

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	ope and Summary of Appraisal	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

### A. Appendices

Medway Council Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment



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.

DRAFT herrin

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





herrir

Part of

Medway Council Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment



#### 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:

DRAFT herrir

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

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.

DRAFT herri

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.

#### Medway Council

Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment

Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3a	Zone 3b
<b>Essential Infrastructure</b> – Essential transport infrastructure, strategic utility infrastructure, including electricity generating power stations.	~	~	е	е
<b>High Vulnerability</b> – Emergency services, basement dwellings, caravans and mobile homes intended for permanent residential use.	~	е	×	×
<b>More Vulnerable</b> – 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.	~	<b>~</b>	~	~
Key :	1		1	
✓ Development is appropriate				
× Development should not be permitted				
€ Exception Test required				

DRAFT herrin



*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.



DRAFT herrir

- **'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.

DRAFT

herri

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.

Medway Council Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment

### 3. Site Summary Tables

3.1. Medium Risk Areas





AS2							
Site Area (H	Ha): 0.341	E>	isting Land Use: Brown	field	Pro	posed Land	
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	d Zone 2	Flood	I Zone 3		
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	100.0%	0.0% 0.0%		.0%			
Development lifetime	100 years			•			
Exception Test required?	The Exception Test is not required to be a	applied for any vulne	rability 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 southe	ern border.					
Geology	Bedrock: London Clay Formation - Clay and Silt Superficial deposits: Head - Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel						
	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from tidal sources during the defended scenario for key return period events. Maximum flood						
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	
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.0m AODN)	0.00% (0.0m 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 Wat						
	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario			'L	
	15.2%		4.3%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	During all modelled scenarios, water is sh	nown to accumulate	onsite attributed to topogra	aphic depressions			
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset s standard of protection is 1 in 1000 years	shows the existing d	efences consist of an emb	ankment with an effecti	ve crest level of 5.08m A	ODN, and ha	
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	N/A – The site is predicted to remain unat	ffected from the Rive	r Medway and the sea for	the lifetime of any deve	elopment.		
Flood Warning Area?	N/A						
	Percentage of site in each Hazard R	ating Classification	during the design flood	l event (2115) (The do	minant hazard rating or	the subject	
Hazard Rating	respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)						
-	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating		
	0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		
Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	he site is located is at risk of flooding from surface water. As a result, a FRA, is required to be undertaken. uDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidar loor levels should be raised above the maximum depth of flooding from surface water, including an additional freeboard where practicable. lood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion. he LPA should be consulted prior to the commencement of any works to obtain consent for any development proposed within 8m of any ordinar ills within the RSIDB area, the RSIDB should be consulted to obtain consent.					ble.	



d Use: Residential
Flood Zone 3b
0.0%
l level on site shown in brackets.
in 1000-year return period event
0.00% (0.0m AODN)
ater Map'
'Low' risk scenario
7.0%
nas a condition rating of 3. The design
ct site has been highlighted in the
'Extreme' Hazard Rating
0.00%
e.
watercourse. Where the watercourse



CCB15								
Site Area (	Ha): 0.337	E	kisting Land Use: Brown	ïeld	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'	91.9%		8.1%	0.0%	0.0%			
Development lifetime	100 years							
Exception Test required?	The Exception Test is not required to be	applied for developm	nent classified as 'more vul	nerable'.				
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 is approximately 485	e River Medway is approximately 485m 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 return period events	S. 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 event - 21	15 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 AODN)	7.21% (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 t	Flooding from Surface Water Map'			
	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	um' risk scenario	'Low' risk scenario			
	1.6%		0.0%		99.6%			
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	During the 'high' and 'medium' risk scena surface water flow path.	ario, surface water is	shown to encroach onto th	e northern corner. Under the 'low' risk scer	ario, the entire site is shown to be affected by a			
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset current condition rating is unknown. The	-			tual crest 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.	o raise an existing en	nbankment, it is estimated	to cost in the region of £550,000 to upgrad	e the 450m 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	'Моа	lerate' Hazard Rating	'Significant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating			
	3.34%		9.27%	5.39%	0.00%			
	f							





	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.
	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	The development should meet the requirements of the EA's Flood Risk Standing Advice, which applies for 'less vulnerable' and 'more vulnerable' development should meet the requirements of the EA's Flood Risk Standing Advice, which applies for 'less vulnerable' and 'more vulnerable' development should meet the requirements of the EA's Flood Risk Standing Advice, which applies for 'less vulnerable' and 'more vulnerable' development should meet the requirements of the EA's Flood Risk Standing Advice, which applies for 'less vulnerable' and 'more vulnerable' development should meet the requirements of the EA's Flood Risk Standing Advice, which applies for 'less vulnerable' and 'more vulnerable' development should be advice at the requirement should be advice at the standard be advice at the s
Mitigation Measures	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 Sequentia
	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

ce. All major development will require a

development within Flood Zone 2.

ntial Approach should also be applied to

ess and egress.



HHH24								
Site Area (I	Ha): 3.183	Exist	ting Land Use: Greenf	ield	Proposed Land Use: Residential			
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Flood 2	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							
Exception Test required?	The Exception Test is not required to be	applied for any vulnerat	ility classification.					
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the sit	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 Hoo Flats are located approximately	Hoo Flats are located approximately 1,150m south of the site.						
Geology	Bedrock: London Clay Formation - Clay Superficial deposits: Head - Clay and Sil	edrock: London Clay Formation - Clay and Silt Iperficial deposits: Head - Clay and Silt						
	Percentage of site at risk of fl	looding from tidal sour	ces during the defenc	ed scenario for key return period	events. Maxin	num 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	200-year return period event - 2070 1 in 200-year return period		nt - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event		
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0.0	0m AODN)	0.00% (0.00m AODN)		0.00% (0.00m AODN)		
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentag	ge of site at risk of floo	ding from surface wat	er based on the EA's 'Risk of Floo	oding from Su	urface Water Map'		
LA	'High' risk scenario 'Medium' risk scenario 'Low' risk scenario				'Low' risk scenario			
	6.9%		0.2%			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 access road. Unde	er all modelled	scenarios, water is shown to flow along the		
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):		shows the existing defe		ankment with an effective crest level	of 5.03m AOI	DN, 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 M	ledway and the sea for	the lifetime of any development.				
Flood Warning Area?	N/A							
	Percentage of site in each Hazard I	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	te' Hazard Rating	Significant' Hazard I	Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating		
	0.00%		0.00%	0.00%		0.00%		
Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	be site is at risk of flooding from surface water and greater than 1ha. As a result, a FRA is required to be undertaken. uDS 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 urface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site. loor levels should be raised above the maximum depth of flooding from surface water, including an additional freeboard where practicable. lood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.							





LW10							
Site Area (F	Ha): 0.310	Ex	isting Land Use: Brown	field	Prope	osed Land	
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floc	od Zone 2	Flood	Zone 3		
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	100.0%	0.0%		0.0	0%		
Development lifetime	100 years						
Exception Test required?	The Exception Test is not required to be	applied for any vulne	rability classification.				
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	e: None.					
Watercourses/Rivers	No watercourses/rivers are located withir	n close proximity to th	e site.				
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formatio	n – Chalk					
	Superficial deposits: Head - Clay, Silt, Sa	and and Gravel					
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	ooding from tidal so	ources during the defenc	ed scenario for key ret	urn period events. Maxin	num flood le	
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	vent   1 in 200-year return period event - 2070     0.00% (0.00m AODN)		1 in 200-year return period event - 2115		1 in	
from tidal sources and surface water,	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 Wat						
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario			ʻL	
	7.1%		15.3%		.3%		
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under the 'high' risk scenario, surface wa	ater is shown to accu	nulate within the north of t	he site. Under the 'medi	um' and 'low' risk scenario	os, there is	
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset	shows no existing de	fences nearby.				
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	N/A - There are no defences near to the	site and the site is pr	edicted to remain unaffect	ed from the River Medwa	ay for the lifetime of devel	opment bas	
Flood Warning Area?	No						
	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rati respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	-	uring the design flood ev	vent (2115) (The domina	ant hazard rating on the	subject si	
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	ʻMod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Significa	ant' Hazard Rating		
	0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		
Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	SuDS should be considered to be include Surface Water Management Strategy to I Floor levels should be raised above the r	0.00% 0.00% 0.00% site is at risk of flooding from surface water. As a result, a FRA is required to be undertaken. OS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance face Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site. For levels should be raised above the maximum depth of flooding from surface water, including an additional freeboard where practicable. For levels and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.					



d Use: Residential
Flood Zone 3b
0.0%
l level on site shown in brackets.
in 1000-year return period event
0.00% (0.00m AODN)
ater Map'
'Low' risk scenario
56.7%
s a surface water flow path onsite.
ased on current data.
site has been highlighted in the
'Extreme' Hazard Rating
0.00%
e. All major development will require a

ННН6								
Site Area (H	ła): 30.050	E	xisting Land Use: Greenf	ield	Proposed Land			
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Flood Zone 2		Flood	I Zone 3			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	100.0%		0.0%	0	.0%			
Development lifetime	100 years							
Exception Test required?	The Exception Test is not required to be	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	dents within the site: None. dents within close proximity of the site: None.						
Watercourses/Rivers	There are multiple drainage ditches onsi	nere are multiple drainage ditches onsite. The River Medway (Upnor Reach) is located approximately 920m south 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 flooding from tidal sources during the defenced scenario for key return period events. Maximum flood levents							
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		
from tidal sources and surface water,	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 Wate							
	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario			'Lo		
	13.8%		5.1%					
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under the 'high' risk scenario, surface wa accumulate under all modelled scenarios		mulate within the southeas	tern corner of the site.	Also, due to multiple draina	age ditches		
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset rating is unknown. The design standard	-		nigh ground with an act	ual crest level between 4.6	67m and 5.82		
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	N/A - The site is predicted to remain una	ffected from the Rive	r Medway and the sea for t	he lifetime of developm	nent based on current data	l.		
Flood Warning Area?	N/A							
	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 the	subject sit		
Hazard Rating	Low' Hazard Rating		lerate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating			
	0.00%		0.00%		0.00%			
						I		

		0.0070	0.0078	0.0070				
	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.						
Required Actions / Recommended		Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site.						
Mitigation Measures	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 wa							
		falls within the RSIDB area, the RSIDB should be consulted to obtain consent.						



ed Land Use: Residential
Flood Zone 3b
0.0%
n flood level on site shown in brackets.
1 in 1000-year return period event
0.00% (0.00m AODN)
ace Water Map'
'Low' risk scenario
7.6%
e ditches onsite, surface water is shown to
n and 5.82m AODN. The current condition
bject site has been highlighted in the
'Extreme' Hazard Rating
0.00%
uidance. All major development will require a
dinary watercourse. Where the watercourse



RN23								
Site Area (I	Ha): 2.185	Existi	ng Land Use: Mostly Gro	eenfield	Prop	osed Land		
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Flood Zone 2		Flood Z	one 3			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	100.0%		0.0%	0.09	0.0%			
Development lifetime	100 years	l00 years						
Exception Test required?	The Exception Test is not required to be	e 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	cidents within the site: None. cidents within close proximity of the site: None.						
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway is located approximate	tely 525m north of the	e site.					
Geology	Bedrock: Seaford Chalk Formation – Cha Superficial deposits: Head - Clay and Sil							
	Percentage of site at risk of fl	ooding from tidal so	urces during the defend	ed scenario for key retu	rn period events. Maxi	imum flood le		
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 return p	1 in 200-year return period event - 2115			
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0	).00m AODN)	0.00% (0.00	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 Wate							
	'High' risk scenario	scenario 'Medium' risk scenari		um' risk scenario	cenario			
	5.8%			4.2%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, there are I	ocalised areas of sur	face 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 st	-	-		ankment with an effecti	ve crest leve		
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	N/A - The site is predicted to remain una	ffected from the Rive	Medway and the sea for	the lifetime of developmer	nt based on current data	a.		
Flood Warning Area?	N/A							
	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rat respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2	-	uring the design flood e	vent (2115) (The dominai	nt hazard rating on the	e subject si		
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Significant' Hazard Rating				
	0.00%	0.00% 0.00%						
Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	he 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 surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site. loor levels should be raised above the maximum depth of flooding from surface water, including an additional freeboard where practicable. lood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.							



d Use: Residential
Flood Zone 3b
0.0%
l level on site shown in brackets.
in 1000-year return period event
0.00% (0.00m AODN)
ater Map'
'Low' risk scenario
8.8%
vel of 4.37m and 5.10m AODN, and
site has been highlighted in the
'Extreme' Hazard Rating
0.00%
e. All major development will require a

-

SR4								
Site Area (I	Ha): 6.290	Ex	xisting Land Use: Greenfield	i	Propos	sed Land		
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floc	Flood Zone 2		d Zone 3			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	100.0%		0.0%	0	0.0%			
Development lifetime	100 years	years						
Exception Test required?	The Exception Test is not required to be a	ne 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:	idents within the site: None. idents within close proximity of the site: None.						
Watercourses/Rivers	There is a drainage ditch along the norther	ere is a drainage ditch along the northern border.						
Geology	Bedrock: London Clay Formation - Clay and Silt Superficial deposits: No Superficial deposits							
	Percentage of site at risk of floo	oding from tidal so	urces during the defenced	scenario for key re	eturn period events. Maxim	um flood le		
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		rn period event - 2115	1 in			
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0	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 Wate							
	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario			'Lo		
	8.9%		C	).6%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, water is sho	wn to accumulate i	n the south of the site. There a	are also small areas	s along the northern and wes	stern borde		
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset sh	nows no existing de	fences nearby.					
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	N/A - There are no defences near to the si	N/A - There are no defences near to the site and the site is predicted to remain unaffected from the River Medway and the sea for the lifetime of any o						
Flood Warning Area?	N/A							
	Percentage of site in each Hazard Ratin respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	g Classification d	uring the design flood event	t (2115) (The domii	nant hazard rating on the s	subject sit		
Hazard Rating	Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating			
	0.00%		0.00%		0.00%			



and Use: Residential
Flood Zone 3b
0.0%
od level on site shown in brackets.
1 in 1000-year return period event
0.00% (0.00m AODN)
Water Map'
'Low' risk scenario
15.4%
porders.
any development.
ct site has been highlighted in the
'Extreme' Hazard Rating
0.00%



Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation MeasuresThe 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 possible Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff Floor levels should be raised above the maximum depth of flooding from surface water, including an additional freeboard 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 of falls within the RSIDB area, the RSIDB should be consulted to obtain consent.	from the site. where practicable.
---	--------------------------------------



ce. All major development will require a

watercourse. Where the watercourse



Site Area (F	la): 0.232	Ex	isting Land Use: Brown	field	Proposed Land				
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floc	od Zone 2	Flood Zone 3					
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	100.0%		0.0%	0.0%					
Development lifetime	100 years	ars							
Exception Test required?	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 site	icidents within the site: None. Icidents within close proximity of the site: None.							
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway is located approximat	ely 220m north of the	e site.						
Geology		Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation – Chalk Superficial deposits: Head - Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel							
	Percentage of site at risk of fle	ooding from tidal so	ources during the defenc	ed scenario for key return perio	event - 2115 1 in DN)				
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			
from tidal sources and surface water,	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 Wat								
LA	'High' risk scenario 'Medium' risk scena			um' risk scenario		ʻL			
	20.1%	0.1% 13.6%							
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, surface wa	ater is shown to accu	mulate onsite.		1				
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset AODN. The current condition rating is un	C C			round with an a	actual crest			
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	N/A - The site is predicted to remain una	-	-	-	on current data				
Flood Warning Area?	N/A								
	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rat respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	-	uring the design flood ev	vent (2115) (The dominant hazar	l rating on the	subject sit			
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Significant' Hazard Rating					
	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. 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.								



d Use: Residential
Flood Zone 3b
0.0%
l level on site shown in brackets.
in 1000-year return period event
0.00% (0.00m AODN)
ater Map'
'Low' risk scenario
32.3%
st level of between 4.60m and 5.49m
site has been highlighted in the
'Extreme' Hazard Rating
0.00%
e. All major development will require a



RWB19								
Site Area (H	ła): 1.567	Ex	isting Land Use: Brown	field	Pro	oposed Land		
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floc	d Zone 2	Flood	Zone 3			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	100.0%	0.0%		0.	0.0%			
Development lifetime	100 years							
Exception Test required?	The Exception Test is not required to be a	e 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	cidents within the site: None. cidents within close proximity of the site: None.						
Watercourses/Rivers	River Medway approximately 120m east of	of the site						
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formatior Superficial deposits: Alluvium - Clay, Silt,		d - Clay, Silt, Sand and G	ravel				
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	ooding from tidal so	urces during the defenc	ed scenario for key re	turn period events. Ma	ximum flood le		
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		
from tidal sources and surface water,	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 Wate							
	'High' risk scenario	risk scenario 'Medium' risk scenario			1			
	47.3%		19.9%					
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, surface wa	ter could accumulate	on the majority of the site	9.				
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset s unknown. The design standard of protecti	-		rith an actual crest level	of between 5.77m and	6.40m AODN.		
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	N/A - The site is predicted to remain unaf	fected from the Rive	Medway and the sea for	the lifetime of developm	ent based on current da	ata.		
Flood Warning Area?	N/A							
	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rati respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	-	uring the design flood ev	vent (2115) (The domin	ant hazard rating on t	he subject sit		
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Significant' Hazard Rating				
	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 guidar 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.							



nd Use: Residential
Flood Zone 3b
0.0%
d level on site shown in brackets.
1 in 1000-year return period event
0.00% (0.00m AODN)
Vater Map'
'Low' risk scenario
25.4%
DN. The current condition rating is
site has been highlighted in the
'Extreme' Hazard Rating
0.00%
ce. All major development will require a

REWW3							
Site Area (	Ha): 0.341	E	isting Land Use: Brown	field	Prop	posed Land	
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood Zone 3			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	100.0%		0.0%	0	.0%		
Development lifetime	100 years						
Exception Test required?	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	tely 720m northeast o	of the site.				
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formatio						
	Superficial deposits: Head - Clay, Silt, Sa	and 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. Max	imum flood le	
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year ret	1 in 200-year return period event - 2070 1 in 200-year return p		n period event - 2115	1 in	
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0.00m AODN) 0.00		0.00% (0.	0% (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 Wate						
	'High' risk scenario		'Medi	'Medium' risk scenario		L	
	17.9%	10.8%					
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, there is a	surface water flow pa	th across the site.		<u>_</u>		
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset unknown. The design standard of protec			ith an actual crest leve	of between 5.77m and 5	.79m AODN.	
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	N/A - The site is predicted to remain una	ffected from the Rive	r Medway and the sea for	the lifetime of developn	nent based on current dat	a	
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 respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)						
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Moderate' Hazard Rating		'Significant' Hazard Rating			
	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 guidan 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.						



nd Use: Residential
Flood Zone 3b
0.0%
od level on site shown in brackets.
1 in 1000-year return period event
0.00% (0.00m AODN)
Vater Map'
'Low' risk scenario
21.2%
DN. The current condition rating is
t site has been highlighted in the
'Extreme' Hazard Rating
0.00%
ce. All major development will require a



SNF8							
Site Area (ł	На): 0.264	Ex	isting Land Use: Brownfi	eld	Prop	osed Land	
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floc	d Zone 2	Flood	d Zone 3		
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	96.9%		3.1%		0.0%		
Development lifetime	100 years	· · ·					
Exception Test required?	The Exception Test is not required to be						
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	e: None.					
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Bridge Reach) is loc	ated approximately 1	35m southeast of the site.				
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formatio Superficial deposits: Head - Clay and Sil		nation and Newhaven Cha	lk Formation (undiffere	entiated) – Chalk		
	Percentage of site at risk of fl	ooding from tidal so	urces during the defence	d scenario for key re	eturn period events. Maxi	imum flood le	
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year return period event - 2070 1 in 20		1 in 200-year retur	in 200-year return period event - 2115		
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	2.75% (	2.75% (5.47m AODN) 11.83%		6.10m 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 Wat						
	'High' risk scenario 'Medium'		m' risk scenario		Ĺ		
	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 (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset condition rating is unknown. The design			d natural high ground	with an actual crest level	of between 4	
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 to	cost in the region of	£475,000 to upgrade the 3	800m of defe	
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 si respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)						
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	'Moderate' Hazard Rating		cant' Hazard Rating		
	4.20%		7.04%		1.40%		



d Use: Residential
Flood Zone 3b
0.0%
l level on site shown in brackets.
in 1000-year return period event
2.75% (5.42m AODN)
ater Map'
'Low' risk scenario
0.0%
1 4.05m and 4.10m AODN. The current
fences in order to protect the site for
site has been highlighted in the
'Extreme' Hazard Rating

0.00%



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

ce. All major development will require a

development within Flood Zone 2. ntial Approach should also be applied to

ess and egress.



SNF5							
Site Area (H	la): 0.353	Existi	ng Land Use: Mostly Gre	eenfield	Propo	sed Land	
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Flood Zone 2		Flood Zone 3			
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 a	applied for any vulne	rability classification.				
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site: None.						
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Bridge Reach) is loca	ited approximately 7	90m southeast of the site.				
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation Superficial deposits: No Superficial depos		mation and Newhaven Ch	alk Formation (undifferentiated) – C	halk		
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	oding from tidal so	ources during the defenc	ed scenario for key return period	events. Maxim	um flood le	
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	
from tidal sources and surface water,	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 Wat						
	'High' risk scenario	enario 'Medium'		ım' risk scenario		Ĺ	
	12.0%	8.2%		8.2%			
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, surface wa	ter is shown to accu	mulate onsite.				
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset s condition rating is unknown. The design s				al crest level of	between 4	
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 £475,000 to	upgrade the 40	00m of defe	
Flood Warning Area?	No						
	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rati respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2115) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject s					
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Significant' Hazard Rating			
·	0.00%		0.00%	0.00%			
Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	he site is at risk of flooding from surface water. As a result, a FRA is required to be undertaken. uDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance urface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site. oor levels should be raised above the maximum depth of flooding from surface water, including an additional freeboard where practicable. ood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.					-	



d Use: Residential
Flood Zone 3b
0.0%
l level on site shown in brackets.
in 1000-year return period event
0.00% (0.00m AODN)
ater Map'
'Low' risk scenario
18.5%
1 4.50m and 5.20m AODN. The current
efences in order to protect the site for
site has been highlighted in the
'Extreme' Hazard Rating
0.00%
e. All major development will require a



CCB20							
Site Area (I	Ha): 0.498	E	Existing Land Use: Brownfield Propos		Propos	ed 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	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 is located approximate	ely 620m northwest	of the site.				
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formatior Superficial deposits: Head - Clay, Silt, Sa						
	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.					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	return period event - 2070 1 in 200-year return period event - 2115		t - 2115	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 flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'						
	'High' risk scenario	'Medium' ris		ım' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario	
	0.0%			0.1%	.1%		
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	r the 'low' risk scenario, surface wate	er could accumu	late over a small portion of the northern	
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset s rating is unknown. The design standard o	-		nigh ground with an actual crest level	l of between 4.7	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	raise an existing en	nbankment, it is estimated	to cost in the region of £250,000 to u	pgrade the 200	m 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	'Моа	lerate' Hazard Rating	'Significant' Hazard F	Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating	
	0.93%		1.65%	6.52%		0.00%	





	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.
		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	The development should meet the requirements of the EA's Flood Risk Standing Advice, which applies for 'less vulnerable' and 'more vulnerable' de
Mitigation Measures	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	
		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

ce. All major development will require a

development within Flood Zone 2. ntial Approach should also be applied to

ess and egress.



SNF17							
Site Area (I	Ha): 0.024	E>	kisting Land Use: Brown	ïeld	Propos	sed Land Use: Residential	
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floc	od 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 applied for development classified as 'more vulnerable'.						
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	e: None.					
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Bridge Reach) is loca	ated approximately 2	35m southeast of the site.				
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation Superficial deposits: Head - Clay and Silt		mation and Newhaven Ch	alk Formation (undifferentiated) –	Chalk		
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 brack					Im 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 ev	ent - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event	
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	0.33% (	5.47m AODN)	35.88% (6.10m AOD	N)	0.33% (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'		m' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario	
	3.0%			1.3%		0.0%	
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under the 'high' and 'medium' risk scenar from the 'medium' risk scenario.	io, surface water is s	hown to accumulate withir	a small area in the north of the s	te. Under the 'low	r' risk scenario, the extent does not increase	
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):		-			ual crest level of l	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.	o raise an existing en	nbankment, it is estimated	to cost in the region of £300,000 t	o upgrade the 250	Om of defences in order to protect the site for	
Flood Warning Area?	Yes						
Hanand Dations	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' Hazar	d Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating	
	10.42%		23.00%	0.00%		0.00%	





		1
		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.	
		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	The development should meet the requirements of the EA's Flood Risk Standing Advice, which applies for 'less vulnerable' and 'more vulnerable' development should meet the requirements of the EA's Flood Risk Standing Advice, which applies for 'less vulnerable' and 'more vulnerable' development should meet the requirements of the EA's Flood Risk Standing Advice, which applies for 'less vulnerable' and 'more vulnerable' development should meet the requirements of the EA's Flood Risk Standing Advice, which applies for 'less vulnerable' and 'more vulnerable' development should meet the requirements of the EA's Flood Risk Standing Advice, which applies for 'less vulnerable' and 'more vulnerable' development should be advice at the requirement should be advice at the sho
Mitigation Measures	The Sequential Approach should be applied to the layout of the site by locating the most vulnerable elements in the lowest risk areas. The Sequentia	
		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

ce. All major development will require a

development within Flood Zone 2. ntial Approach should also be applied to

ess and egress





d Use: Residential
Flood Zone 3b
0.0%
l level on site shown in brackets.
in 1000-year return period event
0.00% (0.00m AODN)
ater Map'
'Low' risk scenario
14.8%
ween 4.60m and 5.49m AODN. The
fences in order to protect the site for
site has been highlighted in the
'Extreme' Hazard Rating
0.00%
e. All major development will require a

Medway Council Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment

### 3.2. High Risk Areas





CHR14							
Site Area (H	a): 11.396	Ex	isting Land Use: Brownfi	eld	Prop	Proposed Land	
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floc	od Zone 2	Flood	Zone 3		
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	36.4%		1.6% 6		0%		
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 with modelling study does not take into account the recently completed defences. These defences would likely reduce the extent of flooding during a 1 in further analysis is recommended to determine the true extent of the functional floodplain onsite. Any development classified as 'Less Vulnerable', 'Mo Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b). Development which is classified as 'essential infrastructu Test. Development that is classified as 'water-compatible' should be designed and constructed to: remain operational and safe for users in times of fl 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,					lay and Sil	
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	oding from tidal so	ources during the defence	ed scenario for key ret	urn period events. Maxii	num flood l	
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 return	ear return period event - 2115		
from tidal sources and surface water,	58.74% (4.98m AODN)	61.61% (	5.48m AODN)	64.43% (6.1	64.43% (6.11m 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 Wat						
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario			ʻl	
	2.1%			0.7%			
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	During all modelled scenarios, a small are portion of the site.	ea of localised floodi	ng could occur in the south	west of the site. Under t	he 'low' risk scenario, sur	face water	
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset s 5.21m AODN. The current condition rating	U U		•	<b>U</b>	nces have	
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,152/m to for the lifetime of any development.	raise an existing en	bankment, it is estimated t	o cost in the region of £	1,500,000 to upgrade the	1300m of	
Flood Warning Area?	Yes						
Userand Dation	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rati respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	ng Classification d	uring the design flood eve	ent (2115) (The domina	ant hazard rating on the	subject s	
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Significa	ant' Hazard Rating		
	1.82%		2.01%		8.22%		

#### nd Use: Residential

Flood Zone 3b

~40.0% \*refer to text below

within the functional floodplain, the in 30 year return period event, and 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly cture' will be subject to the Exception

f flood; result in no net loss of floodplain

Silt

d level on site shown in brackets.

in 1000-year return period event

61.61% (5.42m AODN)

Vater Map'

'Low' risk scenario

23.1%

ter could accumulate in the northeast

e an actual crest level between 3.58 -

of defences in order to protect the site

site has been highlighted in the

'Extreme' Hazard Rating

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.
		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 whe
		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
		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
		The EA should be consulted where development is proposed within 16m of a tidal waterbody or tidal defence infrastructure to obtain consent via a F

ce. All major development will require a

where practicable. Flood resistance and

ntial Approach should also be applied to

ess and egress. a Flood Risk Activity Permit (FRAP).


HHH32							
Site Area (I	На): 0.787	Ex	kisting Land Use: Brown	field		Proposed L	and Use: Residential
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	Flood Zone 2		d Zone 3		Flood Zone 3b
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.0%		0.0% 100.0%		0.0%		0.0%
Development lifetime	100 years	) years					
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulneral	ble' classification will	be subject to the Exceptio	n Test.			
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	e: EA Recorded Floo	d datasets shows the site	was affected from the s	ea in 1953 due t	o waves overtopp	ping the defences.
Watercourses/Rivers	The Hoo Flats are located approximately	490m south of the s	ite.				
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 eve	ents. Maximum flo	ood 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 200		n period event -	2115	1 in 1000-year return period event
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	100.00% (5.43m AODN) 100.		100.00% (	100.00% (6.05m AODN)		100.00% (5.26m 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		'Medi	'Medium' 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 effecti	ve crest level of	5.05m AODN, an	d has a condition rating of 3. The design
High-Level Indication of Defence	Based on an average cost of £1,152/m to	o raise an existing en	nbankment, it is estimated	to cost in the region of	£1,400,000 to up	pgrade the 1200n	n of defences in order to protect the site
Costs	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	'Mod	lerate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rat	ing	'Extreme' Hazard Rating
	0.00%		0.00%		1.96%		98.04%
Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	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 particul Flood Hazard should be appraised again			that users and occupar	its of the site can	n achieve safe ac	cess and egress.





HHH12							
Site Area (H	a): 131.268	Existi	ng Land Use: Mostly Gree	nfield	Propose	ed Land	
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floc	od Zone 2	Flood Zone 3			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	98.1%		0.6%	1.3%			
Development lifetime	100 years		I				
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulnerabl modelling study does not take into accoun further analysis is recommended to detern Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted Test. Development that is classified as 'wa storage; and not impede water flows and r	nt the recently comp nine the true extent within the Functiona ater-compatible' sho	eted defences. These defen of the functional floodplain o I Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b) uld be designed and constru	ces would likely reduce the extent of nsite. Any development classified as . Development which is classified as	f flooding durin s 'Less Vulnera s 'essential infr	ng a 1 in able', 'Mo rastructu	
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site:	EA Recorded Floo	d datasets shows the site wa	is affected from the sea in 1953 due	to waves over	rtopping	
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Upnor Reach and Sho	ort Reach) is located	l along the southern border o	of the site.			
Geology	Bedrock: London Clay Formation - Clay and Silt, Lambeth Group - Sand, Silt and Clay Superficial deposits: Head - Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel, River Terrace Deposits, 1 - Clay and Silt						
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	oding from tidal so	ources during the defenced	l scenario for key return period ev	vents. Maximur	m flood l	
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				- 2115	1 ir	
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.10% (5.04m AODN)	0.10% (	5.43m AODN)	0.84% (6.00m 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 Wat						
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario			Ĺ	
	2.1%			0.3%			
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	During all modelled scenarios, there are lo	ocalised areas of su	face water flooding across t	he site attributed to localised depres	sions.		
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset s The current condition rating is unknow. Th	U U		• • •	an effective cre	st level	
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,152/m to for the lifetime of any development.	raise an existing en	bankment, it is estimated to	cost in the region of £3,150,000 to u	upgrade the 27	'00m of	
Flood Warning Area?	Yes						
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Ratir respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	ng Classification d	uring the design flood even	nt (2115) (The dominant hazard ra	ting on the su	ıbject si	
nazaru Naliny	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Significant' Hazard Ra	ating		
	1.14%		0.58%	1.59%	1.59%		
	1					<u>/</u>	

#### nd Use: Residential

Flood Zone 3b

~1.0% \*refer to text below

within the functional floodplain, the in 30 year return period event, and More Vulnerable' and 'Highly ture' will be subject to the Exception f flood; result in no net loss of floodplain

ig the defences.

l level on site shown in brackets.

in 1000-year return period event

0.10% (6.06m AODN)

'ater Map'

'Low' risk scenario

1.4%

el between 4.07m and 6.00m AODN.

of defences in order to protect the site

site has been highlighted in the

'Extreme' Hazard Rating

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.
	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 whe
<b>Required Actions / Recommended</b>	resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.
Mitigation Measures	The Sequential Approach should be applied to the layout of the site by locating the most vulnerable elements in the lowest risk areas. The Sequentia
	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
	The EA should be consulted where development is proposed within 16m of a tidal waterbody or tidal defence infrastructure to obtain consent via a FI

ce. All major development will require a

here practicable. Flood resistance and

tial Approach should also be applied to



SNF41							
Site Area (ł	la): 4.972	Ex	isting Land Use: Brownfi	eld	Propos	sed Land	
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floc	d Zone 2	Flood Zone 3			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	5.2%	1.3%		93.5%			
Development lifetime	100 years						
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulneral modelling study does not take into accou further analysis is recommended to deter Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted Test. Development that is classified as 'w storage; and not impede water flows and	nt the recently compl mine the true extent within the Functiona vater-compatible' sho	eted defences. These defe of the functional floodplain I Floodplain (Flood Zone 3 uld be designed and constr	nces would likely reduce the ex onsite. Any development classi b). Development which is classi	ttent of flooding duri fied as 'Less Vulner fied as 'essential inf	ing a 1 in rable', 'Mc frastructur	
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	e: None.					
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Limehouse Reach) is	s located along the so	outheastern border of the s	ite.			
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formatio Superficial deposits: Head - Clay and Sili			Ik Formation (undifferentiated)	- Chalk, Lewes Nod	dular Chal	
	Percentage of site at risk of fle	ooding from tidal so	urces during the defence	ed scenario for key return per	riod events. Maximu	um flood le	
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year return period event - 2070 1 ir		1 in 200-year return period	event - 2115	1 in	
from tidal sources and surface water,	90.74% (5.06m AODN)	93.09% (	09% (5.48m AODN) 97.28% (6.12m 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 Wat						
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario		0		
	3.8%		2.1%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	During all modelled scenarios, there are	localised areas of sur	face water flooding across	the site attributed to localised of	depressions.		
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset condition rating of 3. The design standard	-			actual crest level o	of 3.75m a	
High-Level Indication of Defence	Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to	o raise an existing de	ence wall, it is estimated to	o cost in the region of £925,000	to upgrade the 600	Om of defe	
Costs	the lifetime of any development.						
Flood Warning Area?	Yes						
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rat respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	-	uring the design flood eve	ent (2115) (The dominant haz	ard rating on the s	subject si	
Hazara Nating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Significant' Hazard Rating			
			2.56%		<u> </u>		

#### nd Use: Residential

Flood Zone 3b

~85.0% \*refer to text below

vithin the functional floodplain, the in 30 year return period event, and More Vulnerable' and 'Highly ture' will be subject to the Exception f flood; result in no net loss of floodplain

alk Formation – Chalk

l level on site shown in brackets.

*in 1000-year return period event* 

92.98% (5.43m AODN)

'ater Map'

'Low' risk scenario

7.7%

and 5.50m AODN, and has a

efences in order to protect the site for

site has been highlighted in the

'Extreme' Hazard Rating

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
	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 when
Required Actions / Recommended	resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.
Mitigation Measures	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
	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
	The EA should be consulted where development is proposed within 16m of a tidal waterbody or tidal defence infrastructure to obtain consent via a F

ce. All major development will require a

where practicable. Flood resistance and

ntial Approach should also be applied to



SNF35							
Site Area (H	ła): 2.649	Ex	isting Land Use: Brownfi	eld	Propo	osed Land	
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floc	d Zone 2	Flood Zo	one 3		
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.0%		0.0%	100.0	%		
Development lifetime	100 years						
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulnerab *Although the NKC modelling shows the s likely reduce the extent of flooding during development classified as 'Less Vulnerab is classified as 'essential infrastructure' w operational and safe for users in times of	site to be within the fi a 1 in 30 year return le', 'More Vulnerable ill be subject to the E	unctional floodplain, the mo period event, and further a ' and 'Highly Vulnerable' us xception Test. Developmen	delling study does not tak analysis is recommended ses should not be permitte nt that is classified as 'wat	ke into account the rece to determine the true ex ed within the Functional ter-compatible' should b	ntly comple xtent of the Floodplain be designed	
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	: None.					
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Bridge Reach) is loca	ated approximately 2	5m southeast of the site.				
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formatior Superficial deposits: Alluvium - Clay, Silt,	-					
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	oding from tidal so	urces during the defence	d scenario for key retur	n period events. Maxin	num flood le	
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	riod event 1 in 200-year return period event - 2070 1 in 200-year return period event - 211				1 in	
from tidal sources and surface water,	99.89% (5.02m AODN)	99.92% (	5.46m AODN)	99.97% (6.09	m 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 Wat						
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario				
	0.0%		0.1%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	During all modelled scenarios, there are l	ocalised areas of su	face water flooding across	the site attributed to local	lised depressions.		
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset s condition rating of 3. The design standard	•			vith an actual crest level	of 3.75m a	
High-Level Indication of Defence	Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to	raise an existing de	ence wall, it is estimated to	cost in the region of £92	5,000 to upgrade the 60	00m of defe	
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)	ng Classification d	iring the design flood eve	ent (2115) (The dominan	t hazard rating on the	subject si	
The second realing	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Significant	t' Hazard Rating		
	1.75%		2.56%	2	24.96%		
	I	I					

#### nd Use: Residential

Flood Zone 3b

~95.0% \*refer to text below

e' use should not be permitted. bleted defences. These defences would ne functional floodplain onsite. Any in (Flood Zone 3b). Development which ed and constructed to: remain lsewhere.

l level on site shown in brackets.

in 1000-year return period event

99.92% (5.42m AODN)

ater Map'

'Low' risk scenario

15.4%

and 5.50m AODN, and has a

efences in order to protect the site for

site has been highlighted in the

'Extreme' Hazard Rating

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.
		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 who
		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
		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

ce. All major development will require a

where practicable. Flood resistance and

ntial Approach should also be applied to



SMI6							
Site Area (H	la): 57.714	Ex	isting Land Use: Brownf	ield	Prop	osed Land	
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1			Flood Zor	ne 3		
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	23.6%			66.9%		~	
Development lifetime	100 years				i		
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulnerab 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 storage; and not impede water flows and	nt the recently compl mine 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	ences would likely reduce th onsite. Any development c b). Development which is c	ne extent of flooding du lassified as 'Less Vuln lassified as 'essential	uring a 1 in 3 nerable', 'Mo infrastructur	
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 (Gillingham Reach) is	located along the no	rtheastern border of the si	te.			
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 lo						
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		1 in 200-year return pe	riod event - 2115	1 in	
from tidal sources and surface water,	46.15% (5.02m AODN)	93% (5.32m AODN) 82.54% (6.06m 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						
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario				
	9.6%		3.8%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, there are n	umerous localised a	eas of surface water onsit	e attributed to localised dep	pressions.		
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset s design standard of protection is 1 in 1000	-	fences consist of a wall w	ith an effective crest level o	f between 4.60m AOE	DN. The curr	
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to the site for the lifetime of any development	-	ence wall, it is estimated t	o cost in the region of £2,40	00,000 to upgrade app	proximately <sup>2</sup>	
Flood Warning Area?	Yes						
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rati respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	ng Classification d	ıring the design flood ev	ent (2115) (The dominant	hazard rating on the	e subject sit	
Hazara Natiliy	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Significant'	Hazard Rating		
	2.10%		1.07%	25	25.16%		

#### nd Use: Residential

Flood Zone 3b

~10.0% \*refer to text below

vithin the functional floodplain, the in 30 year return period event, and More Vulnerable' and 'Highly ture' will be subject to the Exception f flood; result in no net loss of floodplain

*I level on site shown in brackets. in 1000-year return period event* 

66.51% (5.30m AODN)

ater Map'

'Low' risk scenario

6.8%

urrent condition rating is unknown. The

y 1550m of defences in order to protect

site has been highlighted in the

'Extreme' Hazard Rating

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.
		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 whe
	Required Actions / Recommended	resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.
	Mitigation Measures	The Sequential Approach should be applied to the layout of the site by locating the most vulnerable elements in the lowest risk areas. The Sequentia
		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
		The EA should be consulted where development is proposed within 16m of a tidal waterbody or tidal defence infrastructure to obtain consent via a FI

ce. All major development will require a

where practicable. Flood resistance and

ntial Approach should also be applied to



014 0 41		-		"- I-I	~	osed Land l	
Site Area (Ha): 57.714         Flood Zone Classification based on       Flood Zone 1		Ex	isting Land Use: Brownf	Teld			
	Flood Zone 1	Floo	Flood Zone 2		Flood Zone 3		
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	52.8%		1.3%	93	3.5%	~	
Development lifetime	100 years						
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulneral modelling study does not take into accou further analysis is recommended to deter Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted Test. Development that is classified as 'w storage; and not impede water flows and	nt the recently compl mine the true extent within the Functional vater-compatible' sho	eted defences. These defe of the functional floodplain I Floodplain (Flood Zone 3 uld be designed and const	ences would likely redu onsite. Any developme b). Development which	ce the extent of flooding du ent classified as 'Less Vuln i is classified as 'essential i	uring a 1 in 3 herable', 'Moi infrastructure	
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	e: None.					
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway is located along the n	orthern border of the	site.				
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation Superficial deposits: Alluvium - Clay, Silt,		ch and Tidal Flat Deposits	(undifferentiated) - Cla	ay, Silt and Sand		
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	ooding from tidal so	urces during the defence	ed scenario for key re	eturn period events. Maxin	mum flood le	
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		1 in 200-year retur	n period event - 2115	1 in	
from tidal sources and surface water,	5.40% (5.10m AODN)	21.83% (5.48m AODN) 60			.12m 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 Wate						
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario		"1		
	5.6%		6.1%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, surface was shown to accumulate within the centre of		nulate in the northern corr	ner of the site. Under th	e 'medium' and 'low' scena	arios, there is	
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset 5.49m AODN. The current condition ratin					with an actua	
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 del	fence wall, it is estimated t	o cost in the region of $f$	2400,000 to upgrade the 25	50m of defei	
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 domin	nant hazard rating on the	subject sit	
Hazard Rating	flow Uppord Dation	(Mod	'Moderate' Hazard Rating		'Significant' Hazard Rating		
	Low' Hazard Rating	WOU		Signino			

#### nd Use: Residential

Flood Zone 3b

~10.0% \*refer to text below

vithin the functional floodplain, the n 30 year return period event, and More Vulnerable' and 'Highly ture' will be subject to the Exception flood; result in no net loss of floodplain

l level on site shown in brackets. in 1000-year return period event

21.83% (5.42m AODN)

ater Map'

'Low' risk scenario

4.8%

e is a localised area of surface water

tual crest level between 4.14m and

fences in order to protect the site for

#### site has been highlighted in the

'Extreme' Hazard Rating

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
	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 whether the state of
Required Actions / Recommended	resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.
Mitigation Measures	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
	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 acces
	The EA should be consulted where development is proposed within 16m of a tidal waterbody or tidal defence infrastructure to obtain consent via a f

ce. All major development will require a

where practicable. Flood resistance and

ntial Approach should also be applied to



AS28							
Site Area (Ha	a): 57.714	E	xisting Land Use: Greenfi	eld	Propo	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'	62.2%		6.5%	3	1.3%	0.0%	
Development lifetime	100 years				· ·		
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulneral	ole' classification will	be subject to the Exceptior	i Test.			
Flood History		nts 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. nts 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 defen					
Watercourses/Rivers	The coastline is located approximately 2	pastline is located approximately 235m east of the site.					
Geology		drock: London Clay Formation - Clay and Silt perficial 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 br						
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	rn period event - 2115	1 in 1000-year return perio	
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.0% (0.00m AODN)	0.00% (	0.00% (0.00m AODN) 12.07% (3.50		3.50m AODN)	0.00% (0.00m AOD	
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	'High' risk scenario 'Medium'		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 corr	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	th an effective crest le	evel of 5.70m AODN, and ha	as a condition rating of 3. The des	
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	£625,000 to upgrade the 40	00m of defences in order to protec	
Flood Warning Area?	Yes						
Harard Pating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2115) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlight respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)					subject site has been highlight	
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Moa	lerate' Hazard Rating	'Signifi	icant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard R	
	3.46%		4.07%		5.11%	0.00%	



fences.

brackets.

eriod event

DN)

lesign standard of

tect the site for

hted in the

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. 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 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 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

ce. All major development will require a where practicable. Flood resistance and ntial Approach should also be applied to



CCB27								
Site Area (	Ha): 0.062	Existing Land Use: Bro	wnfield	Propo	osed Land Use: Residential			
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Flood Zone 2	Flood Z	Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.0%	0.0%	100.	.0%	0.0%			
Development lifetime	100 years	l0 years						
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulnera	ble' classification will be subject to the Exce	otion 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		drock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation - Chalk perficial deposits: Head - Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel						
	Percentage of site at risk of fl	looding from tidal sources during the def	enced scenario for key retu	urn period events. Maxin	num flood level on site shown in brackets.			
Percentage of site at risk of flooding om tidal sources and surface water,	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			
	98.18% (4.48m AODN)	100.00% (5.47m AODN)	100.00% (6.1	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	ίΜ.	edium' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario			
	76.1%		20.5%		3.4%			
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under the 'high' risk scenario, surface wa	ater is shown to accumulate on the vast maj	prity of the site. Under the 'm	nedium' and 'low' risk scer	k scenario, the surface water extent is shown to			
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):			ral high ground with an actua	al crest level of 4.75m AC	DDN. The current condition rating is unknown.			
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,152/m to raise an existing embankment, it is estimated to cost in the region of £350,000 to upgrade the 300m of defences in order to protect the site for							
Flood Warning Area?	Yes	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	'Moderate' Hazard Rating	'Significal	nt' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating			
	0.00%	0.00%		63.90%	36.10%			
Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	<ul> <li>The site is located in Flood Zones 2 and 3, and at risk of surface water flooding. Therefore, the site will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.</li> <li>SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site.</li> <li>Floor levels should be raised above the design flood level, including the Environment Agency's recommended additional freeboard requirements where practive resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.</li> <li>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 be applied to the layout of be raised.</li> </ul>							



GN6								
Site Area (ł	Ha): 3.860	Ex	isting Land Use: Brownfie	ld	Proj	oosed Land		
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Flood Zone 2		Flood	Flood Zone 3			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	30.9%	14.4%			4.7%			
Development lifetime	100 years							
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulnerab 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 storage; and not impede water flows and	nt the recently comp mine the true extent within the Functiona ater-compatible' sho	eted defences. These defen of the functional floodplain o I Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b) uld be designed and constru	ces would likely redu nsite. Any developme ). Development which	ce the extent of flooding o ent classified as 'Less Vul n is classified as 'essential	during a 1 in nerable', 'M i infrastructu		
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	: None.						
Watercourses/Rivers	The 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 flooding from tidal sources during the defenced scenario for key return period events. Maximum flood							
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			n period event - 2115	1 ir		
from tidal sources and surface water,	47.35% (5.03m AODN)	68.98% (5.43m AODN) 88.54% (6.05m AODN)						
based off mapping available from the	Percentage	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface W						
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Mediun	n' risk scenario				
	9.3%			4.8%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, surface wa	ter is shown to accu	mulate onsite.					
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset shows the existing defences consist of a wall with an actual crest level of 5.38m AODN. The current conditi standard of protection is 1 in 200 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 £625,000 to upgrade the 400m of defence 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)	-	uring the design flood even	nt (2115) (The domii	nant hazard rating on th	e subject s		
	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating			
	1.78%		9.30%		71.39%			



#### nd Use: Residential

Flood Zone 3b

~15.0% \*refer to text below

within the functional floodplain, the in 30 year return period event, and 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly cture' will be subject to the Exception of flood; result in no net loss of floodplain

#### l level on site shown in brackets.

in 1000-year return period event

62.61% (5.38m AODN)

/ater Map'

'Low' risk scenario

15.5%

lition rating is unknown. The design

efences in order to protect the site for

#### site has been highlighted in the

'Extreme' Hazard Rating

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.
	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 when
Required Actions / Recommended	resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.
Mitigation Measures	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
	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
	The EA should be consulted where development is proposed within 16m of a tidal waterbody or tidal defence infrastructure to obtain consent via a F

ce. All major development will require a

where practicable. Flood resistance and

ntial Approach should also be applied to



SR49						
Site Area (H	ła): 0.235	Ex	isting Land Use: Brownfie	ld	Prop	osed Land
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floc	d Zone 2	Flood	Flood Zone 3	
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	44.7%		6.6%	38.	7%	
Development lifetime	100 years					
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulneral	ole' classification will	be subject to the Exception	Test.		
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	e: None.				
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Upnor Reach) is loca	ated approximately 12	2m southeast of the site.			
Geology	Bedrock: Lambeth Group - Sand, Silt and Superficial deposits: No Superficial depo	•				
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	ooding from tidal so	urces during the defence	d scenario for key ret	urn period events. Maxii	num flood le
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 return	period event - 2115	1 in
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	46.77% (	5.45m AODN)	68.00% (6.0	)8m AODN)	
based off mapping available from the	Percentag	e of site at risk of fl	ooding from surface water	r based on the EA's 'F	Risk of Flooding from S	urface Wat
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Mediur	n' risk scenario		'L
	17.4%		9.0%			
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, water is sh	nown to accumulate a	long the southeastern borde	er of the site.		
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset condition rating is unknown. The design	-		gh ground and a wall w	ith an actual crest level o	f between 5
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 to	cost in the region of £2	250,000 to upgrade the 1	50m of defe
Flood Warning Area?	Yes					
Hannad Dating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rat respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	-	uring the design flood eve	nt (2115) (The domina	ant hazard rating on the	subject si
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Significa	nt' Hazard Rating	
	10.72%		28.26%		30.56%	



d Use: Residential
Flood Zone 3b
0.0%
l level on site shown in brackets.
in 1000-year return period event
46.77% (5.40m AODN)
ater Map'
'Low' risk scenario
11.0%
1 5.39m and 6.24m AODN. The current
fences in order to protect the site for
site has been highlighted in the
'Extreme' Hazard Rating
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.
	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	Floor levels should be raised above the design flood level, including the Environment Agency's recommended additional freeboard requirements whe
Mitigation Measures	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 Sequentia
	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
	The EA should be consulted where development is proposed within 16m of a tidal waterbody or tidal defence infrastructure to obtain consent via a Fl

e. All major development will require a

here practicable. Flood resistance and

tial Approach should also be applied to



SNF15								
Site Area (ł	ła): 2.368	Ex	isting Land Use: Brownfi	əld	Propose	ed Land		
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Flood Zone 2		Flood Zone 3				
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	37.3%	7.0% 55.7%		55.7%				
Development lifetime	100 years							
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulnerable modelling study does not take into account further analysis is recommended to determ Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted v Test. Development that is classified as 'wa storage; and not impede water flows and n	t the recently comp nine the true extent vithin the Functiona ter-compatible' sho	eted defences. These defer of the functional floodplain o I Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b uld be designed and constr	nces would likely reduce the exten onsite. Any development classified ). Development which is classified	nt of flooding durir d as 'Less Vulnera d as 'essential infr	ng a 1 in able', 'Mo rastructu		
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site:	None.						
Watercourses/Rivers	The 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				halk				
	Percentage of site at risk of floo	oding from tidal so	ources during the defence	d scenario for key return period	l events. Maximul	m flood l		
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	eturn period event 1 in 200-year return period event - 2070 1 in 200-year return period event - 2115						
from tidal sources and surface water,	53.52% (5.00m AODN)	60.36% (5.47m AODN) 65.67% (6.10m 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 Wat							
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario			ʻL		
	27.7%			10.5%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, surface wate	er is shown to accu	mulate across the southern	portion of the site.				
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset sh condition rating is unknown. The design st	-			al crest level of b	etween 4		
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 to	cost in the region of £1,125,000	to upgrade the 70	0m of de		
Flood Warning Area?	Yes							
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Ratin respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	g Classification d	uring the design flood eve	ent (2115) (The dominant hazard	l rating on the su	ıbject si		
	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Significant' Hazard	Rating			
	1.85%		3.54%	20.46%				

#### nd Use: Residential

Flood Zone 3b

~40.0% \*refer to text below

vithin the functional floodplain, the in 30 year return period event, and More Vulnerable' and 'Highly ture' will be subject to the Exception f flood; result in no net loss of floodplain

l level on site shown in brackets. in 1000-year return period event

60.36% (5.42m AODN)

'ater Map'

'Low' risk scenario

11.4%

4.50m and 5.20m AODN. The current

defences in order to protect the site for

site has been highlighted in the

'Extreme' Hazard Rating

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.	
	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	Floor levels should be raised above the design flood level, including the Environment Agency's recommended additional freeboard requirements who
Mitigation Measures	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
		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

ce. All major development will require a

where practicable. Flood resistance and

ntial Approach should also be applied to



Site Area (								
	На): 0.059	Ex	isting Land Use: Brownfi	eld	Propos	sed Land		
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floc	od Zone 2	Flood Zone 3				
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.0%	0.0% 100.0%		100.0%		-		
Development lifetime	100 years		·					
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulnerable modelling study does not take into account further analysis is recommended to detern Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted of Test. Development that is classified as 'was storage; and not impede water flows and n	nt 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 3I uld be designed and consti	nces would likely reduce the extent onsite. Any development classified b). Development which is classified	t of flooding duri as 'Less Vulner as 'essential inf	ing a 1 in : rable', 'Mo frastructur		
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site:	: None.						
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Bridge Reach and Lin	nehouse Reach) is l	ocated approximately 235n	n 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	oding from tidal so	ources during the defence	ed scenario for key return period	events. Maximu	ım flood le		
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	in 200-year return period event 1 in 200-year return period event - 2070 1 in 200-year return period event - 2115						
from tidal sources and surface water,	100.00% (5.00m AODN)	100.00% (5.00m AODN) 100.00% (5.47m AODN) 100.00% (6.10m 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 Wate							
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario					
	0.0%			0.0%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, the entire s	ite is shown to rema	in dry.					
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset s condition rating is unknown. The design st				al crest level of l	between 4		
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 to	ο cost in the region of £400,000 to ι	upgrade the 250	)m of defe		
	Yes							
Flood Warning Area?	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2115) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject si							
	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 dominant hazard	rating on the s	ubject sit		
Flood Warning Area? Hazard Rating		-	uring the design flood even erate' Hazard Rating	ent (2115) (The dominant hazard 'Significant' Hazard	_	ubject sit		

#### nd Use: Residential

Flood Zone 3b

~40.0% \*refer to text below

vithin the functional floodplain, the in 30 year return period event, and More Vulnerable' and 'Highly ture' will be subject to the Exception f flood; result in no net loss of floodplain

*I level on site shown in brackets. in 1000-year return period event* 

100.00% (5.42m AODN)

ater Map'

'Low' risk scenario

0.0%

4.50m and 5.20m AODN. The current

efences in order to protect the site for

site has been highlighted in the

'Extreme' Hazard Rating

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.
		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	Floor levels should be raised above the design flood level, including the Environment Agency's recommended additional freeboard requirements who
	Mitigation Measures	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
		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

ce. All major development will require a

where practicable. Flood resistance and

ntial Approach should also be applied to



SNF32							
Site Area (	На): 0.025	Ex	isting Land Use: Brown	ield	Propose	ed Land Use: Residential	
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	Flood Zone 2			Flood Zone 3b	
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	66.5%	(	0.0%			0.0%	
Development lifetime	100 years	•					
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulneral	ble' classification will b	pe 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 (Limehouse Reach) i	is located approximate	ely 390m southeast of the	site.			
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formatio Superficial deposits: Head - Clay and Sil		nation and Newhaven Ch	alk Formation (undifferentiated) - Cha	lk		
	Percentage of site at risk of fl	looding from tidal so	urces during the defenc	ed scenario for key return period e	vents. Maximun	n 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 period event - 211		- 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% (6.12m AODN)		40.64% (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	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' 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	te in the northern portion o	of the site. Under the 'medium' and 'lo	w' risk scenario	, the surface water extent is shown to	
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset condition rating is 4. The design standard	-		nigh ground and a wall with an actual	crest level of be	etween 4.08m and 4.49m AODN, and the	
High-Level Indication of Defence	Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to	o raise an existing def	ence wall, it is estimated t	o cost in the region of £250,000 to up	grade the 150m	n 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)						
The Lord Teating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mode	erate' Hazard Rating	'Significant' Hazard R	ating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating	
	21.52%		67.92%	10.56%		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 or resilience measures should be considered The Sequential Approach should be app the internal layout of buildings, in particu	d in Flood Zones 3, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment. considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. A anagement Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site. Id be raised above the design flood level, including the Environment Agency's recommended additional freeboard requirements where res should be considered for inclusion. Approach should be applied to the layout of the site by locating the most vulnerable elements in the lowest risk areas. The Sequential <i>A</i> it of buildings, in particular where floor levels cannot be raised. ould be appraised against the proposed development layout to ensure that users and occupants of the site can achieve safe access a					





CCB21								
Site Area (I	Ha): 0.035	E	tisting Land Use: Brown	field	Prop	osed Land		
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood	Zone 3			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.0%		98.8%	1	.2%			
Development lifetime	100 years	L		I				
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulnera	ble' classification will	be subject to the Exceptio	n Test.				
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 approxima	tely 575m 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 fl	ooding from tidal so	ources during the defenc	ed scenario for key re	turn period events. Max	imum flood l		
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year reti	ırn period event - 2070	1 in 200-year retur	n period event - 2115	1 in		
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	100.00%	(5.47m AODN)	100.00% (6	6.12m 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 Wa							
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario			ʻl		
	0.0%	0.0		0.0%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under the 'high' and 'medium' risk scena	rio, the entire site is s	hown to remain dry. Unde	r the 'low' risk scenario,	surface water could accu	umulate acro		
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset	-	efences consist of natural	high ground with an act	ual crest level of 4.75m A	ODN. The c		
(inc. SoP):	The design standard of protection is 1 in	100 years.						
High-Level Indication of Defence	Based on an average cost of £1,152/m t	o raise an existing en	nbankment, it is estimated	to cost in the region of	£250,000 to upgrade the 2	200m of def		
Costs Flood Warning Area?	the lifetime of any development. Yes							
J		ing Classification d	uring the design flood ev	ent (2115) (The domin	ant hazard rating on the	e subiect si		
	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2115) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject s respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)							
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	ant' Hazard Rating			
	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							
Required Actions / Recommended	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 whe							
Mitigation Measures	resilience measures should be considered	-	luding the Environment Ag	gency's recommended a	additional freeboard requi	rements who		
	The Sequential Approach should be app		e site by locating the mos	t vulnerable elements ir	the lowest risk areas. Th	e Sequentia		
	the internal layout of buildings, in particu	-				-		
	Flood Hazard should be appraised agair	ist the proposed deve	elopment layout to ensure	that users and occupan	ts of the site can achieve	safe access		



d Use: Residential
Flood Zone 3b
0.0%
level on site shown in brackets.
in 1000-year return period event
100.00% (5.42m AODN)
ater Map'
'Low' risk scenario
99.2%
ross the entire site.
current condition rating is unknown.
efences in order to protect the site for
site has been highlighted in the
'Extreme' Hazard Rating
0.00%
e. All major development will require a
here practicable. Flood resistance and
ial Approach should also be applied to



CCB24							
Site Area (	На): 0.021	Exi	sting Land Use: Brown	ield	Proposed 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'	0.0%	3	.0%	97.0%		0.0%	
Development lifetime	100 years						
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulneral	ble' classification will b	e 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	e River Medway is located approximately 615m 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 fl	ooding from tidal sou	irces during the defenc	ed scenario for key return perio	d 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 retur	n period event - 2070	1 in 200-year return period e	vent - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event	
from tidal sources and surface water,	50.05% (4.48m AODN)	100.00% (5	5.47m AODN)	100.00% (6.12m AOI	DN)	100.00% (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		'Medium' risk scenario			'Low' risk scenario	
	100.0%		0.0%			0.0%	
Description of Surface Water Flow	Under all modelled scenarios, surface wa	ater is shown to accum	nulate on the entire site.				
Paths			· · · · · · · ·				
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset The design standard of protection is 1 in		ences consist of natural	high ground with an actual crest le	evel of 4.75m A	DDN. The current condition rating is unknown.	
High-Level Indication of Defence		•	oankment, it is estimated	to cost in the region of £250,000	o upgrade the 2	200m of defences in order to protect the site for	
Costs	the lifetime of any development.	Ũ	·	<b>C</b>	10	•	
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	'Mode	rate' Hazard Rating	'Significant' Haza	rd Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating	
	0.00%		0.00%	100.00%		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						
Paguirad Actions / Pasammandad	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		-	uding the Environment Ag	ency's recommended additional f	reeboard requir	ements where practicable. Flood resistance and	
	resilience measures should be considered						
		-		vulnerable elements in the lowes	t risk areas. Th	e Sequential Approach should also be applied to	
	the internal layout of buildings, in particul						
	Flood Hazard should be appraised again	ist the proposed develo	opment layout to ensure t	hat users and occupants of the si	te can achieve :	sate access and egress.	





SNF30				-			
Site Area (Ha): 0.112		Ex	isting Land Use: Brownf	ield	Ргорс		
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Flood Zone 2		Flood	Zone 3		
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.0%		0.0%	100	0.0%	1	
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 show modelling study does not take into account the recently completed defences. These defences would likely reduce the extent of floo further analysis is recommended to determine the true extent of the functional floodplain onsite. Any development classified as 'Les Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b). Development which is classified as 'ess Test. Development that is classified as 'water-compatible' should be designed and constructed to: remain operational and safe for storage; and not impede water flows and not increase flood risk elsewhere.					iring a 1 in 3 erable', 'Moi nfrastructure	
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site:	None.					
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Bridge Reach) is loca	ed approximately 1	60m 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 le						
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			n period event - 2115	1 in	
from tidal sources and surface water,	100.00% (4.99m AODN)	100.00% (5.47m AODN) 100.00% (6.10m 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 Wate						
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario			íLo	
	12.9%			9.7%			
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under the 'medium' and 'high' risk scenario surface water is shown to accumulate on the southern portion of the site. Under the 'low' risk scenario, su on the majority of the site.						
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset si unknown. The design standard of protection	-	etences consist of a wall wi	ith an actual crest level	of between 4.07m and 5.2	0m AODN.	
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 £250,000 to upgrade the 150m of defer the lifetime of any development.						
Flood Warning Area?	Yes						
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Ratir respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	g Classification d	uring the design flood ev	ent (2115) (The domin	ant hazard rating on the	subject sit	
Hazara Nating	'Low' Hazard Rating	ʻMod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Significa	ant' Hazard Rating		
	0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		

#### nd Use: Residential

Flood Zone 3b

100.0% \*refer to text below

vithin the functional floodplain, the in 30 year return period event, and More Vulnerable' and 'Highly ture' will be subject to the Exception f flood; result in no net loss of floodplain

*I level on site shown in brackets. in 1000-year return period event* 

100.00% (5.42m AODN)

ater Map'

'Low' risk scenario

74.8%

surface water is shown to accumulate

N. The current condition rating is

efences in order to protect the site for

site has been highlighted in the

'Extreme' Hazard Rating

100.00%



Г		
		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.
		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	Floor levels should be raised above the design flood level, including the Environment Agency's recommended additional freeboard requirements who
	Mitigation Measures	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
		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

ce. All major development will require a

where practicable. Flood resistance and

ntial Approach should also be applied to



CCB31								
Site Area (I	Ex	kisting Land Use: Brown	field	Proposed 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'	82.6%		13.5%	3.9	9%	0.0%		
Development lifetime	100 years			•				
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulnerat	ole' classification will	be subject to the Exceptio	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	River Medway is located approximately 545m northwest of the site.						
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation - Chalk Superficial deposits: No Superficial deposits							
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	ooding from tidal so	ources during the defend	ed scenario for key ret	urn 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 reti	ırn period event - 2070	1 in 200-year return	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% (6.1	17.62% (5.40m AODN)			
based off mapping available from the	Percentag	e of site at risk of fl	ooding from surface wa	ter based on the EA's 'F	Risk of Flooding from S	ding from Surface Water Map'		
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario			'Low' risk scenario		
	0.1%			1.5%		18.1%		
Description of Surface Water Flow	Under the 'high' risk scenario, the entire s	site is shown to rema	in dry. Under the 'medium	' risk scenario, a small po	ortion of the northwestern	n corner is shown to be affected by surface water		
Paths	Under the 'low' risk scenario, the extent of	of flooding to the nort	hwestern corner is shown	to increase.				
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure			efences consist of natural	high ground with an actu	al crest level of 4.75m A	ODN. The current condition rating is unknown.		
(inc. SoP):	The design standard of protection is 1 in	•						
High-Level Indication of Defence	-	o raise an existing en	nbankment, it is estimated	to cost in the region of £	300,000 to upgrade the 2	250m 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	'Моа	lerate' Hazard Rating	'Significa	nt' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating		
	1.57%		6.69%		17.50%	0.63%		
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 requi 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 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							
	the internal layout of buildings, in particul Flood Hazard should be appraised again			that users and occupants	of the site can achieve	safe access and egress.		





RWB2							
Site Area (I	Ha): 1.775	Ex	isting Land Use: Brownf	ïeld	Prope	osed Land	
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Flood Zone 2		Flood	d Zone 3		
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	31.5%		6.8%	6	1.7%		
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 modelling study does not take into account the recently completed defences. These defences would likely reduce the extent of flooding durin further analysis is recommended to determine the true extent of the functional floodplain onsite. Any development classified as 'Less Vulnera Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b). Development which is classified as 'essential infra Test. Development that is classified as 'water-compatible' should be designed and constructed to: remain operational and safe for users in tir 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	e: None.					
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Wickham Reach) is l	ocated along the nor	hwestern border of the site	е.			
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 (undifferentiat					ated) - Clay,	
	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from tidal sources during the defenced scenario for key return period events. Maximum flood le						
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event1 in 200-year return period event - 20701 in 200-year return period event - 2115					1 in	
from tidal sources and surface water,	58.87% (5.00m AODN)	68.15% (	5.48m AODN)	6.11m 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 Wa						
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario				
	3.8%			0.0%			
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under the 'high' risk scenario, there is on area appears in the northeastern corner o		rface water flooding. Unde	er the 'medium' and 'lov	w' risk scenario, this localis	ed area inci	
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):		The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset shows the existing defences consist of natural high ground with an actual crest level of between 8.89m and 8 rating is unknown. The design standard of protection is 1 in 1000 years. However, the defences are on the southern side of the site, therefore providing the second standard of the site, therefore providing the second standard of the site, therefore providing the second standard of the second standard of the second standard of the second standard standard standard of the second standard standa					
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	N/A – Existing defences are behind the site, as such the defences provide little/no benefit to the site itself. Therefore, it is not considered appropriate t for this site.						
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 domin	nant hazard rating on the	subject sit	
Hazaru Naliliy	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating		
	3.60%						

#### nd Use: Residential

Flood Zone 3b

~60.0% \*refer to text below

vithin the functional floodplain, the in 30 year return period event, and More Vulnerable' and 'Highly ture' will be subject to the Exception f flood; result in no net loss of floodplain

ay, Silt and Sand

#### level on site shown in brackets.

in 1000-year return period event

66.28% (5.43m AODN)

ater Map'

'Low' risk scenario

1.4%

ncreases as well as another localised

d 8.91m AODN. The current condition iding little/no benefit to the site itself.

te to consider upgrading the defences

site has been highlighted in the

'Extreme' Hazard Rating

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.
	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	Floor levels should be raised above the design flood level, including the Environment Agency's recommended additional freeboard requirements who
Mitigation Measures	resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.
intigution measures	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
	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
	The EA should be consulted where development is proposed within 16m of a tidal waterbody or tidal defence infrastructure to obtain consent via a F

ce. All major development will require a

where practicable. Flood resistance and

ntial Approach should also be applied to



SNF34							
Site Area (F	ła): 0.172	Ex	isting Land Use: Brownf	ield	Propo	sed Land	
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	d Zone 2	Flood Zor	Flood Zone 3		
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.0%		0.0%	100.0%	6		
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 sit modelling study does not take into account the recently completed defences. These defences would likely reduce the extent of flooding du further analysis is recommended to determine the true extent of the functional floodplain onsite. Any development classified as 'Less Vulne Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b). Development which is classified as 'essential in Test. Development that is classified as 'water-compatible' should be designed and constructed to: remain operational and safe for users in storage; and not impede water flows and not increase flood risk elsewhere.					iring a 1 in : erable', 'Mo nfrastructur	
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 and Lin	nehouse Reach) is lo	ocated approximately 210n	n 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	oding from tidal so	urces during the defence	ed scenario for key returr	n period events. Maxin	num flood le	
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			n period event - 2115 1 ir		
from tidal sources and surface water,	100.00% (4.99m AODN)	100.00% (5.46m AODN) 100.00% (6.09m AODN)			m 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 Wat						
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario		1.		
	10.9%		9.6%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under the 'high' and 'medium' risk scenarion to be affected by surface water.	o, surface water is s	hown to accumulate within	the southwestern corner c	of the site. Under the 'lo	w' risk scer	
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset shows the existing defences consist of a wall with an actual crest level of between 4.42m and 4.78m AODN. unknown. The design standard of protection is 1 in 20 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 £625,000 to upgrade the 400m of defer the lifetime of any development						
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 si respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)						
Hazard Rating			'Moderate' Hazard Rating				
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Significant'	' Hazard Rating		

#### nd Use: Residential

Flood Zone 3b

100.0% \*refer to text below

vithin the functional floodplain, the in 30 year return period event, and More Vulnerable' and 'Highly ture' will be subject to the Exception f flood; result in no net loss of floodplain

*I level on site shown in brackets. in 1000-year return period event* 

100.00% (5.42m AODN)

ater Map'

'Low' risk scenario

79.5%

cenario, the majority of the site is shown

N. The current condition rating is

efences in order to protect the site for

site has been highlighted in the

'Extreme' Hazard Rating

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.
	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	Floor levels should be raised above the design flood level, including the Environment Agency's recommended additional freeboard requirements who
Mitigation Measures	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 Sequentia
	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

ce. All major development will require a

where practicable. Flood resistance and

ntial Approach should also be applied to



SR48							
Site Area (Ha): 0.245		Ex	isting Land Use: Brownf	ield	Proposed		
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Flood Zone 2		Flood Zo	one 3		
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.0%	2	4.5%	55.5%	6		
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 we modelling study does not take into account the recently completed defences. These defences would likely reduce the extent of flooding during a 1 is further analysis is recommended to determine the true extent of the functional floodplain onsite. Any development classified as 'Less Vulnerable', 'I Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b). Development which is classified as 'essential infrastruc' Test. Development that is classified as 'water-compatible' should be designed and constructed to: remain operational and safe for users in times of 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	e: None.					
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Upnor Reach) is loca	ited along the southe	astern 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 flooding from tidal sources during the defenced scenario for key return period events. Maximum flood l						
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		1 in 200-year return pe	rn period event - 2115		
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.63% (5.06m AODN)	99.91% (5.45m AODN) 100.00% (6.08m 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 Wate						
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario			Lo	
	0.3%			0.5%			
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under the 'high' and 'medium' risk scenar to be affected by surface water.	io, surface water is s	hown to encroach onto a s	mall portion of the north o	f the site. Under the 'lo	ow' risk scena	
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset shows the existing defences consist of a wall with an actual crest level of between 5.03m and 5.54m AODN. unknown. The design standard of protection is 1 in 200 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 £250,000 to upgrade the 150m of defer 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)	-	uring the design flood ev	ent (2115) (The dominan	t hazard rating on the	e subject sit	
Tuzura Kaling	'Low' Hazard Rating	ʻMod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Significant	' Hazard Rating		
	0.00%		0.00%	9	9.20%		

#### nd Use: Residential

Flood Zone 3b

~1.0% \*refer to text below

vithin the functional floodplain, the in 30 year return period event, and More Vulnerable' and 'Highly ture' will be subject to the Exception f flood; result in no net loss of floodplain

*I level on site shown in brackets. in 1000-year return period event* 

99.91% (5.40m AODN)

ater Map'

'Low' risk scenario

63.3%

enario, the majority of the site is shown

N. The current condition rating is

efences in order to protect the site for

#### site has been highlighted in the

'Extreme' Hazard Rating

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.
	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	Floor levels should be raised above the design flood level, including the Environment Agency's recommended additional freeboard requirements who
Mitigation Measures	resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.
intigation 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 Sequentia
	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
	The EA should be consulted where development is proposed within 16m of a tidal waterbody or tidal defence infrastructure to obtain consent via a F

ce. All major development will require a

where practicable. Flood resistance and

ntial Approach should also be applied to



CCB7										
Site Area (Ha): 0.049		Existing Land Use: Brownfield			Proposed Land Use: Residential					
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Flood	d Zone 2	Flood Zone 3		Flood Zone 3b				
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.0%	4	1.9%	58.1%		0.0%				
Development lifetime	100 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: None.									
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway is located approximately 235m northwest 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 return period even	t - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event				
from tidal sources and surface water,			5.46m AODN)	100.00% (6.11m 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		'Medium' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario					
	35.1%			0.0%	64.1%					
Description of Surface Water Flow	Under the 'medium' risk scenario, the entire site is shown to remain dry. Under the 'high' risk scenario over a third of the site could be affected by surface water. Under the 'low' risk									
Paths	scenario, more than half of the site could be affected by surface water.									
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset shows the existing defences consist of natural high ground with an actual crest level of between 4.75m and 4.93m AODN. The current condition									
(inc. SoP):	rating is unknown. The design standard o	•	-							
High-Level Indication of Defence	Based on an average cost of £1,152/m to raise an existing embankment, it is estimated to cost in the region of £200,000 to upgrade the 150m of defences in order to protect the site for									
Costs Flood Warning Area?	the lifetime of any development Yes									
Flood Warning Area?										
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	'Mode	erate' Hazard Rating	'Significant' Hazard R	Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating				
	0.00%		0.00%	84.86%		15.14%				
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.									





FP14										
Site Area (Ha): 0.011		Existing Land Use: Brownfield			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'	96.8 %		0.0%	3.2%		0.0%				
Development lifetime	100 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: None.									
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway is located approximately 70m north of the site.									
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation - Chalk 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	centage of site at risk of flooding		urn 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)	6.36% (6.11m AC	DN)	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		'Medium' risk scenario			'Low' risk scenario				
	0.0%			0.0%		0.0%				
Description of Surface Water Flow	Under all modelled scenarios, the entire site is shown to remain dry.									
Paths										
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset shows the existing defences consist of engineered high ground with an actual crest level of between 4.60m and 5.49m AODN. The current condition rating is unknown. The design standard of protection is 1 in 100 years.									
High-Level Indication of Defence	Based on an average cost of £1,152/m to raise an existing embankment, it is estimated to cost in the region of £200,000 to upgrade the 150m 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	'Moderate' Hazard Rating		'Significant' Ha	zard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating				
	5.20%		0.00%	0.629	, 0	0.00%				
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 resista									




SNF38							
Site Area (H	la): 0.069	Ex	isting Land Use: Brownfi	eld	Propo	sed Land	
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floc	d Zone 2	Flood Zone	93		
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.0 %		0.0%	100.0%			
Development lifetime	100 years	00 years					
Exception Test required?	modelling study does not take into accour further analysis is recommended to deterr Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted Test. Development that is classified as 'wa	Development which has a 'more vulnerable' classification will be subject to the Exception Test. *Although the NKC modelling shows the site to be wit modelling study does not take into account the recently completed defences. These defences would likely reduce the extent of flooding during a 1 in arther analysis is recommended to determine the true extent of the functional floodplain onsite. Any development classified as 'Less Vulnerable', 'Mo 'ulnerable' uses should not be permitted within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b). Development which is classified as 'essential infrastructur 'est. Development that is classified as 'water-compatible' should be designed and constructed to: remain operational and safe for users in times of fl- 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: None.						
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Limehouse Reach) is	located approximate	ely 50m east 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	oding from tidal so	urces during the defence	ed scenario for key return µ	period events. Maxim	num flood le	
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 - 2			od event - 2115	1 in	
from tidal sources and surface water,	100.00% (5.03m AODN)	100.00% (5.46m AODN) 100.00			100.00% (6.10m 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 Wate						
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario		1		
	0.0%		7.7%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under the 'high' risk scenario, the entire s scenario, surface water is shown to accur		-	risk scenario, a small portior	n in the north of the si	te is shown	
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset s unknown. The design standard of protecti		fences consist of a wall wi	th an actual crest level of be	tween 4.49m and 5.1	1m AODN.	
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 to	o cost in the region of £250,0	000 to upgrade the 15	i0m of defe	
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 si respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)						
Hazard Rating							
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	ʻMod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Significant' H	lazard Rating		

#### nd Use: Residential

Flood Zone 3b

100.0% \*refer to text below

vithin the functional floodplain, the in 30 year return period event, and More Vulnerable' and 'Highly ture' will be subject to the Exception f flood; result in no net loss of floodplain

*I level on site shown in brackets. in 1000-year return period event* 

100.00% (5.42m AODN)

ater Map'

'Low' risk scenario

74.9%

wn to be affected. Under the 'low' risk

N. The current condition rating is

efences in order to protect the site for

site has been highlighted in the

'Extreme' Hazard Rating

96.86%



1		
		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.	
	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 who
		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
		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

ce. All major development will require a

where practicable. Flood resistance and

ntial Approach should also be applied to

ess and egress.



CCB25							
Site Area (ł	Ha): 0.069	Ex	isting Land Use: Brownfi	eld	Propos	Proposed Land	
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floc	d Zone 2	Flood Zone 3			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.0 %		1.9%	98.1%			
Development lifetime	100 years	JO years					
Exception Test required?	modelling study does not take into account further analysis is recommended to detern Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted Test. Development that is classified as 'w storage; and not impede water flows and	Development which has a 'more vulnerable' classification will be subject to the Exception Test. *Although the NKC modelling shows the site to be with modelling study does not take into account the recently completed defences. These defences would likely reduce the extent of flooding during a 1 in 3 further analysis is recommended to determine the true extent of the functional floodplain onsite. Any development classified as 'Less Vulnerable', 'Mod /ulnerable' uses should not be permitted within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b). Development which is classified as 'essential infrastructure fest. Development that is classified as 'water-compatible' should be designed and constructed to: remain operational and safe for users in times of flo storage; and not impede water flows and not increase flood risk elsewhere.					
Flood History	ncidents within close proximity of the site: None.						
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Chatham Reach) is lo	ocated along the nor	hwestern border of the site				
Geology	Bedrock: Seaford Chalk Formation - Chalk Superficial deposits: Alluvium - Clay, Silt, Sand and Peat						
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	ooding from tidal so	urces during the defence	d scenario for key return period	events. Maximu	ım flood le	
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 return period ever	nt - 2115	1 in	
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0	).00m AODN)	100.00% (6.09m 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 Wat						
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario			Ĺ	
	1.4%			4.4%			
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 s unknown. The design standard of protect	-		h an actual crest level of between t	5.60m and 6.00	m AODN.	
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 to	cost in the region of £475,000 to u	pgrade the 300	m of defe	
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 dominant hazard i	rating on the s	ubject si	
	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Significant' Hazard I	Rating		
	0.00%		0.00%	22.78%			

#### nd Use: Residential

Flood Zone 3b

~1.0% \*refer to text below

vithin the functional floodplain, the in 30 year return period event, and More Vulnerable' and 'Highly ture' will be subject to the Exception f flood; result in no net loss of floodplain

l level on site shown in brackets.

in 1000-year return period event

0.00% (0.00m AODN)

'ater Map'

'Low' risk scenario

5.9%

N. The current condition rating is

efences in order to protect the site for

site has been highlighted in the

'Extreme' Hazard Rating

77.22%



	The site is located in Flood Zones 2 and 3, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.	
	Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance.
		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 who
		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 Sequentia
		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
		The EA should be consulted where development is proposed within 16m of a tidal waterbody or tidal defence infrastructure to obtain consent via a F

ce. All major development will require a

where practicable. Flood resistance and

ntial Approach should also be applied to



SNF31							
Site Area (ł	ła): 0.032	Ex	isting Land Use: Brownf	ield	Propo	sed Land	
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floc	d Zone 2	Flood Z	Zone 3		
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.0 %		0.0%	100.	0%		
Development lifetime	100 years						
Exception Test required?	modelling study does not take into account further analysis is recommended to determ Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted w Test. Development that is classified as 'wa	Development which has a 'more vulnerable' classification will be subject to the Exception Test. *Although the NKC modelling shows the site to be w modelling study does not take into account the recently completed defences. These defences would likely reduce the extent of flooding during a 1 in urther analysis is recommended to determine the true extent of the functional floodplain onsite. Any development classified as 'Less Vulnerable', 'M /ulnerable' uses should not be permitted within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b). Development which is classified as 'essential infrastruct 'est. Development that is classified as 'water-compatible' should be designed and constructed to: remain operational and safe for users in times of 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: None.						
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Bridge Reach and Lim	ehouse Reach) is l	ocated approximately 350r	n 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 lo						
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 eve			period event - 2115	1 in	
from tidal sources and surface water,	100.00% (4.99m AODN)	100.00% (5.47m AODN) 100.00%			100.00% (6.10m 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 Wat						
	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario				
	0.0%			25.0%			
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under the 'high' risk scenario, the entire sit 'low' risk scenario, the majority of the site i		-	risk scenario, surface wa	ater is shown to accumula	ate along th	
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset sl condition rating is unknown. The design st	•			ith an actual crest level of	between 4	
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 £2	50,000 to upgrade the 15	i0m of defe	
Flood Warning Area?	Yes						
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Ratin respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	g Classification d	uring the design flood ev	ent (2115) (The domina	nt hazard rating on the	subject sit	
	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Significal	nt' Hazard Rating		
	0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		

#### nd Use: Residential

Flood Zone 3b

100.0% \*refer to text below

vithin the functional floodplain, the in 30 year return period event, and More Vulnerable' and 'Highly ture' will be subject to the Exception f flood; result in no net loss of floodplain

*I level on site shown in brackets. in 1000-year return period event* 

100.00% (5.42m AODN)

ater Map'

'Low' risk scenario

70.9%

the southeastern boundary. Under the

4.50m and 5.20m AODN. The current

efences in order to protect the site for

site has been highlighted in the

'Extreme' Hazard Rating

100.00%



1		
		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.	
	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 who
		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
		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

ce. All major development will require a

where practicable. Flood resistance and

ntial Approach should also be applied to

ess and egress.



SNF24							
Site Area (ł	ła): 0.052	Ex	isting Land Use: Brownfi	eld	Propos	sed Land	
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floc	d Zone 2	Flood Zone	e 3		
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.0 %		0.0%	100.0%		-	
Development lifetime	00 years				· · · ·		
Exception Test required?	modelling study does not take into account further analysis is recommended to determ Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted v Test. Development that is classified as 'wa	evelopment which has a 'more vulnerable' classification will be subject to the Exception Test. *Although the NKC modelling shows the site to be with nodelling study does not take into account the recently completed defences. These defences would likely reduce the extent of flooding during a 1 in 3 in ther analysis is recommended to determine the true extent of the functional floodplain onsite. Any development classified as 'Less Vulnerable', 'Mor ulnerable' uses should not be permitted within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b). Development which is classified as 'essential infrastructure est. Development that is classified as 'water-compatible' should be designed and constructed to: remain operational and safe for users in times of flo 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: None.						
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Bridge Reach and Lim	ehouse Reach) is l	ocated approximately 470n	n 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 flooding from tidal sources during the defenced scenario for key return period events. Maximum flood le						
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 - 211			od event - 2115	1 in	
from tidal sources and surface water,	100.00% (4.99m AODN)	100.00% (5.47m AODN) 100.00% (6.10m AODN)			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 Wate						
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario		1		
	59.5%			11.2%			
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, surface wate	er is shown to accu	nulate across the majority	of the site.			
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset sh condition rating is unknown. The design st				an actual crest level of l	between 4	
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to the lifetime of any development.	aise an existing de	ence wall, it is estimated to	o cost in the region of £250,0	000 to upgrade the 150	Om of defe	
Flood Warning Area?	Yes						
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Ratin respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	g Classification d	uring the design flood eve	ent (2115) (The dominant h	nazard rating on the s	subject sit	
	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Significant' F	Hazard Rating		
	0.00%		0.00%	14	48%		

#### nd Use: Residential

Flood Zone 3b

~95.0% \*refer to text below

vithin the functional floodplain, the n 30 year return period event, and Aore Vulnerable' and 'Highly cure' will be subject to the Exception flood; result in no net loss of floodplain

l level on site shown in brackets. in 1000-year return period event

100.00% (5.42m AODN)

ater Map'

'Low' risk scenario

16.7%

4.50m and 5.20m AODN. The current

fences in order to protect the site for

site has been highlighted in the

'Extreme' Hazard Rating

85.52%



1		
		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.	
	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 who
		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
		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

ce. All major development will require a

where practicable. Flood resistance and

ntial Approach should also be applied to

ess and egress.



CCB8								
Site Area (	Ha): 0.157	Exi	isting Land Use: Brown	ield	Proposed Land Use: Residential			
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	d Zone 2	Flood 2	Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b		
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.0 %	(	0.0%	100.	.0%	0.0%		
Development lifetime	100 years					·		
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulnerabl	le' classification will b	be subject to the Exception	i Test.				
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	: None.						
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway is located approximate	ely 180m northwest o	f the site.					
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation Superficial deposits: Alluvium - Clay, 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	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.	11m AODN)	100.00% (5.40m AODN)		
based off mapping available from the	Percentage	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding fr				n Surface Water Map'		
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario			'Low' risk scenario		
	0.0%			0.0%		100.0%		
Description of Surface Water Flow	Under the 'high' and 'medium' risk scenari	io, the entire site is sl	hown to remain dry. Unde	the 'low' risk scenario, s	e 'low' risk scenario, surface water is shown to accumulate across the entire site.			
Paths Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure	The EA's Spatial Flood Defense detects	howe the evicting do	fanada appoint of natural l	ich ground with on octu	al creat lovel of botwo	en 4.75m and 4.93m AODN. The current condition		
(inc. SoP):	rating is unknown. The design standard of			ingir ground with an actua	al crescievel of betwee			
High-Level Indication of Defence	Based on an average cost of £1,152/m to	raise an existing em	bankment, it is estimated	to cost in the region of £2	200,000 to upgrade th	e 150m 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 Ratin respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	-	ring the design flood ev	ent (2115) (The domina	nnt hazard rating on t	the subject site has been highlighted in the		
Thizana Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mode	erate' Hazard Rating	'Significa	nt' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating		
	0.00%		0.00%		30.59%	69.41%		
	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.							
<b>Required Actions / Recommended</b>		-		-		uirements where practicable. Flood resistance and		
Mitigation Measures	resilience measures should be considered	-						
			e site by locating the most	vulnerable elements in t	he lowest risk areas.	The Sequential Approach should also be applied to		
	the internal layout of buildings, in particula							
	Flood Hazard should be appraised agains	st the proposed devel	opment layout to ensure t	hat users and occupants	of the site can achiev	e safe access and egress.		





GN15							
Site Area (I	Ha): 5.869	Ex	isting Land Use: Brownfic	eld	Propos	roposed Land	
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	d Zone 2	Flood Zor	ne 3		
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	1.4 %		1.8%	96.8%	)		
Development lifetime	100 years						
Exception Test required?	modelling study does not take into accour further analysis is recommended to deterr Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted Test. Development that is classified as 'wa	velopment which has a 'more vulnerable' classification will be subject to the Exception Test. *Although the NKC modelling shows the site to be with odelling study does not take into account the recently completed defences. These defences would likely reduce the extent of flooding during a 1 in 3 ther analysis is recommended to determine the true extent of the functional floodplain onsite. Any development classified as 'Less Vulnerable', 'Modelling shows the site to be with Inerable' uses should not be permitted within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b). Development which is classified as 'essential infrastructure st. Development that is classified as 'water-compatible' should be designed and constructed to: remain operational and safe for users in times of flood 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 (Gillingham Reach) is	he River Medway (Gillingham Reach) is located along the northern border of the site.					
Geology	Bedrock: Thanet Formation - Sand, Silt ar Superficial deposits: Beach and Tidal Flat	•				on (undiffe	
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	oding from tidal so	urces during the defence	d scenario for key return	n period events. Maximu	ım flood le	
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			urn period event - 2115 1		
from tidal sources and surface water,	90.43% (4.95m AODN)	ON)         98.71% (5.43m AODN)         99.83% (6.05m 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 Wate						
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenari		scenario		
	2.4%		10.4%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, water is sho the 'low' risk scenario but this is due to the		-	f the site. Surface water is	also shown to accumula	ate within	
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset s current condition rating is unknown. The d	-	-		with an actual crest leve	l of betwe	
High-Level Indication of Defence	Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to	raise an existing de	fence wall, it is estimated to	cost in the region of £1,5	50,000 to upgrade the 10	000m of d	
Costs	for the lifetime of any development.						
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 si respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)						
Hazard Rating	respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)						
Hazard Rating	<i>'Low' Hazard Rating</i>	'Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Significant'	Hazard Rating		

#### nd Use: Residential

Flood Zone 3b

~40.0% \*refer to text below

vithin the functional floodplain, the in 30 year return period event, and More Vulnerable' and 'Highly ture' will be subject to the Exception f flood; result in no net loss of floodplain

lifferentiated) - Chalk

#### level on site shown in brackets.

in 1000-year return period event

94.23% (5.38m AODN)

ater Map'

'Low' risk scenario

38.8%

in the northern part of the site under

ween 4.80m and 5.38m AODN. The

f defences in order to protect the site

site has been highlighted in the

'Extreme' Hazard Rating

56.82%



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 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 Sequent 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	Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance 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 wh 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

ce. All major development will require a

where practicable. Flood resistance and

ntial Approach should also be applied to



RWB25							
Site Area (I	ła): 0.593	E	isting Land Use: Brownfi	eld	Prop	osed Land	
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood	Zone 3		
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.0 %		0.0%	17.	3%		
Development lifetime	100 years						
Exception Test required?	modelling study does not take into account further analysis is recommended to determ Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted v Test. Development that is classified as 'wa	evelopment which has a 'more vulnerable' classification will be subject to the Exception Test. *Although the NKC modelling shows the site to be windelling study does not take into account the recently completed defences. These defences would likely reduce the extent of flooding during a 1 in urther analysis is recommended to determine the true extent of the functional floodplain onsite. Any development classified as 'Less Vulnerable', 'M 'ulnerable' uses should not be permitted within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b). Development which is classified as 'essential infrastructurest. Development that is classified as 'water-compatible' should be designed and constructed to: remain operational and safe for users in times of 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: None.						
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Limehouse Reach) is	ocated along the n	orthern border 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						
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	rent 1 in 200-year return period event - 2070 1 in 200-year return period event - 2115				1 ir	
from tidal sources and surface water,	3.10% (5.02m AODN)	97.78% (5.45m AODN) 99.58% (6.08m 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 Wat						
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	m' risk scenario		Έ	
	0.0%		0.0%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under the 'high' and 'medium' risk scenario	o, the entire site is s	hown to remain dry. Under	the 'low' risk scenario,	there are two localised ar	eas onsite	
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset sh condition rating is unknown. The design st	-	-	ed high ground and an	embankment with an actu	ual crest lev	
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,152/m to the lifetime of any development.	aise an existing en	bankment, it is estimated to	o cost in the region of $\pounds$	425,000 to upgrade the 3	50m of def	
Flood Warning Area?	Yes						
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Ratin respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	g Classification d	uring the design flood eve	ent (2115) (The domina	ant hazard rating on the	subject s	
nazaru Nainiy	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Моа	erate' Hazard Rating	'Significa	ant' Hazard Rating		
	1.83%		4.80%		53.27%		

#### nd Use: Residential

Flood Zone 3b

~5.0% \*refer to text below

within the functional floodplain, the in 30 year return period event, and 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly cture' will be subject to the Exception of flood; result in no net loss of floodplain

d level on site shown in brackets. in 1000-year return period event

95.98% (5.40m AODN)

Vater Map'

'Low' risk scenario

17.3%

ite shown to flood from surface water.

level of 5.87m AODN. The current

defences in order to protect the site for

site has been highlighted in the

'Extreme' Hazard Rating

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.
	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	Floor levels should be raised above the design flood level, including the Environment Agency's recommended additional freeboard requirements whe
Mitigation Measures	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 Sequentia
	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
	The EA should be consulted where development is proposed within 16m of a tidal waterbody or tidal defence infrastructure to obtain consent via a FI

ce. All major development will require a

here practicable. Flood resistance and

tial Approach should also be applied to



GN3							
Site Area (I	la): 1.235	Ex	isting Land Use: Brown	field	Prop	osed Land	
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floc	d Zone 2	Flood	l Zone 3		
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	22.4 %	,	5.6%	62	2.0%	,	
Development lifetime	100 years			•			
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulnerab 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 storage; and not impede water flows and	nt the recently compl mine the true extent within the Functiona ater-compatible' sho	eted defences. These defe of the functional floodplain Floodplain (Flood Zone 3 uld be designed and const	ences would likely redu nonsite. Any developme 3b). Development which	ce the extent of flooding du ent classified as 'Less Vuln n is classified as 'essential i	uring a 1 in herable', 'Mc infrastructur	
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	: None.					
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Gillingham Reach) is	located approximate	ly 80m north of the site.				
Geology	Bedrock: Thanet Formation - Sand, Silt a Superficial deposits: Alluvium - Clay, Silt,	-					
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	ooding from tidal so	urces during the defenc	ed scenario for key re	eturn period events. Maxir	mum flood le	
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 retur	n period event - 2115	1 in	
from tidal sources and surface water,	62.84% (5.04m AODN)	75.30% (	5.42m AODN)	99.08% (6	.06m AODN)		
based off mapping available from the	Percentage	e of site at risk of fl	ooding from surface wat	er based on the EA's	'Risk of Flooding from S	urface Wat	
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	um' risk scenario		'Lo	
	8.7%			10.1%			
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, surface wa	ter is shown to accu	nulate onsite.				
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset s unknown. The design standard of protect	-	-	red high ground with ar	n effective crest level of3.6	3m AODN.	
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,152/m to the lifetime of any development.	raise an existing er	bankment, it is estimated	to cost in the region of	£600,000 to upgrade the 5	500m of defe	
Flood Warning Area?	Yes						
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rati respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	ng Classification d	uring the design flood ev	vent (2115) (The domir	nant hazard rating on the	subject sit	
	'Low' Hazard Rating	ʻMod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating		
	5.49%		9.75%		32.25%		

#### nd Use: Residential

Flood Zone 3b

~30.0% \*refer to text below

vithin the functional floodplain, the in 30 year return period event, and More Vulnerable' and 'Highly ture' will be subject to the Exception f flood; result in no net loss of floodplain

*I level on site shown in brackets. in 1000-year return period event* 

75.30% (5.37m AODN)

ater Map'

'Low' risk scenario

41.1%

N. The current condition rating is

efences in order to protect the site for

site has been highlighted in the

'Extreme' Hazard Rating

50.82%



1		
		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.
		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	Floor levels should be raised above the design flood level, including the Environment Agency's recommended additional freeboard requirements who
	Mitigation Measures	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
		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

ce. All major development will require a

where practicable. Flood resistance and

ntial Approach should also be applied to

ess and egress.



#### **HHH22 & HHH31** Site Area (Ha): 170.876 **Existing Land Use: Greenfield** 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' 94.8 % 1.4% 3.8% 0.0% **Development lifetime** 100 years **Exception Test required?** Development which has a 'more vulnerable' classification will be subject to the Exception Test Incidents within the site: None. Flood History 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 1,190m south of the site. Bedrock: London Clay Formation - Clay and Silt Geology Superficial deposits: Head - Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel, River Terrace Deposits, 2 - 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. 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 Percentage of site at risk of flooding 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 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 2.6% 1.1% 1.9% **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 shown to be Paths at risk of surface water flooding. Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset shows the existing defences consist of an embankment with an effective crest level of 5.05m AODN, with a condition rating of 3. The design (inc. SoP): standard of protection is 1 in 1000 years. **High-Level Indication of Defence** Based on an average cost of £1,152/m to raise an existing embankment, it is estimated to cost in the region of £4,400,000 to upgrade approximately 3,800m of defences in order to protect the site for the lifetime of any development. Costs 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' Hazard Rating 'Extreme' Hazard Rating 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 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. **Required Actions / Recommended** Floor levels should be raised above the design flood level, including the Environment Agency's recommended additional freeboard requirements where practicable. Flood resistance and **Mitigation Measures** 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	ła): 99.005	Ex	isting Land Use: Brownf	ield	Propo	sed Land
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floc	od Zone 2	Flood Z	one 3	
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	33.3 %	:	36.2%	30.5	%	
Development lifetime	100 years					
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulnerab modelling study does not take into account further analysis is recommended to detern Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted Test. Development that is classified as 'w storage; and not impede water flows and	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 reduce onsite. Any development b). Development which is	the extent of flooding du t classified as 'Less Vulne classified as 'essential in	ring a 1 in erable', 'Mo nfrastructu
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	: None.				
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway is along the eastern, s	outhern and western	n border of the site.			
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation Superficial deposits: Head - Clay And Silt and Sand					
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	ooding from tidal so	ources during the defence	ed scenario for key retu	rn period events. Maxin	num flood le
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	Percentage of site at risk of flo 1 in 200-year return period event		ources during the defence urn period event - 2070	e <b>d scenario for key retu</b> 1 in 200-year return p	-	
Percentage of site at risk of flooding from tidal sources and surface water,		1 in 200-year retu			period event - 2115	
from tidal sources and surface water, based off mapping available from the	1 in 200-year return period event 22.84% (5.06m AODN)	1 in 200-year retu 56.00% (	ırn period event - 2070	1 in 200-year return p 95.62% (6.1	period event - 2115 1m AODN)	1 in
from tidal sources and surface water,	1 in 200-year return period event 22.84% (5.06m AODN)	1 in 200-year retu 56.00% (	urn period event - 2070 5.46m AODN) ooding from surface wate	1 in 200-year return p 95.62% (6.1	period event - 2115 1m AODN)	1 in Irface Wat
from tidal sources and surface water, based off mapping available from the	1 in 200-year return period event 22.84% (5.06m AODN) Percentage	1 in 200-year retu 56.00% (	urn period event - 2070 5.46m AODN) ooding from surface wate	1 in 200-year return p 95.62% (6.1 <sup>-</sup> er based on the EA's 'R	period event - 2115 1m AODN)	1 in Irface Wat
from tidal sources and surface water, based off mapping available from the	1 in 200-year return period event 22.84% (5.06m AODN) Percentage 'High' risk scenario	1 in 200-year retu 56.00% ( e of site at risk of fl	urn period event - 2070 5.46m AODN) ooding from surface wate 'Mediu	1 in 200-year return p 95.62% (6.1 <sup>-</sup> er based on the EA's 'R im' risk scenario 5.7%	period event - 2115 1m AODN)	1 in Irface Wat
from tidal sources and surface water, based off mapping available from the EA Description of Surface Water Flow	1 in 200-year return period event 22.84% (5.06m AODN) Percentage 'High' risk scenario 5.1%	1 in 200-year retu 56.00% ( e of site at risk of fl umerous localised a	<i>urn period event - 2070</i> 5.46m AODN) <b>ooding from surface wate</b> <i>'Mediu</i> reas of surface water flood efences consist of natural h	1 in 200-year return p 95.62% (6.1 er based on the EA's 'R um' risk scenario 5.7% ing onsite.	isk of Flooding from Su	1 in urface Wate
from tidal sources and surface water, based off mapping available from the EA Description of Surface Water Flow Paths Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure	1 in 200-year return period event         22.84% (5.06m AODN)         Percentage         'High' risk scenario         5.1%         Under all modelled scenarios, there are no         The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset states	1 in 200-year retu 56.00% ( e of site at risk of fl umerous localised a shows the existing de tandard of protection raise an existing de	irn period event - 2070 5.46m AODN) ooding from surface water 'Mediu reas of surface water flood efences consist of natural h	1 in 200-year return p 95.62% (6.1 <sup>2</sup> er based on the EA's 'R um' risk scenario 5.7% ing onsite. high ground and a wall wit years.	th an actual crest level of	1 in <b>urface Wat</b> 'L
from tidal sources and surface water, based off mapping available from the EA Description of Surface Water Flow Paths Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP): High-Level Indication of Defence	1 in 200-year return period event         22.84% (5.06m AODN)         Percentage         'High' risk scenario         5.1%         Under all modelled scenarios, there are n         The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset s         condition rating is unknown. The design s         Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to	1 in 200-year retu 56.00% ( e of site at risk of fl umerous localised a shows the existing de tandard of protection raise an existing de	irn period event - 2070 5.46m AODN) ooding from surface water 'Mediu reas of surface water flood efences consist of natural h	1 in 200-year return p 95.62% (6.1 <sup>2</sup> er based on the EA's 'R um' risk scenario 5.7% ing onsite. high ground and a wall wit years.	th an actual crest level of	1 in <b>urface Wat</b> 'L
from tidal sources and surface water, based off mapping available from the EA Description of Surface Water Flow Paths Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP): High-Level Indication of Defence Costs Flood Warning Area?	1 in 200-year return period event         22.84% (5.06m AODN)         Percentage         'High' risk scenario         5.1%         Under all modelled scenarios, there are n         The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset s         condition rating is unknown. The design s         Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to         the site for the lifetime of any development	1 in 200-year retu 56.00% ( e of site at risk of fl umerous localised a shows the existing de tandard of protection raise an existing de nt.	<i>urn period event - 2070</i> 5.46m AODN) <b>ooding from surface wate</b> <i>'Mediu</i> reas of surface water flood efences consist of natural h n is 1 in 200 and 1 in 1000 fence wall, it is estimated t	1 in 200-year return p 95.62% (6.1 <sup>-</sup> er based on the EA's 'R um' risk scenario 5.7% ing onsite. nigh ground and a wall wit years. o cost in the region of £5,	th an actual crest level of ,850,000 to upgrade app	1 in Irface Wate 'L
from tidal sources and surface water, based off mapping available from the EA Description of Surface Water Flow Paths Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP): High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	1 in 200-year return period event         22.84% (5.06m AODN)         Percentage         'High' risk scenario         'High' risk scenario         5.1%         Under all modelled scenarios, there are n         The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset s         condition rating is unknown. The design s         Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to         the site for the lifetime of any development         Yes         Percentage of site in each Hazard Ration	1 in 200-year retu 56.00% ( e of site at risk of fl umerous localised a shows the existing de tandard of protection raise an existing de nt.	<i>urn period event - 2070</i> 5.46m AODN) <b>ooding from surface wate</b> <i>'Mediu</i> reas of surface water flood efences consist of natural h n is 1 in 200 and 1 in 1000 fence wall, it is estimated t	1 in 200-year return p 95.62% (6.1 <sup>-</sup> er based on the EA's 'R um' risk scenario 5.7% ing onsite. nigh ground and a wall wit years. o cost in the region of £5, ent (2115) (The dominal	th an actual crest level of ,850,000 to upgrade app	1 in Irface Wate 'L between 4

#### nd Use: Residential

Flood Zone 3b

~15.0% \*refer to text below

vithin the functional floodplain, the in 30 year return period event, and More Vulnerable' and 'Highly ture' will be subject to the Exception f flood; result in no net loss of floodplain

alk Formation - Chalk

Deposits (undifferentiated) - Clay, Silt

l level on site shown in brackets.

in 1000-year return period event

50.66% (5.42m AODN)

ater Map'

'Low' risk scenario

5.3%

4.70m and 5.87m AODN. The current

ly 3800m of defences in order to protect

#### site has been highlighted in the

'Extreme' Hazard Rating

21.46%



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 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 wh 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 Sequentia 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
	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 The EA should be consulted where development is proposed within 16m of a tidal waterbody or tidal defence infrastructure to obtain consent via a F

ce. All major development will require a

where practicable. Flood resistance and

ntial Approach should also be applied to

CCB35							
Site Area (	Ha): 2.700	Exist	ing Land Use: Mostly Gre	enfield	Propose	d Land Use: Non-Residential	
lood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood Zone 3		Flood Zone 3b	
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	60.8 %		11.3%	27.9%		0.0%	
Development lifetime	75 years				·		
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulnerab	le' classification will	be subject to the Exceptior	i Test.			
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 (Chatham Reach) is lo	ocated approximatel	y 245m west of the site.				
Geology	Bedrock: Seaford Chalk Formation - Chal Superficial deposits: River Terrace Depos		avel				
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	ooding from tidal so	ources during the defence	ed scenario for key return period	l events. Maxim	um flood level on site shown in brackets.	
ercentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year reti	urn period event - 2070	1 in 200-year return period ev	ent - 2115	1 in 1000-year return period event	
om tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0.00m AODN) 48.88%		48.88% (6.09m AODN	1)	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	
sed off mapping available from the	Percentage	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			'Low' risk scenario			
	1.1%	1.0%		1.0%		2.6%	
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, there are a	few localised areas	of surface water flooding.				
kisting Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset s unknown. The design standard of protect	-		th an actual crest level of betweer	5.60m and 5.66	6m AODN. The current condition rating is	
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 £850,000 to	upgrade approx	ximately 550m of defences in order to prote	
Flood Warning Area?	Yes						
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rati respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	ng Classification d	uring the design flood ev	ent (2115) (The dominant hazard	l rating on the s	subject site has been highlighted in the	
nazara nating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Моа	lerate' Hazard Rating	'Significant' Hazard	l Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating	
	2.29%		4.55%	31.50%		9.58%	
Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	Surface Water Management Strategy to b Floor levels should be raised above the d resilience measures should be considered The Sequential Approach should be appli	ed within the develop be produced to show esign flood level, inc d for inclusion. ied to the layout of th	ment where possible, in ac how SuDS will be included cluding the Environment Ag ne site by locating the most	cordance with the NPPF and its p d to manage surface water runoff f ency's recommended additional fr	rom the site. eeboard require	guidance. All major development will requir ments where practicable. Flood resistance Sequential Approach should also be applie	
	the internal layout of buildings, in particula					· · ·	

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 (H	la): 57.714	Ex	isting Land Use: Brownfie	əld	Propo	sed Land Us
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floc	od Zone 2	Flood	I Zone 3	
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	23.6%		9.5%	66	5.9%	
Development lifetime	75 years					
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulnerab 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 storage; and not impede water flows and	nt the recently comp mine the true extent within the Functiona ater-compatible' sho	eted defences. These defen of the functional floodplain o I Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b uld be designed and constru	nces would likely redu onsite. Any developme ). Development which	ce the extent of flooding o ent classified as 'Less Vu i is classified as 'essentia	during a 1 in Inerable', 'Mo I infrastructu
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	: None.				
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Gillingham Reach) is	located along the no	ortheastern border of the site	Э.		
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 flo	oding from tidal so	ources during the defenced	d scenario for key re	eturn period events. Max	imum flood l
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
from tidal sources and surface water,	46.15% (5.02m AODN)	68.93% (	5.32m AODN)	82.54% (6	.06m AODN)	
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage	e of site at risk of fl	ooding from surface water	r based on the EA's	'Risk of Flooding from	Surface Wa
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Mediun	m' risk scenario		ʻl
	9.6%		3.8%			
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 s design standard of protection is 1 in 1000	Ū.	efences consist of a wall with	h an effective crest le	vel of between 4.60m AO	DN. The cur
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 to	cost in the region of f	£2,400,000 to upgrade ap	proximately
Flood Warning Area?	Yes					
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rati respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	ng Classification d	uring the design flood eve	nt (2115) (The domin	nant hazard rating on th	e subject si
THE REAL AND THE R	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating	
	2.10%		1.07%		25.16%	



#### Use: Non-Residential

Flood Zone 3b

~10.0% \*refer to text below

within the functional floodplain, the in 30 year return period event, and 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly cture' will be subject to the Exception of flood; result in no net loss of floodplain

#### l level on site shown in brackets.

in 1000-year return period event

66.51% (5.30m AODN)

/ater Map'

'Low' risk scenario

6.8%

urrent condition rating is unknown. The

ely 1550m of defences in order to protect

site has been highlighted in the

'Extreme' Hazard Rating

51.19%



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 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 Sequent 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	Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance 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 wh 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

ce. All major development will require a

where practicable. Flood resistance and

ntial Approach should also be applied to



HHH35							
Site Area (H	la): 57.440	E	sisting Land Use: Green	field	Propose	ed Land Us	
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floc	d Zone 2	Flood	Zone 3		
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	85.3%		5.3%	9.4	1%		
Development lifetime	75 years						
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulnerabl	e' classification will	be subject to the Exceptio	n Test.			
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site:	of the site: EA Recorded Flood datasets shows the surrounding area was affected from the sea in 1953 due to wa					
Watercourses/Rivers	The Hoo Flats are located approximately	965m south of the si	te.				
Geology	Bedrock: London Clay Formation - Clay an Superficial deposits: Head - Clay and Silt,	n - Clay and Silt / and Silt, River Terrace Deposits, 1 - Clay and Silt, Alluvium - Clay, Silt, Sand and Peat					
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	oding from tidal so	urces during the defend	ed scenario for key ret	urn period events. Maxin	າum flood le	
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 return	period event - 2115	1 in	
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	8.24% (5.41m AODN)		12.08% (6.0	)2m 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 Wate						
EA	'High' risk scenario	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario		ʻL	
	1.0%	0.4%		0.4%			
Description of Surface Water Flow	Under all modelled scenarios, water is sho	own to flow along pa	rts of the site, however, th	is is due to the presence	of a drainage ditches. Th	ere are als	
Paths	water flooding.						
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset s			ankment and wall with ar	n actual crest level of betw	/een 5.12m	
(inc. SoP):	condition rating of 3. The design standard	-	-				
High-Level Indication of Defence	Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to	-	fence wall, it is estimated	to cost in the region of £4	4,750,000 to upgrade app	oximately	
Costs Flood Warning Area?	the site for the lifetime of any developmen Yes	t.					
		<b>.</b>					
	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 domina	ant nazard rating on the	subject si	
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Significant' Hazard Rating			
	2.65%		2.41%		6.79%		
	The site is located in Flood Zones 2 and 3	, and therefore will ı	equire a detailed Flood R	isk Assessment.			
	SuDS should be considered to be included	d within the develop	ment where possible, in a	ccordance with the NPPF	and its planning practice	guidance.	
	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	Floor levels should be raised above the de	esign flood level, inc	luding the Environment Ag	gency's recommended ad	dditional freeboard require	ments whe	
Mitigation Measures	resilience measures should be considered	for inclusion.					
	The Sequential Approach should be applied	ed to the layout of th	e site by locating the mos	t vulnerable elements in	the lowest risk areas. The	Sequentia	
	the internal layout of buildings, in particula	ar 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						



#### Use: Non-Residential Flood Zone 3b 0.0% es overtopping the defences. level on site shown in brackets. in 1000-year return period event 7.18% (5.25m AODN) 'ater Map' 'Low' risk scenario 0.8% also a few localised areas of surface 2m and 7.10m AODN, and has a ly 3100m of defences in order to protect site has been highlighted in the 'Extreme' Hazard Rating 4.55% e. All major development will require a here practicable. Flood resistance and

tial Approach should also be applied to

ss and egress.



HHH36						
Site Area (Ha	a): 114.109	Ex	isting Land Use: Brownfi	eld	Proposed	Land Us
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floc	d Zone 2	Flood Zone 3		
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.1%	ŕ	0.5%	89.4%		
Development lifetime	75 years					
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulnerabl modelling study does not take into accoun further analysis is recommended to detern Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted v Test. Development that is classified as 'wa storage; and not impede water flows and r	It 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 3t uld be designed and constr	nces would likely reduce the extent onsite. Any development classified b). Development which is classified	of flooding durii as 'Less Vulnera as 'essential infi	ng a 1 in : able', 'Mo rastructur
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site:	EA Recorded Floor	d datasets shows the surro	unding area was affected from the s	sea in 1953 due	to waves
Watercourses/Rivers	The Hoo Flats and Slede Ooze are located	d along the southerr	border of the site.			
Geology	Bedrock: London Clay Formation - Clay a Superficial deposits: River Terrace Depos		Alluvium - Clay, Silt, Sand	and Peat		
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	oding from tidal so	urces during the defence	d scenario for key return period	events. Maximu	m flood le
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 ever	nt - 2115	1 in
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.91% (5.03m AODN)	18.29% (	5.40m AODN)	85.67% (6.03m AODN)		
based off mapping available from the	Percentage	of site at risk of fl	ooding from surface wate	r based on the EA's 'Risk of Floc	oding from Sur	face Wat
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	m' risk scenario		'L
	1.0%			0.4%		
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, water is sho surface water flooding.	own to flow along pa	rts of the site, however, this	s is due to the presence of a draina	ge ditches. The	re are als
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset s condition rating of 3. The design standard	-		nkment and wall with an actual cres	st level of betwe	en 5.12m
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to the site for the lifetime of any developmen	C C	fence wall, it is estimated to	o cost in the region of £2,450,000 to	upgrade appro	ximately
Flood Warning Area?	Yes					
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Ratir respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	ng Classification d	uring the design flood eve	ent (2115) (The dominant hazard i	rating on the s	ubject sit
nazara nating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Significant' Hazard I	Rating	
	3.75%		4.27%	40.30%		

#### Use: Non-Residential

Flood Zone 3b

~1.0% \*refer to text below

vithin the functional floodplain, the in 30 year return period event, and More Vulnerable' and 'Highly ture' will be subject to the Exception f flood; result in no net loss of floodplain

es overtopping the defences.

level on site shown in brackets.

in 1000-year return period event

18.29% (5.25m AODN)

ater Map'

'Low' risk scenario

0.8%

also numerous areas of localised

2m and 7.10m AODN, and has a

y 1600m of defences in order to protect

site has been highlighted in the

'Extreme' Hazard Rating

23.40%



	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
	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	Floor levels should be raised above the design flood level, including the Environment Agency's recommended additional freeboard requirements wh
Mitigation Measures	resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.
Milgator Measures	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
	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
	The EA should be consulted where development is proposed within 16m of a tidal waterbody or tidal defence infrastructure to obtain consent via a F

ce. All major development will require a

where practicable. Flood resistance and

ntial Approach should also be applied to

Medway Council Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment



#### A. Appendices

Appendix A.1 – Site Location Map

Medway Council Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment



Appendix A.1 – Site Location Map





	LEVEL 2 SITES	
	Medway Council	
	Strategic Flood Risk Assess	ment
	_	
	LEGEND	
	Medway Administr	ativo
	Boundary	auve
	Sites	
	DETAILS	
	The datasets used may have been designed viewed at a range of map scales, and therefore	
	map is not intended to be viewed at a site-s scale. The information presented is the best	pecific
	at the time of collation, but should not be co comprehensive.	
	Queries with regard to the administrative bo should be directed to the LPA.	undaries
	<b>NOTES</b> <ol> <li>This drawing contains Ordnance Survey of</li> </ol>	lata ©
	Crown copyright and database copyright 202 2. All dimensions are in metres unless other	25.
	stated 3. All heights are in metres Above Ordnance	
	Newlyn (mAODN) unless otherwise stated	
	This map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey with the permission of Ordnance Survey on bel	half of the
	controller of His Majesty's Stationery Office ( copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringe copyright and may lead to prosecution or	es Crown
	proceedings.	
		13
		2
	Medwa	11
		J
	COUNCIL	
	r	
	herringto	h
	nennigi	<u> </u>
	Por	r of ep
	Canterbury, London, Cambridge, Bristol	, Leeds
Onese Tower		
A State of S		
River		
	<b></b>	
	REV DESCRIPTION	DATE
	1 1st issue	18-06-2025
	Medway Council	
	Medway Council Strategic Flood Risk Asses	
1	SCALE     PROJECT No.     INITIALS       1:23290 @ A3     1866     AB	CHECKED BY AW
	Appendix A.1	



			-0
a)	2	5	V
SUL	3	0	2
JC	- 6	m Bac	109
T	No	01	(are













