand, Alluvium - Clay, Silt, Sand and Peat										
	Percentage of site at risk of floor	oding from tidal so	ources during the defence	ed scenario for key	return period events	s. Maximur	m flood level on site shown in brackets.				
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event 1 in 200-year return period event - 2070 1 in 200-year return period event - 2115 1 in 1000-year return period e						1 in 1000-year return period event				
from tidal sources and surface water,	90.43% (4.95m AODN)	98.71% (5.43m AODN)	99.83%	(6.05m AODN)		94.23% (5.38m AODN)				
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'										
	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	ım' risk scenario			'Low' risk scenario				
	2.4%			10.4%			38.8%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, water is sho the 'low' risk scenario but this is due to the		·	of the site. Surface w	ater is also shown to	accumula	te within the northern part of the site under				
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset so current condition rating is unknown. The d	_	-		a wall with an actual o	crest level	of between 4.80m and 5.38m AODN. The				
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to for the lifetime of any development.	raise an existing de	fence wall, it is estimated t	o cost in the region o	of £1,550,000 to upgra	ide the 10	00m of defences in order to protect the site				
Flood Warning Area?	Yes										
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Ratin respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	ng Classification d	uring the design flood ev	ent (2115) (The don	ninant hazard rating	on the su	bject site has been highlighted in the				
nazaiu Katiliy	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Moa	erate' Hazard Rating	'Sign	ificant' Hazard Rating		'Extreme' Hazard Rating				
	0.00%		0.00%		43.18%		56.82%				





The site is located in Flood Zones 2 and 3, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.

SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require a Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site.

Floor levels should be raised above the design flood level, including the Environment Agency's recommended additional freeboard requirements where practicable. Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

The Sequential Approach should be applied to the layout of the site by locating the most vulnerable elements in the lowest risk areas. The Sequential Approach should also be applied to the internal layout of buildings, in particular where floor levels cannot be raised.

Flood Hazard should be appraised against the proposed development layout to ensure that users and occupants of the site can achieve safe access and egress.

The EA should be consulted where development is proposed within 16m of a tidal waterbody or tidal defence infrastructure to obtain consent via a Flood Risk Activity Permit (FRAP).





RWB25										
Site Area (I	Ha): 0.593	Ex	cisting Land Use: Brownf	ield	Prop	osed Land Use: Residential				
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Floo	d Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b				
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.0 %		0.0%	1	7.3%	~5.0% *refer to text below				
Development lifetime	100 years									
Exception Test required?	modelling study does not take into account further analysis is recommended to determine the vulnerable uses should not be permitted.	nt the recently comp mine the true extent within the Functiona ater-compatible' sho	leted defences. These defe of the functional floodplain al Floodplain (Flood Zone 3 ould be designed and const	ences would likely reduces would likely reduced onsite. Any development whice	uce the extent of flooding d nent classified as 'Less Vuli h is classified as 'essential	uring a 1 in 30 year return period event, and nerable', 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly infrastructure' will be subject to the Exception n times of flood; result in no net loss of floodplain				
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	e: None.								
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Limehouse Reach) is	River Medway (Limehouse Reach) is located along the northern border of the site.								
Geology	edrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation - Chalk uperficial deposits: Alluvium - Clay, Silt, Sand and Peat									
	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from tidal sources during the defenced scenario for key return period events. Maximum flood level on site shown in brackets.									
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year return period event - 2070 1 ii		1 in 200-year retu	ırn period event - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event				
from tidal sources and surface water,	3.10% (5.02m AODN)	97.78% (5.45m AODN) 99.58% (6.08m AODN)		95.98% (5.40m AODN)						
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'									
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario			'Low' risk scenario				
	0.0%			0.0%		17.3%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under the 'high' and 'medium' risk scenar	io, the entire site is s	shown to remain dry. Unde	the 'low' risk scenario	o, there are two localised a	reas onsite shown to flood from surface water.				
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset so condition rating is unknown. The design s	_	-	red high ground and a	n embankment with an act	ual crest level of 5.87m AODN. The current				
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,152/m to the lifetime of any development.	raise an existing en	nbankment, it is estimated	to cost in the region of	f £425,000 to upgrade the	350m of defences in order to protect the site for				
Flood Warning Area?	Yes									
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2115) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)									
Tiuzui a Italing	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	lerate' Hazard Rating	'Signifi	icant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating				
	1.83%		4.80%		53.27%	40.10%				





The site is located in Flood Zones 3, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.

SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require a Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site.

Floor levels should be raised above the design flood level, including the Environment Agency's recommended additional freeboard requirements where practicable. Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

The Sequential Approach should be applied to the layout of the site by locating the most vulnerable elements in the lowest risk areas. The Sequential Approach should also be applied to the internal layout of buildings, in particular where floor levels cannot be raised.

Flood Hazard should be appraised against the proposed development layout to ensure that users and occupants of the site can achieve safe access and egress.

The EA should be consulted where development is proposed within 16m of a tidal waterbody or tidal defence infrastructure to obtain consent via a Flood Risk Activity Permit (FRAP).





GN3											
Site Area (I	На): 1.235	Existing Land Use: Brown	field	Propos	sed Land Use: Residential						
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Flood Zone 2	Flood Zone 3		Flood Zone 3b						
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	22.4 %	15.6%	62.0%		~30.0% *refer to text below						
Development lifetime	100 years										
Exception Test required?	modelling study does not take into account further analysis is recommended to determine the vulnerable uses should not be permitted.	•	fences would likely reduce the extent n onsite. Any development classified 3b). Development which is classified	of flooding dur as 'Less Vulne as 'essential in	ing a 1 in 30 year return period event, and rable', 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly						
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	lents within the site: None. lents within close proximity of the site: None.									
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Gillingham Reach) is	River Medway (Gillingham Reach) is located approximately 80m north of the site.									
Geology	edrock: Thanet Formation - Sand, Silt and Clay uperficial deposits: Alluvium - Clay, Silt, Sand and Peat										
	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from tidal sources during the defenced scenario for key return period events. Maximum flood level on site shown in brackets.										
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year return period event - 2070	1 in 200-year return period ever	nt - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event						
from tidal sources and surface water,	62.84% (5.04m AODN)	75.30% (5.42m AODN)	99.08% (6.06m AODN)		75.30% (5.37m AODN)						
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'										
EA	'High' risk scenario	'Мес	ium' risk scenario	'Low' risk scenario							
	8.7%		10.1%		41.1%						
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, surface wa	ter is shown to accumulate onsite.									
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset sunknown. The design standard of protection	shows the existing defences consist of engine on is 1 in 200 years.	ered high ground with an effective cre	est level of3.63i	m AODN. The current condition rating is						
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,152/m to the lifetime of any development.	raise an existing embankment, it is estimated	I to cost in the region of £600,000 to ι	upgrade the 50	Om of defences in order to protect the site for						
Flood Warning Area?	Yes										
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rational respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	ng Classification during the design flood e	vent (2115) (The dominant hazard i	rating on the s	subject site has been highlighted in the						
	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Moderate' Hazard Rating	'Significant' Hazard I	Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating						
	5.49%	9.75%	32.25%		50.82%						





The site is located in Flood Zones 2 and 3, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.

SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require a Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site.

Floor levels should be raised above the design flood level, including the Environment Agency's recommended additional freeboard requirements where practicable. Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

The Sequential Approach should be applied to the layout of the site by locating the most vulnerable elements in the lowest risk areas. The Sequential Approach should also be applied to the internal layout of buildings, in particular where floor levels cannot be raised.

Flood Hazard should be appraised against the proposed development layout to ensure that users and occupants of the site can achieve safe access and egress.





HHH22 & HHH31								
Site Area (H	a): 170.876	Ex	cisting Land Use: Greenf	ield	Pro	posed Land Use: Residential		
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood	Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b		
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	94.8 %		1.4%	3	.8%	0.0%		
Development lifetime	100 years							
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulnerate	ble' classification will l	be subject to the Exception	n Test				
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	e: EA Recorded Flood	d datasets shows the surro	ounding area was affect	ed from the sea in 1953	due to waves overtopping the defences.		
Watercourses/Rivers	The Hoo Flats are located approximately	1,190m south of the	site.					
Geology	Bedrock: London Clay Formation - Clay a Superficial deposits: Head - Clay, Silt, Sa		r Terrace Deposits, 2 - Sar	nd and Gravel, Alluvium	ı - Clay, Silt, Sand and Pe	eat		
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	ooding from tidal so	ources during the defence	ed scenario for key re	turn period events. Max	ximum flood level on site shown in brackets.		
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year retu	ırn period event - 2070	1 in 200-year retur	n period event - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event		
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0	0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0.	00m AODN)	0.00% (0.00m AODN)		
based off mapping available from the	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'							
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	ım' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario		
	2.6%			1.1%		1.9%		
Description of Surface Water Flow	Under all modelled scenarios, water is sh	nown to flow along pa	arts of the site, however, th	is is due to the presenc	e of a drainage ditches.	There are also a few localised areas shown to be		
Paths	at risk of surface water flooding.							
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset standard of protection is 1 in 1000 years.		efences consist of an emba	ankment with an effectiv	ve crest level of 5.05m A	ODN, with a condition rating of 3. The design		
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs		o raise an existing em	nbankment, it is estimated	to cost in the region of	£4,400,000 to upgrade a	pproximately 3,800m of defences in order to		
Flood Warning Area?	Yes							
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rati respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	_	uring the design flood ev	rent (2115) (The domir	nant hazard rating on th	ne subject site has been highlighted in the		
Tidzūra rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	ant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating		
	0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	0.00%		
Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	The site is located in Flood Zones 2 and 3, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment. SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require a Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site. Floor levels should be raised above the design flood level, including the Environment Agency's recommended additional freeboard requirements where practicable. Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion. The Sequential Approach should be applied to the layout of the site by locating the most vulnerable elements in the lowest risk areas. The Sequential Approach should also be applied to the internal layout of buildings, in particular where floor levels cannot be raised. Flood Hazard should be appraised against the proposed development layout to ensure that users and occupants of the site can achieve safe access and egress.							





SR53											
Site Area (H	la): 99.005	E	kisting Land Use: Brownfie	eld	Propos	sed Land Use: Residential					
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Flo	od Zone 2	Flood	d Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b					
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	33.3 %		36.2%	3	0.5%	~15.0% *refer to text below					
Development lifetime	100 years										
Exception Test required?	modelling study does not take into accou further analysis is recommended to deter Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted	nt the recently comp mine the true extent within the Functiona ater-compatible' sho	leted defences. These defer of the functional floodplain of al Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b ould be designed and constru	nces would likely redu onsite. Any developm). Development which	ice the extent of flooding dur ent classified as 'Less Vulne n is classified as 'essential in	e to be within the functional floodplain, the ing a 1 in 30 year return period event, and rable', 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly frastructure' will be subject to the Exception times of flood; result in no net loss of floodplain					
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	ents within the site: None. ents within close proximity of the site: None.									
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway is along the eastern, s	River Medway is along the eastern, southern and western border of the site.									
Geology	edrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation, Seaford Chalk Formation and Newhaven Chalk Formation (undifferentiated) - Chalk, Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation - Chalk uperficial deposits: Head - Clay And Silt, River Terrace Deposits, 3 - Sand and Gravel, Alluvium - Clay, Silt, Sand and Peat, Beach and Tidal Flat Deposits (undifferentiated) - Clay, Silt and Sand										
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	ooding from tidal s	ources during the defence	d scenario for key re	eturn period events. Maximo	um flood level on site shown in brackets.					
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year ret	urn period event - 2070	1 in 200-year retui	rn period event - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event					
from tidal sources and surface water,	22.84% (5.06m AODN)	56.00%	(5.46m AODN)	95.62% (6	S.11m AODN)	50.66% (5.42m AODN)					
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage	e of site at risk of f	looding from surface water	based on the EA's	'Risk of Flooding from Sui	face Water Map'					
	'High' risk scenario		'Mediur	n' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario					
	5.1%			5.7%		5.3%					
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, there are n	umerous localised a	reas of surface water floodir	ng onsite.							
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset so condition rating is unknown. The design s	· ·			with an actual crest level of	between 4.70m and 5.87m AODN. The current					
High-Level Indication of Defence		_	fence wall, it is estimated to	cost in the region of	£5,850,000 to upgrade appro	eximately 3800m of defences in order to protect					
Costs	the site for the lifetime of any developmen	nt.									
Flood Warning Area?	Yes										
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rati respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	=	uring the design flood eve	nt (2115) (The domi	nant hazard rating on the s	ubject site has been highlighted in the					
- America Controlly	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Мос	lerate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating					
	8.38%		6.15%		61.52%	21.46%					





The site is located in Flood Zones 2 and 3, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.

SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require a Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site.

Floor levels should be raised above the design flood level, including the Environment Agency's recommended additional freeboard requirements where practicable. Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

The Sequential Approach should be applied to the layout of the site by locating the most vulnerable elements in the lowest risk areas. The Sequential Approach should also be applied to the internal layout of buildings, in particular where floor levels cannot be raised.

Flood Hazard should be appraised against the proposed development layout to ensure that users and occupants of the site can achieve safe access and egress.

The EA should be consulted where development is proposed within 16m of a tidal waterbody or tidal defence infrastructure to obtain consent via a Flood Risk Activity Permit (FRAP).



CCB35									
Site Area (На): 2.700	Existin	g Land Use: Mostly Gre	enfield	Pro	posed Land Use: Non-Resi	dential		
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Flood	Zone 2	Flood	l Zone 3	Flood Z	one 3b		
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	60.8 %	11	1.3%	27	7.9%	0.0)%		
Development lifetime	75 years								
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulneral	ble' classification will be	e subject to the Exception	n Test.					
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None.	a. Nana							
Watercourses/Rivers	·	ents within close proximity of the site: None. River Medway (Chatham Reach) is located approximately 245m west of the site.							
Geology	Bedrock: Seaford Chalk Formation - Cha Superficial deposits: River Terrace Depo	alk							
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	ooding from tidal sou	rces during the defenc	ed scenario for key re	eturn period events.	Maximum flood level on site sh	own in brackets.		
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year retur	n period event - 2070	1 in 200-year retur	n period event - 2115	1 in 1000-year re	turn period event		
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0.	00m AODN)	48.88% (6	.09m AODN)	0.00% (0.0	0m AODN)		
based off mapping available from the	from the Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'								
EA	'High' risk scenario	'Mediu	um' risk scenario		'Low' risk scena	ario			
	1.1%			1.0%		2.6%			
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, there are a	a few localised areas o	f surface water flooding.		<u> </u>				
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset	shows the existing def	ences consist of a wall w	ith an actual crest level	of between 5.60m ar	d 5.66m AODN. The current of	condition rating is		
(inc. SoP):	unknown. The design standard of protect	tion is 1 in 1000 years.							
High-Level Indication of Defence	Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to	-	ence wall, it is estimated t	o cost in the region of £	£850,000 to upgrade a	approximately 550m of defend	es in order to protect		
Costs	the site for the lifetime of any developme	ent.							
Flood Warning Area?	Yes								
	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rate respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	_	ring the design flood ev	rent (2115) (The domin	nant hazard rating o	n the subject site has been l	nighlighted in the		
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating		rate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme'	Hazard Rating		
	2.29%		4.55%	<u> </u>	31.50%		0.58%		
	The site is located in Flood Zones 2 and	3, and therefore will re	quire a detailed Flood Ri	sk Assessment.					
	SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require a								
Paguired Actions / Pagammanded	Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site.								
Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	Floor levels should be raised above the design flood level, including the Environment Agency's recommended additional freeboard requirements where practicable. Flood resistance and								
winganon weasures		resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.							
	The Sequential Approach should be applet the internal levent of buildings, in particular	-	-	vulnerable elements ir	n the lowest risk areas	. The Sequential Approach sh	iould also be applied to		
	the internal layout of buildings, in particul Flood Hazard should be appraised again			hat users and occupan	ts of the site can achi	eve safe access and earess			
	1 1000 Hazaru Shoulu be appraised again	ist the broposed develo	princin layout to ensure t	inai users anu uccupan	is or the site can doll	eve sale access allu egless.			





SMI6											
Site Area (H	Ha): 57.714	E	xisting Land Use: Brownf	ield	Propose	d Land Use: Non-Residential					
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Flo	od Zone 2	Flood Zo	ne 3	Flood Zone 3b					
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	23.6%		9.5%	66.9%	6	~10.0% *refer to text below					
Development lifetime	75 years										
Exception Test required?	modelling study does not take into accour further analysis is recommended to detern Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted	nt the recently comp mine the true extent within the Functiona ater-compatible' sho	oleted defences. These defe of the functional floodplain al Floodplain (Flood Zone 3 ould be designed and const	ences would likely reduce to onsite. Any development of b). Development which is	he extent of flooding du classified as 'Less Vulne classified as 'essential ir	e to be within the functional floodplain, the ring a 1 in 30 year return period event, and erable', 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly infrastructure' will be subject to the Exception times of flood; result in no net loss of floodplain					
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	: None.									
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Gillingham Reach) is	River Medway (Gillingham Reach) is located along the northeastern border of the site.									
Geology	sedrock: Thanet Formation - Sand, Silt and Clay, Seaford Chalk Formation - Chalk Superficial deposits: Alluvium - Clay, Silt, Sand and Peat										
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	oding from tidal s	ources during the defence	ed scenario for key retur	n period events. Maxim	um flood level on site shown in brackets.					
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year ret	urn period event - 2070	1 in 200-year return pe	eriod event - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event					
from tidal sources and surface water,	46.15% (5.02m AODN)	68.93% (5.32m AODN)		82.54% (6.06)	m AODN)	66.51% (5.30m AODN)					
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'										
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	ım' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario					
	9.6%			3.8%		6.8%					
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, there are n	umerous localised a	areas of surface water flood	ing onsite.							
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset s design standard of protection is 1 in 1000	_	efences consist of a wall w	ith an effective crest level o	of between 4.60m AODN	N. The current condition rating is unknown. The					
High-Level Indication of Defence	Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to	raise an existing de	efence wall, it is estimated t	o cost in the region of £2,4	00,000 to upgrade appr	oximately 1550m of defences in order to protect					
Costs	the site for the lifetime of any developmen	nt.									
Flood Warning Area?	Yes										
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rational respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	ng Classification o	luring the design flood ev	ent (2115) (The dominan	t hazard rating on the	subject site has been highlighted in the					
παεαια παιπη	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Мос	derate' Hazard Rating	'Significant	' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating					
	2.10%		1.07%	2	5.16%	51.19%					





The site is located in Flood Zones 2 and 3, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.

SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require a Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site.

Floor levels should be raised above the design flood level, including the Environment Agency's recommended additional freeboard requirements where practicable. Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

The Sequential Approach should be applied to the layout of the site by locating the most vulnerable elements in the lowest risk areas. The Sequential Approach should also be applied to the internal layout of buildings, in particular where floor levels cannot be raised.

Flood Hazard should be appraised against the proposed development layout to ensure that users and occupants of the site can achieve safe access and egress.

The EA should be consulted where development is proposed within 16m of a tidal waterbody or tidal defence infrastructure to obtain consent via a Flood Risk Activity Permit (FRAP).





ННН35										
Site Area (Ha): 57.440		Existing Land Use: Greenfield			Proposed Land Use: Non-Residential					
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Flood Zone 2		Flood Zone 3		Flood Zone 3b				
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	85.3%	5.3%		9	.4%	0.0%				
Development lifetime	75 years									
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulnerable' classification will be subject to the Exception Test.									
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site: EA Recorded Flood datasets shows the surrounding area was affected from the sea in 1953 due to waves overtopping the defences.									
Watercourses/Rivers	The Hoo Flats are located approximately 965m south of the site.									
Geology	Bedrock: London Clay Formation - Clay and Silt Superficial deposits: Head - Clay and Silt, River Terrace Deposits, 1 - Clay and Silt, Alluvium - Clay, Silt, Sand and Peat									
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from tidal sources during the defenced scenario for key return period events. Maximum flood level on site shown in brackets.									
	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year return period event - 2070		1 in 200-year return period event - 2115		1 in 1000-year return period event				
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	8.24% (5.41m AODN)		12.08% (6.02m AODN)		7.18% (5.25m AODN)				
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'									
	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario			'Low' risk scenario				
	1.0%			0.4%		0.8%				
Description of Surface Water Flow	Under all modelled scenarios, water is shown to flow along parts of the site, however, this is due to the presence of a drainage ditches. There are also a few localised areas of surface									
Paths	water flooding.									
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset shows the existing defences consist of an embankment and wall with an actual crest level of between 5.12m and 7.10m AODN, and has a condition rating of 3. The design standard of protection is 1 in 1000 years.									
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to raise an existing defence wall, it is estimated to cost in the region of £4,750,000 to upgrade approximately 3100m of defences in order to protect the site for the lifetime of any development.									
Flood Warning Area?	Yes									
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2115) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)									
	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Moderate' Hazard Rating		'Significant' Hazard Rating		'Extreme' Hazard Rating				
	2.65%	2.41%		6.79%		4.55%				
Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	The site is located in Flood Zones 2 and 3, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment. SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require a Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site. Floor levels should be raised above the design flood level, including the Environment Agency's recommended additional freeboard requirements where practicable. Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion. The Sequential Approach should be applied to the layout of the site by locating the most vulnerable elements in the lowest risk areas. The Sequential Approach should also be applied to the internal layout of buildings, in particular where floor levels cannot be raised. Flood Hazard should be appraised against the proposed development layout to ensure that users and occupants of the site can achieve safe access and egress.									





нннз6										
Site Area (Ha): 114.109		Existing Land Use: Brownfield			Proposed Land Use: Non-Residential					
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood	I Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b				
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.1%		10.5%	88	9.4%	~1.0% *refer to text below				
Development lifetime	75 years									
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulnerable' classification will be subject to the Exception Test. *Although the NKC modelling shows the site to be within the functional floodplain, the modelling study does not take into account the recently completed defences. These defences would likely reduce the extent of flooding during a 1 in 30 year return period event, and further analysis is recommended to determine the true extent of the functional floodplain onsite. Any development classified as 'Less Vulnerable', 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b). Development which is classified as 'essential infrastructure' will be subject to the Exception Test. Development that is classified as 'water-compatible' should be designed and constructed to: remain operational and safe for users in times of flood; result in no net loss of floodplain storage; and not impede water flows and not increase flood risk elsewhere.									
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site: EA Recorded Flood datasets shows the surrounding area was affected from the sea in 1953 due to waves overtopping the defences.									
Watercourses/Rivers	The Hoo Flats and Slede Ooze are located along the southern border of the site.									
Geology	Bedrock: London Clay Formation - Clay and Silt Superficial deposits: River Terrace Deposits, 1 - Clay and Silt, Alluvium - Clay, Silt, Sand and Peat									
	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from tidal sources during the defenced scenario for key return period events. Maximum flood level on site shown in brackets.									
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year return period event - 2070		1 in 200-year retur	n period event - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event				
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.91% (5.03m AODN)	18.29%	5.40m AODN)	85.67% (6	.03m AODN)	18.29% (5.25m AODN)				
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'									
LA	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario			'Low' risk scenario				
	1.0%		0.4%			0.8%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, water is shown to flow along parts of the site, however, this is due to the presence of a drainage ditches. There are also numerous areas of localised surface water flooding.									
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset shows the existing defences consist of an embankment and wall with an actual crest level of between 5.12m and 7.10m AODN, and has a condition rating of 3. The design standard of protection is 1 in 1000 years.									
High-Level Indication of Defence	Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to raise an existing defence wall, it is estimated to cost in the region of £2,450,000 to upgrade approximately 1600m of defences in order to protect									
Costs	the site for the lifetime of any development.									
Flood Warning Area?	Yes									
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2115) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)									
mazara Nating		'Moderate' Hazard Rating				, - , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				
	'Low' Hazard Rating	Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating				





The site is located in Flood Zones 2 and 3, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.

SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require a Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site.

Floor levels should be raised above the design flood level, including the Environment Agency's recommended additional freeboard requirements where practicable. Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

The Sequential Approach should be applied to the layout of the site by locating the most vulnerable elements in the lowest risk areas. The Sequential Approach should also be applied to the internal layout of buildings, in particular where floor levels cannot be raised.

Flood Hazard should be appraised against the proposed development layout to ensure that users and occupants of the site can achieve safe access and egress.

The EA should be consulted where development is proposed within 16m of a tidal waterbody or tidal defence infrastructure to obtain consent via a Flood Risk Activity Permit (FRAP).



A. Appendices

Appendix A.1 - Site Location Map

Appendix A.1 – Site Location Map



















