

In partnership with:

Medway Council

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

Medway Council

Gun Wharf

Dock Road

Chatham

Kent

ME4 4TR



Canterbury Office

Unit 6&7 Barham Business Park Elham Valley Road Canterbury Kent CT4 6DQ Tel 01227 833855

Registered Office

7B Caxton House Broad Street Cambourne Cambridge CB23 6JN

www.epstrategies.co.uk

This report has been prepared by EPS 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.

© Environmental Protection Strategies Limited



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
2	1	Report updated in line with new modelling. Final report issued.	November 2025	АВ	SMB



Contents Page

1.	Sco	1	
2.	Def	inition of Assessment Criteria	3
	2.1.	Assessment Criteria	3
	2.2.	Table of Individual Sites	7
3.	Site	e Summary Tables	8
	3.1.	Medium Risk Areas	9
	3.2.	High Risk Areas	27
Α.	Арр	pendices	



1. Scope and Summary of Appraisal

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

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

Paragraph 178 of the NPPF 2024 reads;

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

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

A high-level application of Part B of the Exception Test has been carried out for all sites within Flood Zones 2 and 3, and for sites in any Flood Zone where over 5% of the gross site area is at 'high' risk of surface water flooding, and where over 40% of the gross area is at 'medium' risk of surface water flooding. In total, **50 sites** were taken forward for the application of the Exception Test Part B, with the breakdown of the sites as follows:

- 9 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.
- **3 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.
- **38 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.

Medway Council Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment



The document will also be used to assist developers in undertaking site-specific application of 'Part B' of the Exception Test.

Recommendations are made on the basis of the best available information at this time and in absence of detailed proposals or Site Investigation data. Therefore, the suitability of any proposals is subject to appropriate Flood Risk Assessments in the context of wider planning objectives.

www.epstrategies.co.uk Page 2



2. Definition of Assessment Criteria

2.1. Assessment Criteria

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In some instances, a site is shown to be located/partially located within the functional floodplain, where this is the case, an * is located next to the Flood Zone 3b percentage stated. Further guidance is included in the 'Exception Test Required' and 'Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures' sections.

In cases where less than ~10% of the site is shown to be located within the functional floodplain, the site is not considered to be wholly within Flood Zone 3b. Instead, it is recommended that for these sites the *Sequential Approach* is applied, and development within the area of site shown to



be within Flood Zone 3b should be avoided. This is listed as a recommendation within the 'Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures' section.

Development Lifetime – States the anticipated lifetime of the development. The NPPF and 'Flood and Coastal Change' Planning Practice Guidance states that residential development should be considered for a minimum of 100 years¹, 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.

www.epstrategies.co.uk Page 4

¹ Paragraph 031 of the NPPG (September 2025)



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

Table 2.1 - Flood risk vulnerability and flood zone incompatibility.²

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 (2024 – 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.

www.epstrategies.co.uk Page 5

² Taken from Table 2 of the NPPG (September 2025)



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

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

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

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

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

All estimates have been based on the information contained within 'Cost Estimation for Coastal Protection – Summary of Evidence – Report SC080039/R7' and 'Cost Estimation for fluvial defences – Summary of Evidence – Report SC080039/R2' previously provided by the EA. The estimates do not account for inflation since the documents were published in March 2015, and the cost for the individual sites do include 'double counting' of defence costs where multiple sites benefit from the same defences. All figures are broad estimates, based on data available at the time of writing, 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*³ – The hazard rating classification outputs, provided as part of the NKC Modelling Study (2024), have been analysed and the percentage of the site which falls within each classification has been listed. There are four hazard rating classifications, as defined in Table 2.2 below, and the dominant Hazard Rating has been coloured within each site summary table (in the corresponding hazard rating colour) to allow for ease of comparison between sites.

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

Table 2.2 – Classification of Hazard Rating Thresholds.

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

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

2.2. Table of Individual Sites

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

_

³ Taken from the DEFRA Hazard Rating Report



3. Site Summary Tables

3.1. Medium Risk Areas

AS2								
Site Area (l	На): 0.341	Ex	isting Land Use: Brownf	ield	Prop	osed Land Use: Residential		
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	Flood Zone 2 Flood Zone 3			Flood Zone 3b		
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	100.0%	0.0% 0.0%				0.0%		
Development lifetime	100 years							
Exception Test required?	The Exception Test is not required to be	The Exception Test is not required to be applied for any vulnerability classification.						
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	e: None.						
Watercourses/Rivers	There is a drainage ditch along the south	ern border.						
Geology		Bedrock: London Clay Formation - Clay and Silt Superficial deposits: Head - Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel						
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	ooding from tidal so	urces during the defend	ed scenario for key return pe	riod events. Maxi	mum flood level on site shown in brackets.		
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year return period event - 2100		1 in 200-year return period event - 2125		1 in 1000-year return period event		
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.0m AODN)	0.00% (0.0m AODN) 0.00% (0.0m AODN)				0.00% (0.0m AODN)		
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentag	e of site at risk of flo	oding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'					
	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	ium' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario		
	15.4%			4.3%		6.8%		
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	During all modelled scenarios, water is si	hown to accumulate o	onsite attributed to topogra	phic depressions				
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset standard of protection is 1 in 1000 years	•	efences consist of an emba	nkment with an effective crest	evel of 5.08m AO	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	iffected from the Rive	r Medway and the sea for	the lifetime of any development				
Flood Warning Area?	N/A							
	Percentage of site in each Hazard F	Rating Classification		event (2125) (The dominant l our – Refer to Table 2.2)	azard rating on	the subject site has been highlighted in the		
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mode	erate' Hazard Rating	'Significant' Haz	ard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating		
	0.00%		0.00%	0.00%)	0.00%		



Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures

The site is located is at risk of flooding from surface water. As a result, a FRA, is required to be undertaken.

SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance.

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

Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

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



CCB15								
Site Area (H	Ha): 0.337	Ex	xisting Land Use: Brownf	ield	Prop	osed Land Use: Residential		
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Floor	d Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b		
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	91.6%		8.4%	0	0.0%	0.0%		
Development lifetime	100 years							
Exception Test required?	The Exception Test is not required to be a	applied for developm	ent classified as 'more vul	nerable'.				
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	: None.						
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway is approximately 485n	n northwest of the sit	te.					
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation Superficial deposits: Head - Clay, Silt, Sa							
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	oding from tidal so	ources during the defence	ed scenario for key re	eturn period events. Maxii	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 period event - 2100		1 in 200-year retur	rn period event - 2125	1 in 1000-year return period event		
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.0m AODN)	33.19% (5.79m AODN) 36.77% (6.10n		5.10m AODN)	9.05% (4.92m AODN)			
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'							
	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	edium' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario		
	1.8%			0.5%		97.4%		
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	During the 'high' and 'medium' risk scenar surface water flow path.	rio, surface water is	shown to encroach onto th	e northern corner. Und	er the 'low' risk scenario, th	ne entire site is shown to be affected by a		
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset so current condition rating is unknown. The	_		and engineered high gr	round and has an actual cro	est level between 4.60m and 5.49m AODN. The		
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,152/m to the lifetime of any development.	raise an existing en	nbankment, it is estimated	to cost in the region of	£550,000 to upgrade the 4	50m of defences in order to protect the site for		
Flood Warning Area?	Yes							
	Percentage of site in each Hazard R	ating Classification		event (2125) (The do our – Refer to Table 2	_	the subject site has been highlighted in the		
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	lerate' Hazard Rating		cant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating		
	11.19%		12.89%		11.87%	0.00%		



Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures

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

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

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

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

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

Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

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



LW10									
Site Area (l	На): 0.310	Ex	isting Land Use: Brownf	ield	Proposed Land Use: Residential				
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Flood Zone 2		Flood Zone 3		Flood Zone 3b			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	100.0%	0.0%		0.0%		0.0%			
Development lifetime	100 years								
Exception Test required?	The Exception Test is not required to be a	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:	: None.							
Watercourses/Rivers	No watercourses/rivers are located within	close proximity to th	e site.						
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation Superficial deposits: Head - Clay, Silt, Sar	nd and Gravel							
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	oding from tidal so	urces during the defenc	ed scenario for key return period e	events. Maximu	ım flood level on site shown in brackets.			
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year return period event - 2100		1 in 200-year return period even	t - 2125	1 in 1000-year return period event			
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0	0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0.00m AODN)		0.00% (0.00m AODN)			
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'								
<u>-</u> A	'High' risk scenario	'High' risk scenario 'Medium' risk sc				'Low' risk scenario			
	7.7%			24.6%		46.9%			
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under the 'high' risk scenario, surface wat	ter is shown to accur	nulate within the north of t	he site. Under the 'medium' and 'low'	risk scenarios,	, there is a surface water flow path onsite.			
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset s	shows no existing de	fences nearby.						
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	N/A - There are no defences near to the s	ite and the site is pre	edicted to remain unaffect	ed from the River Medway for the life	time of develop	oment based on current data.			
Flood Warning Area?	No								
Horord Poting	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2125) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)								
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mode	erate' Hazard Rating	'Significant' Hazard F	Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating			
	0.00%		0.00%	0.00%		0.00%			
Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	The site is at risk of flooding from surface water. As a result, a FRA is required to be undertaken. SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will requestive water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site. Floor levels should be raised above the maximum depth of flooding from surface water, including an additional freeboard where practicable. Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.								



ннн6								
Site Area (F	la): 30.050	Ex	kisting Land Use: Greenf	ield	Prop	posed Land Use: Residential		
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood	Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b		
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	100.0%		0.0%	0	.0%	0.0%		
Development lifetime	100 years	00 years						
Exception Test required?	The Exception Test is not required to be	The Exception Test is not required to be applied for any vulnerability classification.						
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	ncidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site: None.						
Watercourses/Rivers	There are multiple drainage ditches onsit	e. The River Medway	(Upnor Reach) is located	approximately 920m s	outh of the site.			
Geology	Bedrock: London Clay Formation - Clay and Silt Superficial deposits: Head - Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel							
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	ooding from tidal so	ources during the defence	ed scenario for key re	turn period events. Max	imum flood level on site shown in brackets.		
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year retu	ırn period event - 2100	1 in 200-year retur	n period event - 2125	1 in 1000-year return period event		
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0	0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0.	00m AODN)	0.00% (0.00m AODN)		
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentag	e of site at risk of flo	ooding from surface wat	er based on the EA's	Risk of Flooding from	Surface Water Map'		
	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario			'Low' risk scenario		
	12.6%			3.6%		9.8%		
Description of Surface Water Flow			mulate within the southeas	tern corner of the site.	Also, due to multiple drain	nage ditches onsite, surface water is shown to		
Paths	accumulate under all modelled scenarios							
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	rating is unknown. The design standard of	_		nigh ground with an act	ual crest level between 4.	67m and 5.82m AODN. The current condition		
High-Level Indication of Defence	N/A - The site is predicted to remain unat	ffected from the River	r Medway and the sea for t	he lifetime of developm	nent based on current dat	a.		
Costs								
Flood Warning Area?	N/A							
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rati respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	_	uring the design flood ev	ent (2125) (The domir	nant hazard rating on th	e subject site has been highlighted in the		
	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mode	erate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	ant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating		
	0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	0.00%		
Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	SuDS should be considered to be included Surface Water Management Strategy to I Floor levels should be raised above the resistance and resilience measures. The LPA should be consulted prior to the	0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% The site is at risk of flooding from surface water and greater than 1ha. As a result, a FRA is required to be undertaken. SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require a Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site. Floor levels should be raised above the maximum depth of flooding from surface water, including an additional freeboard where practicable. Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion. The LPA should be consulted prior to the commencement of any works to obtain consent for any development proposed within 8m of any ordinary watercourse. Where the watercourse alls within the RSIDB area, the RSIDB should be consulted to obtain consent.						

www.epstrategies.co.uk Page 8



SR4								
Site Area (l	На): 6.290	Ex	isting Land Use: Greenf	ield	Propo	sed Land Use: Residential		
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	d Zone 2	Flood Zone 3		Flood Zone 3b		
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	100.0%		0.0%			0.0%		
Development lifetime	100 years							
Exception Test required?	The Exception Test is not required to be applied for any vulnerability classification.							
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site: None.						
Watercourses/Rivers	There is a drainage ditch along the northe	ern border.						
Geology		Bedrock: London Clay Formation - Clay and Silt Superficial deposits: No Superficial deposits						
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	ooding from tidal so	urces during the defenc	ed scenario for key return period e	events. Maxim	um flood level on site shown in brackets.		
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year return period event - 2100 1 in 200		1 in 200-year return period even	t - 2125	1 in 1000-year return period event		
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0	0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0.00m AODN)		0.00% (0.00m AODN)		
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage	e of site at risk of fl	ooding from surface wat	er based on the EA's 'Risk of Floo	ding from Su	rface Water Map'		
	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario			'Low' risk scenario		
	8.0%			1.1%		6.3%		
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, water is sh	own to accumulate in	n the south of the site. The	re are also small areas along the no	rthern and wes	stern borders.		
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset s	shows no existing de	fences nearby.					
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	N/A - There are no defences near to the s	site and the site is pro	edicted to remain unaffect	ed from the River Medway and the se	ea for the lifeti	me of any development.		
Flood Warning Area?	N/A							
11	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rati respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	ng Classification de	uring the design flood ev	ent (2125) (The dominant hazard r	ating on the s	subject site has been highlighted in the		
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Significant' Hazard F	Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating		
	0.00%		0.00%	0.00%		0.00%		



Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures

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

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

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

Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

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



CCB1									
Site Area (I	На): 0.232	Ex	cisting Land Use: Brownf	ield	Prop	posed Land Use: Residential			
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood Zone 3		Flood Zone 3b			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	100.0%		0.0%	0.0%		0.0%			
Development lifetime	100 years								
Exception Test required?	The Exception Test is not required to be	The Exception Test is not required to be applied for any vulnerability classification.							
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	ncidents within the site: None. Incidents 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 Formatio Superficial deposits: Head - Clay, Silt, Sa								
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	ooding from tidal so	ources during the defenc	ed scenario for key return pe	riod events. Max	imum flood level on site shown in brackets.			
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year retu	ırn period event - 2100	1 in 200-year return period	event - 2125	1 in 1000-year return period event			
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0	0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0.00m AODN)		0.00% (0.00m AODN)			
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'								
	'High' risk scenario	io 'Medium' risk scenario				'Low' risk scenario			
	20.1%			13.6%		32.3%			
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, surface wa	ater is shown to accu	mulate onsite.						
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset AODN. The current condition rating is un	•			h ground with an	actual crest level of between 4.60m and 5.49m			
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	N/A - The site is predicted to remain unat	ffected from the Rive	r Medway and the sea for	he lifetime of development bas	ed on current data	a.			
Flood Warning Area?	N/A								
Hanand Dating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rati respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	_	uring the design flood ev	ent (2125) (The dominant haz	ard rating on the	e subject site has been highlighted in the			
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Significant' Haz	ard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating			
	0.00%		0.00%	0.00%	6	0.00%			
Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	The site is at risk of flooding from surface water. As a result, a FRA is required to be undertaken. SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site. Floor levels should be raised above the maximum depth of flooding from surface water, including an additional freeboard where practicable. Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.								



RWB19									
Site Area (I	На): 1.567	Ex	cisting Land Use: Brown	ield	Pro	posed Land Use: Residential			
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood Zone 3		Flood Zone 3b			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	100.0%		0.0%	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 site	e: None.							
Watercourses/Rivers	River Medway approximately 120m east	of the site							
Geology		Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation – Chalk Superficial deposits: Alluvium - Clay, Silt, Sand and Peat, Head - Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel							
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	ooding from tidal so	ources during the defenc	ed scenario for key ret	turn period events. Max	ximum flood level on site shown in brackets.			
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year retu	ırn period event - 2100	1 in 200-year return	period event - 2125	1 in 1000-year return period event			
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0	0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0.00m AODN)		0.00% (0.00m AODN)			
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentag	e of site at risk of flo	ooding from surface wat	er based on the EA's 'I	Risk of Flooding from	Surface Water Map'			
	'High' risk scenario		'Medi	um' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario			
	47.2%			24.3%	21.2%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, surface wa	ater could accumulate	e on the majority of the site).	·				
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset unknown. The design standard of protect	_		ith an actual crest level o	of between 5.77m and 6	6.40m AODN. The current condition rating is			
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	N/A - The site is predicted to remain una	ffected from the River	r Medway and the sea for	the lifetime of developme	ent based on current da	ta.			
Flood Warning Area?	N/A								
Hannal Bating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rate respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	_	uring the design flood ev	rent (2125) (The domina	ant hazard rating on th	ne subject site has been highlighted in the			
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Significa	ant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating			
	0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	0.00%			
Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	The site is at risk of flooding from surface water and greater than 1ha. As a result, a FRA is required to be undertaken. SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require 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.								



REWW3									
Site Area (На): 0.341	Ex	isting Land Use: Brownf	ield	Proposed Land Use: Residential				
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Flood Zone 2		Flood Zone 3		Flood Zone 3b			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	100.0%	(0.0%	0.0%		0.0%			
Development lifetime	100 years				•				
Exception Test required?	The Exception Test is not required to be a	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.	cidents within the site: None.							
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway is located approximate	ely 720m northeast o	f the site.						
Geology	Superficial deposits: Head - Clay, Silt, Sar	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation – Chalk Superficial deposits: Head - Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel							
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	oding from tidal so	urces during the defenc	ed scenario for key return period e	events. Maximu	um flood level on site shown in brackets.			
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year return period event - 2100		1 in 200-year return period even	t - 2125	1 in 1000-year return period event			
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0	0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0.00m AODN)		0.00% (0.00m AODN)			
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'								
LA.	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario			'Low' risk scenario			
	17.8%	17.8% 11.9			11.9% 20.2%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, there is a si	urface water flow pa	th across the site.						
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset s unknown. The design standard of protection	· ·		ith an actual crest level of between 5	.77m and 5.79	m AODN. The current condition rating is			
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	N/A - The site is predicted to remain unaff	fected from the River	Medway and the sea for	he lifetime of development based on	current data				
Flood Warning Area?	No								
Howard Detina	Percentage of site in each Hazard Ratin respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	ng Classification du	uring the design flood ev	ent (2125) (The dominant hazard r	ating on the s	ubject site has been highlighted in the			
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mode	erate' Hazard Rating	'Significant' Hazard F	Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating			
	0.00%		0.00%	0.00%		0.00%			
Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	The site is at risk of flooding from surface water. As a result, a FRA is required to be undertaken. SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site. Floor levels should be raised above the maximum depth of flooding from surface water, including an additional freeboard where practicable. Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.								



SNF8									
Site Area (I	Ha): 0.264	Ex	isting Land Use: Brownf	ield	Propo	osed Land Use: Residential			
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood Zone 3		Flood Zone 3b			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	96.7%		3.1%	0.0%		0.0%			
Development lifetime	00 years								
Exception Test required?	The Exception Test is not required to be a	ne 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	ncidents within the site: None. ncidents within close proximity of the site: None.							
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Bridge Reach) is loca	he River Medway (Bridge Reach) is located approximately 185m southeast of the site.							
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation Superficial deposits: Head - Clay and Silt	dedrock: 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 pe	riod 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 retu	ırn period event - 2100	1 in 200-year return period	r return period event - 2125 1 in 1000-year return peri				
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	20.84% (5.81m AODN)	20.84% (6.10m A	(6.10m AODN) 12.83% (5.29m AODN				
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage	e of site at risk of fl	ooding from surface wat	er based on the EA's 'Risk o	Flooding from St	urface Water Map'			
	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario			'Low' risk scenario			
	0.0%			0.0%		0.0%			
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, the entire s	ite is shown to rema	in dry.						
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset so condition rating is unknown. The design s			nd natural high ground with an	actual crest level o	f between 4.05m and 4.10m AODN. The current			
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to the lifetime of any development.	raise an existing de	fence wall, it is estimated t	o cost in the region of £475,00) to upgrade the 30	00m of defences in order to protect the site for			
Flood Warning Area?	Yes								
	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2125) (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' Ha	ard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating			
	5.74%		11.30%	3.37%		0.00%			



Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures

The site is located in Flood Zones 1 and 2, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.

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

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

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

Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

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



SNF5										
Site Area (I	На): 0.353	Existi	ng Land Use: Mostly Gre	enfield	Proposed Land Use: Residential					
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Flood Zone 2		Flood Zone 3		Flood Zone 3b				
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	100.0%		0.0%	0.0%		0.0%				
Development lifetime	100 years	<u> </u>								
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 (Bridge Reach) is local	ated approximately 7	90m southeast of the site.							
Geology		Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation, Seaford Chalk Formation and Newhaven Chalk Formation (undifferentiated) – Chalk Superficial deposits: No Superficial deposits								
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	ooding from tidal so	ources during the defenc	ed scenario for key return period	events. Maxim	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 retu	ırn period event - 2100	1 in 200-year return period eve	ent - 2125	1 in 1000-year return period event				
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0	0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0.00m AODN)		0.00% (0.00m AODN)				
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentag	e of site at risk of flo	ooding from surface wat	er based on the EA's 'Risk of Flo	oding from Su	ırface Water Map'				
	'High' risk scenario	'High' risk scenario 'Medium' risk				'Low' risk scenario				
	11.9%			8.3%		18.6%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, surface wa	ater is shown to accui	mulate onsite.		•					
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset so condition rating is unknown. The design s	_			al crest level of	between 4.50m and 5.20m AODN. The curren				
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,152/m to the lifetime of any development	o raise an existing em	nbankment, it is estimated	to cost in the region of £475,000 to	upgrade the 40	00m of defences in order to protect the site for				
Flood Warning Area?	No									
Honord Poting	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rati respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	_	uring the design flood ev	ent (2125) (The dominant hazard	rating on the	subject site has been highlighted in the				
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Significant' Hazard	Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating				
	0.00%		0.00%	0.00%		0.00%				
Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	The site is at risk of flooding from surface water. As a result, a FRA is required to be undertaken. SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require a Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site. Floor levels should be raised above the maximum depth of flooding from surface water, including an additional freeboard where practicable. Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.									



CCB20									
Site Area (I	На): 0.498	Exis	sting Land Use: Brownf	ield	Propo	osed Land Use: Residential			
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Flood	Zone 2	Flood Z	one 3	Flood Zone 3b			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	94.1%	5.	9%	0.09	%	0.0%			
Development lifetime	100 years								
Exception Test required?	The Exception Test is not required to be	ne 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	cidents within the site: None. cidents 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 Formation – Chalk Superficial deposits: Head - Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel							
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	ooding from tidal sou	rces during the defence	ed scenario for key retu	rn 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	n period event - 2100	1 in 200-year return p	ar return period event - 2125 1 in 1000-year return period				
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	9.31% (5.7	79m AODN)	9.39% (6.09	m AODN)	0.00% (0.00m AODN)			
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage	e of site at risk of floo	oding from surface water	er based on the EA's 'Ri	isk of Flooding from Su	ırface Water Map'			
	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario			'Low' risk scenario			
	0.0%			0.0%		2.1%			
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under the 'high' and 'medium' risk scenar corner of the site.	io, the entire site is sho	own to remain dry. Under	the 'low' risk scenario, su	urface water could accur	nulate over a small portion of the northern			
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):				igh ground with an actua	I crest level of between 4	1.75m and 4.93m AODN. The current condition			
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,152/m to the lifetime of any development	Based on an average cost of £1,152/m to raise an existing embankment, it is estimated to cost in the region of £250,000 to upgrade the 200m of defences in order to protect the site for the lifetime of any development							
Flood Warning Area?	Yes								
Hannal Beting	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2125) (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	'Moder	rate' Hazard Rating	'Significan	nt' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating			
	0.12%		4.33%		4.89%	0.00%			



Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures

The site is located in Flood Zones 1 and 2, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.

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

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

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

Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

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



SNF17									
Site Area (I	Ha): 0.024	Ex	kisting Land Use: Brownf	ield	Prop	osed Land Use: Residential			
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood	I Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	94.4%		5.6%	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 development classified as 'more vulnerable'.							
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 (Bridge Reach) is loca	he River Medway (Bridge Reach) is located approximately 235m southeast of the site.							
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation Superficial deposits: Head - Clay and Silt	sedrock: 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 defenc	ed scenario for key re	eturn period events. Maxi	mum flood level on site shown in brackets.			
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year retu	urn period event - 2100	1 in 200-year retur	n period event - 2125	1 in 1000-year return period event			
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	71.71% ((5.77m AODN)	71.72% (6	.11m AODN)	0.00% (0.00m AODN)			
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage	e of site at risk of fl	ooding from surface wat	er based on the EA's	'Risk of Flooding from S	Surface Water Map'			
	'High' risk scenario		'Medit	ım' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario			
	3.7%			0.7%		0.0%			
Description of Surface Water Flow		o, surface water is s	shown to accumulate withir	a small area in the no	rth of the site. Under the 'l	ow' risk scenario, the extent does not increase			
Paths Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure	from the 'medium' risk scenario. The FA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset s	shows the existing de	efences consist of natural l	nigh ground and a wall	with an actual crest level	of between 4.50m and 5.20m AODN. The current			
(inc. SoP):	condition rating is unknown. The design s	_							
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,152/m to the lifetime of any development.	Based on an average cost of £1,152/m to raise an existing embankment, it is estimated to cost in the region of £300,000 to upgrade the 250m of defences in order to protect the site for the lifetime of any development.							
Flood Warning Area?	Yes								
	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2125) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the								
Hazard Rating	respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	'Maa	Jorato' Hazard Poting	(Circuitia	cant' Hazard Poting	'Extreme' Hazard Pating			
	'Low' Hazard Rating 0.00%	Mod	lerate' Hazard Rating	Signific	cant' Hazard Rating 0.00%	'Extreme' Hazard Rating			
	0.00%		29.88%		0.0076	0.00%			



Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures

The site is located in Flood Zones 1 and 2, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.

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

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

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

Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

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



FP25											
Site Area (Ha): 2.590	Ex	isting Land Use: Brownf	ield	Proposed Land Use: Residential						
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	d Zone 2	Flood Zone 3		Flood Zone 3b					
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	100.0%	(0.0%	0.0%		0.0%					
Development lifetime	100 years	0 years									
Exception Test required?	The Exception Test is not required to be a	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.									
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway is located approximate	ely 270m north of the	site.								
Geology	Superficial deposits: Head - Clay, Silt, Sar	edrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation – Chalk uperficial deposits: Head - Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel									
	Percentage of site at risk of floor	oding from tidal so	urces during the defenc	ed scenario for key return period e	events. Maximu	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 retu	rn period event - 2100	1 in 200-year return period even	t - 2125	1 in 1000-year return period event					
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0	.00m AODN)	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	(0.00m AODN) 0.00% (0.00m AODN)						
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage	of site at risk of flo	ooding from surface wat	er based on the EA's 'Risk of Floo	ding from Surf	face Water Map'					
	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario			'Low' risk scenario					
	17.5%			26.0%		16.8%					
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, surface wat	ter is shown to accur	nulate onsite. However, th	is is likely due to the lowered land fo	r the railway line	e.					
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset si current condition rating is unknown. The d	•	•		ctual crest level	of between 4.60m and 5.49m AODN. The					
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to the lifetime of any development	raise an existing def	ence wall, it is estimated t	o cost in the region of £550,000 to up	ograde the 350r	m of defences in order to protect the site for					
Flood Warning Area?	No										
Horord Poting	Percentage of site in each Hazard Ratin respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	ng Classification du	ıring the design flood ev	ent (2125) (The dominant hazard r	ating on the su	ubject site has been highlighted in the					
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mode	erate' Hazard Rating	'Significant' Hazard F	Rating	'Extreme' 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 guidance. All major development will require a Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site. Floor levels should be raised above the maximum depth of flooding from surface water, including an additional freeboard where practicable. Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.										



3.2. High Risk Areas

CHR14										
Site Area (F	Ha): 11.396	Ex	cisting Land Use: Brownf	ield	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'	36.7%		1.6%	61.8%		~63.9% *refer to text below				
Development lifetime	100 years				•					
Exception Test required?	uses should not be permitted within the F located within Flood Zone 3b. Developme	Development which has a 'more vulnerable' classification will be subject to the Exception Test. Any development classified as 'Less Vulnerable', 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly Vulnerable' ses should not be permitted within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b). Development which is classified as 'essential infrastructure' will be subject to the Exception Test if it is ocated within Flood Zone 3b. Development that is classified as 'water-compatible' should be designed and constructed to: remain operational and safe for users in times of flood; result in o net loss of floodplain storage; and not impede water flows and not increase flood risk elsewhere.								
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	cidents within the site: None. cidents within close proximity of the site: None.								
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Wickham Reach) is le	The River Medway (Wickham Reach) is located along the southern border.								
Geology		Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation - Chalk, New Pit Chalk Formation – Chalk Superficial deposits: Alluvium - Clay, Silt, Sand and Peat, Beach and Tidal Flat Deposits (undifferentiated) - Clay, Silt and Sand, Head - Clay and Silt								
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	ooding from tidal so	ources during the defenc	ed scenario for key return period	events. Maximu	ım flood level on site shown in brackets.				
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year retu	urn period event - 2100	1 in 200-year return period eve	nt - 2125	1 in 1000-year return period event				
from tidal sources and surface water,	65.70% (4.98m AODN)	69.76% ((5.94m AODN)	71.46% (6.30m AODN)	68.11% (5.48m AODN)				
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'									
LA	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario			'Low' risk scenario				
	0.3%			0.3%		19.1%				
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 the 'low' risk	scenario, surfa	ce water could accumulate in the northeast				
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset s 5.21m AODN. The current condition rating	_		•		es have an actual crest level between 3.58 -				
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	nbankment, it is estimated	to cost in the region of £1,500,000 t	o upgrade the 1	300m of defences in order to protect the site				
Flood Warning Area?	Yes									
U 1 P	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2125) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)									
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	lerate' Hazard Rating	'Significant' Hazard	Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating				
	2.47%		3.70%	11.49%		53.08%				



Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures

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

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

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

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

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

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



ннн32									
Site Area (I	На): 0.787	Ex	kisting Land Use: Brownf	ield		Proposed Land Use: Res	sidential		
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood	I Zone 3	Flo	ood Zone 3b		
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.0%		0.0%	10	0.0%		0.0%		
Development lifetime	100 years		,			•			
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulneral	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	ncidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site: EA Recorded Flood datasets shows the site was affected from the sea in 1953 due to waves overtopping the defences.							
Watercourses/Rivers	The Hoo Flats are located approximately	490m south of the s	ite.						
Geology	Bedrock: London Clay Formation - Clay a Superficial deposits: River Terrace Depo								
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	ooding from tidal so	ources during the defence	ed scenario for key re	turn period events.	Maximum flood level on sit	te 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 - 2100	1 in 200-year retur	n period event - 2125	1 in 1000-yea	ar return period event		
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	91.23% ((5.83m AODN)	91.23% (6	.12m AODN)	86.31%	(5.39m AODN)		
based off mapping available from the	Percentag	e of site at risk of fl	ooding from surface wat	er based on the EA's	'Risk of Flooding fro	m Surface Water Map'			
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	ım' risk scenario		'Low' risk s	'Low' risk scenario		
	0.0%			0.0%).0%		6		
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 emba	ankment with an effecti	ve crest level of 5.05i	n AODN, and has a condi	tion rating of 3. The design		
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,152/m to for the lifetime of any development.	o raise an existing en	nbankment, it is estimated	to cost in the region of	£1,400,000 to upgrad	e the 1200m of defences	in order to protect the site		
Flood Warning Area?	Yes								
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rati respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	_	uring the design flood ev	ent (2125) (The domin	nant hazard rating o	n the subject site has be	een highlighted in the		
	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	lerate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating	'Extre	me' Hazard Rating		
	6.08%		13.27%		53.51%		18.07%		
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 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.								



HHH12									
Site Area (H	a): 131.268	Existi	ng Land Use: Mostly Gre	enfield	Prop	posed Land Use: Residential			
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	ood Zone 2 Flood		Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	98.0%		0.6%	1.	.4%	~0.3% *refer to text below			
Development lifetime	100 years								
Exception Test required?	uses should not be permitted within the F located within Flood Zone 3b Developm	Development which has a 'more vulnerable' classification will be subject to the Exception Test. Any development classified as 'Less Vulnerable', 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly Vulnerable' ses should not be permitted within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b). Development which is classified as 'essential infrastructure' will be subject to the Exception Test if it is ocated within Flood Zone 3b. Development that is classified as 'water-compatible' should be designed and constructed to: remain operational and safe for users in times of flood; result no net loss of floodplain storage; and not impede water flows and not increase flood risk elsewhere.							
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	cidents within the site: None. cidents within close proximity of the site: EA Recorded Flood datasets shows the site was affected from the sea in 1953 due to waves overtopping the defences.							
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Upnor Reach and Sh	The River Medway (Upnor Reach and Short Reach) is located along the southern border 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	ooding from tidal so	ources during the defenc	ed scenario for key re	turn period events. Max	imum flood level on site shown in brackets.			
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year retu	ırn period event - 2100	1 in 200-year retur	n period event - 2125	1 in 1000-year return period event			
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.27% (4.93m AODN)	1.06% (5.72m AODN)	3.86% (6.	06m AODN)	0.27% (5.34m AODN)			
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'								
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario			'Low' risk scenario			
	0.9%			0.7%		1.3%			
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	During all modelled scenarios, there are	localised areas of su	rface water flooding across	s the site attributed to lo	ocalised depressions.				
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):		The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset shows the existing defences consist of natural and engineered high ground and has an effective crest level between 4.07m and 6.00m AODN. The current condition rating is unknow. The design standard of protection is 1 in 10, 1 in 200 and 1 in 1000 years.							
High-Level Indication of Defence	Based on an average cost of £1,152/m to	raise an existing en	nbankment, it is estimated	to cost in the region of	£3,150,000 to upgrade th	e 2700m 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 (2125) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)								
Hazaru Katiliy	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	lerate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	ant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating			
	0.62%		0.84%		1.96%	0.43%			



Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures

The site is located in Flood Zones 1,2 and 3, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.

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

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

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

Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

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

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



SNF41										
Site Area (l	На): 4.972	Ex	cisting Land Use: Brown	field	Pro	posed Land Use: Residential				
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood	Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b				
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	5.2%		2.5%	92	2.3%	~13.4% *refer to text below				
Development lifetime	100 years									
Exception Test required?	uses should not be permitted within the F located within Flood Zone 3b Developm	Development which has a 'more vulnerable' classification will be subject to the Exception Test. Any development classified as 'Less Vulnerable', 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly Vulnerable' ses should not be permitted within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b). Development which is classified as 'essential infrastructure' will be subject to the Exception Test if it is ocated within Flood Zone 3b. Development that is classified as 'water-compatible' should be designed and constructed to: remain operational and safe for users in times of flood; result no net loss of floodplain storage; and not impede water flows and not increase flood risk elsewhere.								
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	cidents within the site: None. cidents within close proximity of the site: None.								
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Limehouse Reach) is	The River Medway (Limehouse Reach) is located along the southeastern border of the site.								
Geology		Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation, Seaford Chalk Formation and Newhaven Chalk Formation (undifferentiated) - Chalk, Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation – Chalk Superficial deposits: Head - Clay and Silt, Alluvium - Clay, Silt, Sand and Peat								
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	ooding from tidal so	ources during the defenc	ed scenario for key re	eturn period events. Max	ximum flood level on site shown in brackets.				
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year retu	urn period event - 2100	1 in 200-year retur	n period event - 2125	1 in 1000-year return period event				
from tidal sources and surface water,	34.70% (5.07m AODN)	87.26% ((6.02m AODN)	99.75% (6	.21m AODN)	65.26% (5.58m AODN)				
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'									
LA	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario			'Low' risk scenario				
	2.4%			2.7%		10.1%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	During all modelled scenarios, there are	ocalised areas of su	rface water flooding across	s the site attributed to lo	ocalised depressions.					
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset condition rating of 3. The design standard	_			all with an actual crest lev	el of 3.75m and 5.50m AODN, and has a				
High-Level Indication of Defence 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 £925,000 to upgrade the 600m of defences in order to protect the site for the lifetime of any development.									
Flood Warning Area?	Yes									
Hazard Pating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2125) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)									
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	lerate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating				
	14.67%		16.22%		45.34%	23.65%				



The site is located in Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.

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

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

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

Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

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

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



SNF35											
Site Area (I	На): 2.649	Ex	cisting Land Use: Brown	field	Prop	posed Land Use: Residential					
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood	I Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b					
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.05%	(0.05%	99	.90%	~16.2% *refer to text below					
Development lifetime	100 years										
Exception Test required?	uses should not be permitted within the Flocated within Flood Zone 3b. Developme	evelopment which has a 'more vulnerable' classification will be subject to the Exception Test. Any development classified as 'Less Vulnerable', 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly Vulnerable' ses should not be permitted within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b). Development which is classified as 'essential infrastructure' will be subject to the Exception Test if it is cated within Flood Zone 3b. Development that is classified as 'water-compatible' should be designed and constructed to: remain operational and safe for users in times of flood; result in net loss of floodplain storage; and not impede water flows and not increase flood risk elsewhere.									
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None.	dents within the site: None.									
	Incidents within close proximity of the site										
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Bridge Reach) is loca	e River Medway (Bridge Reach) is located approximately 25m southeast of the site.									
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation - Chalk									
	Superficial deposits: Alluvium - Clay, Silt,	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 return period event - 2100 1 in 200-year return period event - 2125 1 in 1000-year return									
from tidal sources and surface water,	73.85% (4.64m AODN)	78.24% (5.89m AODN)	97.73% (6	.15m AODN)	76.71% (5.42m AODN)					
based off mapping available from the	Percentag	e of site at risk of fl	ooding from surface wat	er based on the EA's	'Risk of Flooding from S	Surface Water Map'					
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Medi	um' risk scenario	isk scenario 'Low' risk scenario						
	0.0%			0.4%		15.4%					
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	During all modelled scenarios, there are	ocalised areas of su	rface water flooding across	s the site attributed to lo	ocalised depressions.						
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset condition rating of 3. The design standard	_			ıll with an actual crest leve	el of 3.75m and 5.50m AODN, and has a					
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to the lifetime of any development.	raise an existing de	fence wall, it is estimated t	to cost in the region of £	£925,000 to upgrade the 6	600m of defences in order to protect the site for					
Flood Warning Area?	Yes										
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2125) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)										
- Inamed Hutting	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating					
	17.54%		7.55%		29.25%	43.02%					



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

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

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

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

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



SMI6										
Site Area (F	ła): 57.714	Ex	kisting Land Use: Brownf	ield	Pro	pposed Land Use: Residential				
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood	d Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b				
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	20.9%		10.0%	69	9.1%	~28.2% *refer to text below				
Development lifetime	100 years									
Exception Test required?	uses should not be permitted within the Flocated within Flood Zone 3b. Developme	evelopment which has a 'more vulnerable' classification will be subject to the Exception Test. Any development classified as 'Less Vulnerable', 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly Vulnerable' es should not be permitted within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b). Development which is classified as 'essential infrastructure' will be subject to the Exception Test if it is cated within Flood Zone 3b. Development that is classified as 'water-compatible' should be designed and constructed to: remain operational and safe for users in times of flood; result in net loss of floodplain storage; and not impede water flows and not increase flood risk elsewhere.								
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	dents within the site: None. dents within close proximity of the site: None.								
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Gillingham Reach) is	e River Medway (Gillingham Reach) is located along the northeastern border of the site.								
Geology		edrock: Thanet Formation - Sand, Silt and Clay, Seaford Chalk Formation - Chalk superficial deposits: Alluvium - Clay, Silt, Sand and Peat								
	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from tidal sources during the defenced scenario for key return period events. Maximum flood level on site shown in brackets.									
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year ret	urn period event - 2100	1 in 200-year retur	n period event - 2125	1 in 1000-year return period event				
from tidal sources and surface water,	38.49% (5.06m AODN)	65.63%	(5.81m AODN)	81.41% (6	5.32m AODN)	44.05% (5.42m AODN)				
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'									
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	um' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario				
	3.9%			3.8%		12.5%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, there are r	numerous localised a	reas of surface water onsit	e attributed to localised	d depressions.					
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset design standard of protection is 1 in 1000	_	efences consist of a wall w	ith an effective crest le	vel of between 4.60m A	DDN. The current condition rating is unknown. The				
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to the site for the lifetime of any development	_	fence wall, it is estimated t	to cost in the region of	£2,400,000 to upgrade a	pproximately 1550m of defences in order to protect				
Flood Warning Area?	Yes									
Hozord Bating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2125) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)									
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	lerate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating				
	6.90%		5.66%		29.34%	38.87%				



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

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

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

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

Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

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

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



FP11										
Site Area (F	la): 57.714	Ex	cisting Land Use: Brownf	ïeld	Proposed Land Use: Residential					
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood	d Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b				
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	52.5%		6.4%	4	1.1%	~23.1% *refer to text below				
Development lifetime	100 years									
Exception Test required?	Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted Test if it is located within Flood Zone 3b.	evelopment which has a 'more vulnerable' classification will be subject to the Exception Test. * Any development classified as 'Less Vulnerable', 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly ulnerable' uses should not be permitted within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b). Development which is classified as 'essential infrastructure' will be subject to the Exception est if it is located within Flood Zone 3b. Development that is classified as 'water-compatible' should be designed and constructed to: remain operational and safe for users in times of cod; result in no net loss of floodplain storage; and not impede water flows and not increase flood risk elsewhere.								
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	dents within the site: None. dents within close proximity of the site: None.								
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway is located along the n	e River Medway is located along the northern border of the site.								
Geology	edrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation - Chalk uperficial 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 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 - 2100 1 in 200-year return period event - 2125 1 in 1000-year return period event					1 in 1000-year return period event				
from tidal sources and surface water,	47.68% (4.99m AODN)	72.20% ((5.80m AODN)	79.64% (6	3.13m AODN)	56.23% (5.33m 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				
	5.1%			7.0%		9.5%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, surface was shown to accumulate within the centre of		mulate in the northern corr	ner of the site. Under th	ne 'medium' and 'low' scer	narios, there is a localised area of surface water				
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset 5.49m AODN. The current condition ratin	_				with an actual crest level between 4.14m and				
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to the lifetime of any development.	raise an existing de	fence wall, it is estimated t	o cost in the region of	£400,000 to upgrade the	250m of defences in order to protect the site for				
Flood Warning Area?	Yes									
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rate respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	_	uring the design flood ev	rent (2125) (The domi	nant hazard rating on th	e subject site has been highlighted in the				
	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating				
	13.72%		17.88%		39.36%	8.19%				



The site is located in Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.

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

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

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

Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

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

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



AS28										
Site Area (F	la): 57.714	Ex	isting Land Use: Greenf	ield	Prop	posed Land Use: Residential				
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	d Zone 2	Flood	d Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b				
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	62.17%	6	5.55%	31	.28%	0.0%				
Development lifetime	100 years									
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulneral	ole' classification will b	pe subject to the Exception	n Test.						
Flood History	Incidents within the site: EA Recorded FI Incidents within close proximity of the site					•				
Watercourses/Rivers	The coastline is located approximately 23	coastline 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 brackets.									
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year return period event - 2100		1 in 200-year retur	n period event - 2125	1 in 1000-year return period event				
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.0% (0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0	.00m AODN)	0.00% (0.	00m AODN)	0.00% (0.00m AODN)				
based off mapping available from the	Percentag	e of site at risk of flo	ooding from surface wat	er based on the EA's	'Risk of Flooding from S	Surface Water Map'				
EA	'High' risk scenario	'High' risk scenario 'Medium' risk scenario				'Low' risk scenario				
	2.0%			0.5%		2.0%				
Description of Surface Water Flow	Under all modelled scenarios, surface wa	ater is shown to accur	nulate in the southern cor	ner of the site.						
Paths Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset protection is 1 in 1000 years.	shows the existing de	fences consist of a wall w	ith an effective crest le	vel of 5.70m AODN, and I	nas a condition rating of 3. The design standard of				
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 def	ence wall, it is estimated t	o cost in the region of f	£625,000 to upgrade the 4	400m of defences in order to protect the site for				
Flood Warning Area?	Yes									
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2125) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)									
nazaru Kauny	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mode	erate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' 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.

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

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

Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

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



CCB27								
Site Area (l	На): 0.062	Ex	cisting Land Use: Brownf	ïeld	Proposed Land Use: Residential			
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood	I Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b		
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.00%	(0.35%	99	.65%	0.0%		
Development lifetime	100 years							
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulnerable	e' classification will	be subject to the Exception	n 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 is located approximately	y 625m northwest	of the site.					
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation - Superficial deposits: Head - Clay, Silt, Sand							
	Percentage of site at risk of floo	ding from tidal so	ources during the defence	ed scenario for key re	turn 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 retu	ırn period event - 2100	1 in 200-year retur	n period event - 212	1 in 1000-year return period event		
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	100.00%	(5.79m AODN)	100.00% (6	6.09m AODN)	100.00% (4.92m 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		
	76.5%		20.2%			3.3%		
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under the 'high' risk scenario, surface wate increase slightly.	er is shown to accu	mulate on the vast majority	of the site. Under the '	medium' and 'low' r	risk scenario, the surface water extent is shown to		
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure		nows the existing de	efences consist of natural h	nigh ground with an act	ual crest level of 4.7	75m AODN. The current condition rating is unknown.		
(inc. SoP):	The design standard of protection is 1 in 10	00 years.						
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,152/m to rethe lifetime of any development.	aise an existing em	nbankment, it is estimated	to cost in the region of	£350,000 to upgrad	de the 300m of defences in order to protect the site for		
Flood Warning Area?	Yes							
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	g Classification d	uring the design flood ev	rent (2125) (The domin	nant hazard rating	on the subject site has been highlighted in the		
Tidzara Tatinig	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating		
	0.00%		0.00%		65.81%	34.19%		
Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	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. 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.							



GN6										
Site Area (I	На): 3.860	Ex	kisting Land Use: Brown	field	Prop	osed Land Use: Residential				
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood Zone 3		Flood Zone 3b				
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	30.5%		14.4%	55.1%		~15.5% *refer to text below				
Development lifetime	100 years									
Exception Test required?	uses should not be permitted within the F	unctional Floodplain ent that is classified a	(Flood Zone 3b). Develop as 'water-compatible' shou	ment which is classified as 'esse d be designed and constructed t	ntial infrastructur	erable', 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly Vulnerable' e' will be subject to the Exception Test if it is ional and safe for users in times of flood; result in				
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	sidents within the site: None. sidents within close proximity of the site: None.								
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Gillingham Reach) is	e River Medway (Gillingham Reach) is located along the northern border of the site.								
Geology	edrock: Thanet Formation - Sand, Silt and Clay uperficial deposits: Alluvium - Clay, Silt, Sand and Peat, Beach and Tidal Flat Deposits (undifferentiated) - Clay, Silt and Sand									
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	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	urn period event - 2100	1 in 200-year return period e	vent - 2125	1 in 1000-year return period event				
from tidal sources and surface water,	55.56% (4.94m AODN)	87.58% ((5.73m AODN)	93.30% (6.12m AOI	DN)	73.58% (5.38m 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	um' risk scenario	'Low' risk scenario					
	8.0%			1.1%		6.3%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, surface wa	iter is shown to accu	mulate onsite.							
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset standard of protection is 1 in 200 years.	shows the existing do	efences consist of a wall w	ith an actual crest level of 5.38m	AODN. The curr	rent condition rating is unknown. The design				
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	to cost in the region of £625,000	o upgrade the 4	00m of defences in order to protect the site for				
Flood Warning Area?	Yes									
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2115) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)									
nazara naung	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	lerate' Hazard Rating	'Significant' Haza	rd Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating				
	9.11%		9.11%	65.24%		9.28%				



The site is located in Flood Zones 1, 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.

Required Actions / Recommended 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 Approach should also be applied to the internal layout of buildings, in particular where floor levels cannot be raised.

Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion.

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

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



SR49									
Site Area (l	На): 0.235	Ex	isting Land Use: Brownf	ield	Propos	ed Land Use: Residential			
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	nd Zone 2	Flood Zone 3		Flood Zone 3b			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	44.8%	•	16.5%	38.7%		0.0%			
Development lifetime	100 years								
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulnerate	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	ncidents within the site: None.							
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Upnor Reach) is local	e River Medway (Upnor Reach) is located approximately 12m southeast of the site.							
Geology		edrock: Lambeth Group - Sand, Silt and Clay uperficial deposits: No Superficial deposits							
Percentage of site at risk of flooding from tidal sources during the defenced scenario for key return period events. Maximum flood level on site shown in bro									
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year return period event - 2100		1 in 200-year return period ever	nt - 2125	1 in 1000-year return period event			
from tidal sources and surface water,	64.58% (4.97m AODN)	74.22% (5.73m AODN)	82.76% (6.04m AODN)		69.23% (5.44m AODN)			
based off mapping available from the	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'								
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	ım' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario			
	17.4%		9.1%			11.2%			
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, water is sh	own to accumulate a	long the southeastern bor	der of the site.	•				
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset so condition rating is unknown. The design s	_		nigh ground and a wall with an actua	al crest level of b	petween 5.39m and 6.24m AODN. The current			
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to the lifetime of any development.	raise an existing de	fence wall, it is estimated t	o cost in the region of £250,000 to u	pgrade the 150	m of defences in order to protect the site for			
Flood Warning Area?	Yes								
Hazard Patina	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2125) (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' Hazard	Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating			
	11.24%		18.96%	45.53%		8.46%			



The site is located in Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.

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

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

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

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

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



SNF15										
Site Area (На): 2.368	Ex	kisting Land Use: Brownf	ield		Propose	ed Land Use: Residential			
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood	od Zone 3		Flood Zone 3b			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	36.9%		7.2%	55	5.9%		~36.9% *refer to text below			
Development lifetime	100 years					•				
Exception Test required?	uses should not be permitted within the F located within Flood Zone 3b. Developme	evelopment which has a 'more vulnerable' classification will be subject to the Exception Test. Any development classified as 'Less Vulnerable', 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly Vulnerable' es should not be permitted within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b). Development which is classified as 'essential infrastructure' will be subject to the Exception Test if it is cated within Flood Zone 3b. Development that is classified as 'water-compatible' should be designed and constructed to: remain operational and safe for users in times of flood; result in net loss of floodplain storage; and not impede water flows and not increase flood risk elsewhere.								
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	dents within the site: None. dents within close proximity of the site: None.								
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Bridge Reach) is local	River Medway (Bridge Reach) is located approximately 155m southeast of the site.								
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation Superficial deposits: Head - Clay and Silt	edrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation, Seaford Chalk Formation and Newhaven Chalk Formation (undifferentiated) - Chalk uperficial deposits: Head - Clay and Silt								
	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from tidal sources during the defenced scenario for key return period events. Maximum flood level on site shown in brackets.									
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year retu	urn period event - 2100	1 in 200-year retur	n period event - 21	25	1 in 1000-year return period event			
from tidal sources and surface water,	53.58% (4.62m AODN)	69.77% ((5.95m AODN)	72.94% (6	.27m AODN)		65.18% (5.30m 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			
	28.5%			11.0%			15.4%			
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, surface wa	ter is shown to accu	mulate across the souther	n portion of the site.						
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset so condition rating is unknown. The design s	_		-	with an actual crest	t level of be	etween 4.50m and 5.20m AODN. The current			
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to the lifetime of any development.	raise an existing de	fence wall, it is estimated t	to cost in the region of £	£1,125,000 to upgra	ade the 700	Om of defences in order to protect the site for			
Flood Warning Area?	Yes									
Hazard Patina	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2125) (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	'Moo	lerate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	ant' Hazard Rating	7	'Extreme' Hazard Rating			
	4.00%		6.38%		22.01%		40.34%			



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

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

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

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

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



SNF23							
Site Area (На): 0.059	Ex	isting Land Use: Brownf	ield	Pro	posed Land Use: Residential	
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood	I Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b	
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.0%	1	0.0%	10	0.0%	0.0%	
Development lifetime	100 years						
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulneral	ole' classification will l	be subject to the Exception	n Test.			
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	e: None.					
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Bridge Reach and Li	e River Medway (Bridge Reach and Limehouse Reach) is located approximately 235m southeast of the site.					
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formatio Superficial deposits: Head - Clay and Silt	drock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation, Seaford Chalk Formation and Newhaven Chalk Formation (undifferentiated) - Chalk perficial deposits: Head - Clay and Silt					
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	ooding from tidal so	urces during the defence	ed scenario for key re	turn period events. Max	imum flood level on site shown in brackets.	
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year retu	ırn period event - 2100	1 in 200-year retur	n period event - 2125	1 in 1000-year return period event	
from tidal sources and surface water,	42.00% (4.42m AODN)	100.00%	(5.77m AODN)	100.00% (6	6.10m AODN)	100.00% (5.28m AODN)	
based off mapping available from the	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'						
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	ım' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario	
	0.0%			0.0%		0.0%	
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, the entire	site is shown to rema	in dry.				
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset	shows the existing de	efences consist of natural h	nigh ground and a wall	with an actual crest level	of between 4.50m and 5.20m AODN. The current	
(inc. SoP):	condition rating is unknown. The design	standard of protection	n is 1 in 50 and 1 in 200 ye	ars.			
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 def	fence wall, it is estimated to	o cost in the region of £	£400,000 to upgrade the	250m of defences in order to protect the site for	
Flood Warning Area?	Yes						
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rate respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	_	uring the design flood ev	ent (2125) (The domir	nant hazard rating on th	e subject site has been highlighted in the	
	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mode	erate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating	
	0.00%		0.00%		100.00%	0.00%	
Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	Surface Water Management Strategy to Floor levels should be raised above the cresilience measures should be considered.	be produced to show design flood level, included for inclusion. lied to the layout of the	ment where possible, in according to the Environment Agree site by locating the most cannot be raised.	ccordance with the NPF d to manage surface wa ency's recommended a vulnerable elements in	ater runoff from the site. additional freeboard requi	re guidance. All major development will require a frements where practicable. Flood resistance and the Sequential Approach should also be applied to safe access and egress.	



SNF32										
Site Area (l	На): 0.025	Existing Land Use: Brown	field	Propose	ed Land Use: Residential					
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Flood Zone 2	Flood Zone 3		Flood Zone 3b					
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	66.7%	0.0%	33.3%		0.0%					
Development lifetime	100 years			•						
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulnerab	evelopment which has a 'more vulnerable' classification will be subject to the Exception Test.								
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	acidents within the site: None. acidents within close proximity of the site: None.								
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Limehouse Reach) is	e River Medway (Limehouse Reach) is located approximately 390m southeast of the site.								
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation Superficial deposits: Head - Clay and Silt	edrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation, Seaford Chalk Formation and Newhaven Chalk Formation (undifferentiated) - Chalk uperficial deposits: Head - Clay and Silt								
	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from tidal sources during the defenced scenario for key return period events. Maximum flood level on site shown in brackets.									
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year return period event - 2100	9-year return period event - 2100 1 in 200-year return period event - 2125							
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	100.00% (5.77m AODN)	100.00% (6.12m AODN)		98.68% (5.05m AODN)					
based off mapping available from the	Percentage	of site at risk of flooding from surface wa	ter based on the EA's 'Risk of Floo	ding from Surfa	ace Water Map'					
EA	'High' risk scenario	'Med	ium' risk scenario	'Low' risk scenario						
	60.7%		1.8%		3.4%					
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under the 'high' scenario, surface water is increase slightly.	shown to accumulate in the northern portion	of the site. Under the 'medium' and 'k	ow' risk scenario	o, the surface water extent is shown to					
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset s condition rating is 4. The design standard	hows the existing defences consist of natural of protection is 1 in 10 and 1 in 20 years.	high 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 Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to the lifetime of any development.	raise an existing defence wall, it is estimated	to cost in the region of £250,000 to up	ograde the 150m	n of defences in order to protect the site for					
Flood Warning Area?	Yes									
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2125) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)									
FIAZATU KALIIIY	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Moderate' Hazard Rating	'Significant' Hazard F	Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating					
	1.29%	30.21%	68.50%		0.00%					



The site is located in Flood Zones 1 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.



CCB21							
Site Area (I	На): 0.035	Existing Land Use: Brownfield			Proposed Land Use: Residential		
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood	I Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b	
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.0%	9	98.7%	1	.3%	0.0%	
Development lifetime	100 years						
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulneral	ble' classification will l	be subject to the Exception	n Test.			
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	ncidents within the site: None. ncidents within close proximity of the site: None.					
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway is located approximate	tely 575m northwest of	of the site.				
Geology		edrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation - Chalk uperficial deposits: Head - Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel					
	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from tidal sources during the defenced scenario for key return period events. Maximum flood level on site shown in brackets.						
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year retu	ırn period event - 2100	1 in 200-year retur	n period event - 2125	1 in 1000-year return period event	
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	100.00%	(5.79m AODN)	100.00% (6	6.09m AODN)	48.51% (4.92m AODN)	
based off mapping available from the	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'						
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	ım' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario	
	0.0%			0.0%		99.2%	
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under the 'high' and 'medium' risk scena	rio, the entire site is s	shown to remain dry. Unde	r the 'low' risk scenario,	, surface water could acc	umulate across the entire site.	
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset The design standard of protection is 1 in		efences consist of natural h	nigh ground with an act	ual crest level of 4.75m A	ODN. The current condition rating is unknown.	
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,152/m to the lifetime of any development.	o raise an existing em	nbankment, it is estimated	to cost in the region of	£250,000 to upgrade the	200m of defences in order to protect the site for	
Flood Warning Area?	Yes						
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rate respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	_	uring the design flood ev	ent (2125) (The domir	nant hazard rating on th	e subject site has been highlighted in the	
	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating	
	0.00%		0.00%		100.00%	0.00%	
Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	The site is located in Flood Zones 2 and 3, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment. SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require 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 ar 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 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.						



CCB24							
Site Area (На): 0.021	Ex	cisting Land Use: Brownf	ield	Р	roposed Land Use: Residential	
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood	I Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b	
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.0%		3.1%	96	5.9%	0.0%	
Development lifetime	100 years						
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulnerate	ole' classification will	be subject to the Exception	n Test.			
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	e: None.					
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway is located approximat	he River Medway is located approximately 615m 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 flo	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	urn period event - 2100	1 in 200-year retur	n period event - 2125	1 in 1000-year return period event	
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (4.48m AODN)	100.00%	(5.79m AODN)	100.00% (6	6.09m AODN)	100.00% (4.92m AODN)	
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'						
EA	'High' risk scenario	'High' risk scenario				'Low' risk scenario	
	100.0%			0.0%		0.0%	
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, surface wa	ater is shown to accu	mulate on the entire site.				
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure			efences consist of natural I	nigh ground with an act	ual crest level of 4.75r	n AODN. The current condition rating is unknown.	
(inc. SoP):	The design standard of protection is 1 in						
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,152/m to the lifetime of any development.	o raise an existing en	nbankment, it is estimated	to cost in the region of	£250,000 to upgrade t	he 200m of defences in order to protect the site for	
Flood Warning Area?	Yes						
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rati respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	_	uring the design flood ev	ent (2125) (The domin	nant hazard rating on	the subject site has been highlighted in the	
Tiuzura raung	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	lerate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating	
	0.00%		0.00%		100.00%	0.00%	
Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	Surface Water Management Strategy to I Floor levels should be raised above the c resilience measures should be considered	ed within the develop be produced to show design flood level, inc ed for inclusion. lied to the layout of the lar where floor levels	ment where possible, in ac how SuDS will be included cluding the Environment Ag ne site by locating the most cannot be raised.	ccordance with the NPF d to manage surface wa ency's recommended a vulnerable elements in	ater runoff from the site additional freeboard re	quirements where practicable. Flood resistance and The Sequential Approach should also be applied to	



SNF30								
Site Area (Ha): 0.112	Existing Land Use: Brownfield			Proposed Land Use: Residential			
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	nd Zone 2	Flood	Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b		
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.0%		0.0%	100	0.0%	0.0%		
Development lifetime	100 years							
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulnerable	e' classification will l	be subject to the Exception	Test.				
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site:	ncidents within the site: None. ncidents within close proximity of the site: None.						
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Bridge Reach) is locate	ne River Medway (Bridge Reach) is located approximately 160m southeast of the site.						
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation, Seaford Chalk Formation and Newhaven Chalk Formation (undifferentiated) - Chalk Superficial deposits: Alluvium - Clay, Silt, Sand and Peat							
	Percentage of site at risk of floo	oding from tidal so	urces during the defence	ed scenario for key ret	urn period events. Max	imum flood level on site shown in brackets.		
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year retu	ırn period event - 2100	1 in 200-year return	period event - 2125	1 in 1000-year return period event		
from tidal sources and surface water,	100.00% (4.40m AODN)	100.00%	(5.78m AODN)	100.00% (6.	.10m AODN)	100.00% (5.29m AODN)		
based off mapping available from the	Percentage	of site at risk of fl	ooding from surface wate	er based on the EA's 'l	Risk of Flooding from	Surface Water Map'		
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario			'Low' risk scenario		
	13.0%			11.9%		75.1%		
Description of Surface Water Flow	Under the 'medium' and 'high' risk scenario	surface water is sh	nown to accumulate on the	southern portion of the	site. Under the 'low' risk	scenario, surface water is shown to accumulate		
Paths	on the majority of the site.							
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure	•	_	efences consist of a wall wi	th an actual crest level	of between 4.07m and 5	.20m AODN. The current condition rating is		
(inc. SoP):	unknown. The design standard of protectio	-						
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to r the lifetime of any development.	aise an existing de	fence wall, it is estimated to	cost in the region of £2	250,000 to upgrade the	150m of defences in order to protect the site for		
Flood Warning Area?	Yes							
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2125) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the							
	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Significa	ant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating		
	0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	100.00%		
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 resistance and							



CCB31									
Site Area (H	la): 0.795	Exis	sting Land Use: Brownf	ield	Prop	osed Land Use: Residential			
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Flood	Zone 2	Flood	d Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	82.3%	13	3.7%	4	.0%	0.0%			
Development lifetime	100 years								
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulnerab	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	ncidents within the site: None. ncidents within close proximity of the site: None.							
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway is located approximat	The 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 sou	rces during the defence	ed scenario for key re	eturn period events. Maxii	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 returi	n period event - 2100	1 in 1000-year return period event					
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	41.81% (5.	.81m AODN)	45.58% (6	i.41m AODN)	23.90% (5.00m AODN)			
based off mapping available from the	Percentage	e of site at risk of floo	oding from surface wat	er based on the EA's	'Risk of Flooding from S	urface Water Map'			
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	ım' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario			
	0.1%			1.6%		18.0%			
Description of Surface Water Flow	Under the 'high' risk scenario, the entire s	site is shown to remain	dry. Under the 'medium'	risk scenario, a small	portion of the northwestern	corner is shown to be affected by surface water.			
Paths	Under the 'low' risk scenario, the extent o								
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 h	nigh ground with an act	tual crest level of 4.75m AC	DDN. The current condition rating is unknown.			
					2000 2001				
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	the lifetime of any development.	raise an existing emb	pankment, it is estimated	to cost in the region of	£300,000 to upgrade the 2	50m of defences in order to protect the site for			
Flood Warning Area?	Yes								
UI Dations	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2125) (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		rate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating			
	8.81%		12.03%		23.69%	0.82%			



The site is located in Flood Zones 1, 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.



RWB2										
Site Area (I	На): 1.775	Ex	cisting Land Use: Brownf	ield	Proposed Land Use: Residential					
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Floor	d Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b				
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	31.8%		6.9%	6	1.3%	~64.8% *refer to text below				
Development lifetime	100 years									
Exception Test required?	uses should not be permitted within the Fu located within Flood Zone 3b. Developmen	Development which has a 'more vulnerable' classification will be subject to the Exception Test. Any development classified as 'Less Vulnerable', 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b). Development which is classified as 'essential infrastructure' will be subject to the Exception Test if it is ocated within Flood Zone 3b. Development that is classified as 'water-compatible' should be designed and constructed to: remain operational and safe for users in times of flood; result in no net loss of floodplain storage; and not impede water flows and not increase flood risk elsewhere.								
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site:	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site: None.								
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Wickham Reach) is loc	The River Medway (Wickham Reach) is located along the northwestern border of the site.								
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation - Chalk Superficial deposits: Head - Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel, Alluvium - Clay, Silt, Sand and Peat, Beach and Tidal Flat Deposits (undifferentiated) - Clay, Silt and Sand									
	Percentage of site at risk of floor	oding from tidal so	ources during the defenc	ed scenario for key re	eturn period events. Maxim	um flood level on site shown in brackets.				
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year retu	urn period event - 2100	1 in 200-year retui	rn period event - 2125	1 in 1000-year return period event				
from tidal sources and surface water,	70.82% (5.04m AODN)	79.77% ((5.88m AODN)	83.98% (6	6.16m AODN)	76.43% (5.46m AODN)				
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage	of site at risk of fl	ooding from surface wat	er based on the EA's	'Risk of Flooding from Su	rface Water Map'				
LA	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	ım' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario				
	0.9%			0.0%		3.2%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under the 'high' risk scenario, there is one area appears in the northeastern corner of		urface water flooding. Unde	er the 'medium' and 'lo	w' risk scenario, this localise	d area increases as well as another localised				
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 8.91m AODN. The current condition 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 little/no benefit to the site itself.									
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 to consider upgrading the defences for this site.									
Flood Warning Area?	Yes									
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2125) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)									
Timen a rading	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	lerate' Hazard Rating	'Signifi	cant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating				
	6.18%		8.43%		27.60%	41.60%				



The site is located in Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.

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

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

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

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

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



SNF34									
Site Area (I	На): 0.172	Ex	cisting Land Use: Brown	field	Proposed Land Use: Residential				
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood	d Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.0%		0.0%	10	0.0%	8.7% *refer to text below			
Development lifetime	100 years								
Exception Test required?	uses should not be permitted within the Flocated within Flood Zone 3b. Developme	Development which has a 'more vulnerable' classification will be subject to the Exception Test. Any development classified as 'Less Vulnerable', 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b). Development which is classified as 'essential infrastructure' will be subject to the Exception Test if it is located within Flood Zone 3b. Development that is classified as 'water-compatible' should be designed and constructed to: remain operational and safe for users in times of flood; result in no net loss of floodplain storage; and not impede water flows and not increase flood risk elsewhere.							
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	ncidents within the site: None. ncidents within close proximity of the site: None.							
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Bridge Reach and Li	The River Medway (Bridge Reach and Limehouse Reach) is located approximately 210m southeast of the site.							
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation - Chalk Superficial deposits: Alluvium - Clay, Silt, Sand and Peat								
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	ooding from tidal so	ources during the defenc	ed scenario for key re	eturn period events. Max	ximum flood level on site shown in brackets.			
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year ret	urn period event - 2100	1 in 200-year retur	rn period event - 2125	1 in 1000-year return period event			
from tidal sources and surface water,	100.00% (4.40 AODN)	100.00%	(5.77m AODN)	100.00% (6	6.10m AODN)	100.00% (5.28m AODN)			
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'								
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario			'Low' risk scenario			
	10.8%			10.2%		79.0%			
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under the 'high' and 'medium' risk scenar to be affected by surface water flooding.	rio, surface water is s	shown to accumulate within	n the southwestern corr	ner of the site. Under the	'low' risk scenario, the majority of the site is shown			
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. The current condition rating is 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 defences in order to protect the site for the lifetime of any development								
Flood Warning Area?	Yes								
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2125) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)								
Times of Fideling	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	lerate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating			
	0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	100.00%			



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

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

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

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

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



SR48									
Site Area (На): 0.245	Ex	cisting Land Use: Brownf	ïeld	Proposed Land Use: Residential				
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	lood Zone 2 Flood		d Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.0%	,	44.8%	55	5.2%	~5.3% *refer to text below			
Development lifetime	100 years								
Exception Test required?	uses should not be permitted within the Flocated within Flood Zone 3b. Developme	Development which has a 'more vulnerable' classification will be subject to the Exception Test. Any development classified as 'Less Vulnerable', 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b). Development which is classified as 'essential infrastructure' will be subject to the Exception Test if it is ocated within Flood Zone 3b. Development that is classified as 'water-compatible' should be designed and constructed to: remain operational and safe for users in times of flood; result in no net loss of floodplain storage; and not impede water flows and not increase flood risk elsewhere.							
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	ncidents within the site: None. ncidents within close proximity of the site: None.							
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Upnor Reach) is local	The River Medway (Upnor Reach) is located along the southeastern border of the site.							
Geology	Bedrock: Thanet Formation - Sand, Silt and Clay Superficial deposits: Beach and Tidal Flat Deposits (undifferentiated) - Clay, Silt and Sand								
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	ooding from tidal so	ources during the defenc	ed scenario for key re	eturn period events. M	eximum flood level on site shown in brackets.			
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year retu	urn period event - 2100	1 in 200-year retur	n period event - 2125	1 in 1000-year return period event			
from tidal sources and surface water,	14.57% (4.93m AODN)	100.00%	(5.73m AODN)	100.00% (6	6.04m AODN)	100.00% (5.34m AODN)			
based off mapping available from the	Percentag	e of site at risk of fl	ooding from surface wat	er based on the EA's	'Risk of Flooding fron	Surface Water Map'			
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	um' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario			
	0.3%			0.5%		64.8%			
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under the 'high' and 'medium' risk scenar to be affected by surface water.	io, surface water is s	shown to encroach onto a s	small portion of the nor	th of the site. Under the	low' risk scenario, the majority of the site is shown			
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. The current condition rating is 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 defences in order to protect the site for the lifetime of any development.								
Flood Warning Area?	Yes								
Hozord Boting	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2125) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)								
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	lerate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating			
	0.00%		0.00%		72.19%	27.81%			



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

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

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

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

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

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



CCB7								
Site Area (Ha): 0.049	Ex	cisting Land Use: Brownf	ield	Proposed Land Use: Residential			
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood	I Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b		
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.0%		12.8%	57	7.2%	0.0%		
Development lifetime	100 years							
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulnerate	ole' classification will	be subject to the Exception	n Test.				
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	ncidents within the site: None. ncidents within close proximity of the site: None.						
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway is located approximat	ely 235m northwest	of the site.					
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation Superficial deposits: Alluvium - Clay, Silt,							
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	ooding from tidal so	ources during the defenc	ed scenario for key re	turn period events. Ma	ximum flood level on site shown in brackets.		
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year retu	ırn period event - 2100	1 in 200-year retur	n period event - 2125	1 in 1000-year return period event		
from tidal sources and surface water,	34.97% (3.84m AODN)	100.00%	(5.78m AODN)	100.00% (6	6.09m AODN)	100.00% (4.92m AODN)		
based off mapping available from the	Percentag	e of site at risk of fl	ooding from surface wat	er based on the EA's	'Risk of Flooding from	Surface Water Map'		
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	m' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario		
	35.1%			0.0%		64.1%		
Description of Surface Water Flow	Under the 'medium' risk scenario, the ent	tire site is shown to re	emain dry. Under the 'high'	risk scenario over a thi	ird of the site could be a	ffected by surface water. Under the 'low' risk		
Paths	scenario, more than half of the site could							
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset rating is unknown. The design standard of			nigh ground with an act	ual crest level of betwee	en 4.75m and 4.93m AODN. The current condition		
(inc. SoP): High-Level Indication of Defence		•	-	to post in the region of	C200 000 to ungrade the	e 150m of defences in order to protect the site for		
Costs	the lifetime of any development	Taise all existing en	ibalikillelit, it is estilliateu	to cost in the region of a	£200,000 to upgrade the	e 130111 of defences in order to protect the site for		
Flood Warning Area?	Yes							
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rati respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	_	uring the design flood ev	ent (2125) (The domin	nant hazard rating on t	he subject site has been highlighted in the		
	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating		
	0.00%		0.00%		82.74%	17.26%		
Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	Floor levels should be raised above the design flood level, including the Environment Agency's recommended additional freeboard requirements where practicable. Flood resistance and							



FP14								
Site Area (I	Ha): 0.011	Ex	cisting Land Use: Brownf	ield	Proposed Land Use: Residential			
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood	Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b		
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	96.8 %		0.0%	3	.2%	0.0%		
Development lifetime	100 years							
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulneral	ble' classification will	be subject to the Exception	Test.				
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	ncidents within the site: None. ncidents within close proximity of the site: None.						
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway is located approximate	tely 70m north of the	site.					
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formatio Superficial deposits: No Superficial depo							
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	ooding from tidal so	ources during the defence	ed scenario for key re	turn period events. Ma	nximum 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 - 2100	1 in 200-year retur	n period event - 2125	1 in 1000-year return period event		
from tidal sources and surface water,	71.83% (4.99m AODN)	71.83% ((5.77m AODN)	71.83% (6	.09m AODN)	71.83% (5.33m AODN)		
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentag	e of site at risk of fl	looding from surface water	er based on the EA's	'Risk of Flooding from	Surface Water Map'		
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	ım' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario		
	0.0%			0.0%		0.0%		
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, the entire	site is shown to rema	ain dry.					
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure	•	_	_	red high ground with ar	actual crest level of be	tween 4.60m and 5.49m AODN. The current		
(inc. SoP):	condition rating is unknown. The design	•	•					
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 t	to cost in the region of	£200,000 to upgrade the	e 150m of defences in order to protect the site for		
Flood Warning Area?	Yes							
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rati respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	_	uring the design flood ev	ent (2125) (The domin	nant hazard rating on t	he subject site has been highlighted in the		
Tidzūra rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	lerate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	eant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating		
	0.00%		54.85%		18.19%	0.00%		
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 an 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.								



SNF38										
Site Area (На): 0.069	Exi	sting Land Use: Brown	field	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 %	0	0.0%	100	0.0%	100.0% *refer to text below				
Development lifetime	100 years									
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulnerable' classification will be subject to the Exception Test. Any development classified as 'Less Vulnerable', 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b). Development which is classified as 'essential infrastructure' will be subject to the Exception Test if it is located within Flood Zone 3b. Development that is classified as 'water-compatible' should be designed and constructed to: remain operational and safe for users in times of flood; result in no net loss of floodplain storage; and not impede water flows and not increase flood risk elsewhere.									
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site:	ncidents within the site: None. ncidents within close proximity of the site: None.								
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Limehouse Reach) is	The River Medway (Limehouse Reach) is located approximately 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 sou	urces during the defenc	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 retur	n period event - 2100	1 in 200-year return	period event - 2125	1 in 1000-year return period event				
from tidal sources and surface water,	100.00% (4.95m AODN)	100.00% (5.76m AODN)	100.00% (6.	.10m AODN)	100.00% (5.33m AODN)				
based off mapping available from the	Percentage	of site at risk of flo	oding from surface wat	er based on the EA's 'l	Risk of Flooding from S	Surface Water Map'				
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Medi	um' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario				
	0.0%			8.4%		76.8%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under the 'high' risk scenario, the entire si scenario, surface water is shown to accum		-	risk scenario, a small p	ortion in the north of the	site is shown to be affected. Under the 'low' risk				
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 4.49m and 5.11m AODN. The current condition rating is 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 £250,000 to upgrade the 150m of defences in order to protect the site for the lifetime of any development.									
Flood Warning Area?	Yes									
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2125) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)									
nazaiu Kaliliy	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mode	rate' Hazard Rating	'Significa	ant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating				
	0.00%		0.00%		10.61%	89.39%				
										



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

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

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

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

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



CCB25										
Site Area (На): 0.069	Existing Land Use: Brownfield			Proposed Land Use: Residential					
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood	d Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b				
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.0 %		1.9%	98	8.1%	~8.1% *refer to text below				
Development lifetime	100 years									
Exception Test required?	uses should not be permitted within the F located within Flood Zone 3b. Developme	Development which has a 'more vulnerable' classification will be subject to the Exception Test. Any development classified as 'Less Vulnerable', 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b). Development which is classified as 'essential infrastructure' will be subject to the Exception Test if it is ocated within Flood Zone 3b. Development that is classified as 'water-compatible' should be designed and constructed to: remain operational and safe for users in times of flood; result in no net loss of floodplain storage; and not impede water flows and not increase flood risk elsewhere.								
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	ncidents within the site: None. ncidents within close proximity of the site: None.								
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Chatham Reach) is I	The River Medway (Chatham Reach) is located along the northwestern 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	ources during the defenc	ed scenario for key re	eturn period events. M	aximum flood level on site shown in brackets.				
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year retu	urn period event - 2100	1 in 200-year retur	n period event - 2125	1 in 1000-year return period event				
from tidal sources and surface water,	8.13% (4.94m AODN)	100.00%	(5.74m AODN)	100.00% (6	6.06m AODN)	8.13% (5.34m AODN)				
based off mapping available from the	Percentag	e of site at risk of fl	ooding from surface wat	er based on the EA's	'Risk of Flooding fron	Surface Water Map'				
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Media	um' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario				
	1.5%			3.8%		7.9%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, there are a	a few localised areas	of surface water flooding.		·					
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 5.60m and 6.00m AODN. The current condition rating is unknown. The design standard of protection is 1 in 1000 years.								
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to raise an existing defence wall, it is estimated to cost in the region of £475,000 to upgrade the 300m of defences in order to protect the site for the lifetime of any development.									
Flood Warning Area?	Yes									
Hazard 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 highlighted in the respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)									
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	lerate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating				
	0.00%		0.00%		9.44%	90.56%				



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

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

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

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

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

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



SNF31							
Site Area (l	Ha): 0.032	Exi	isting Land Use: Brownfi	ield	Pro	posed Land Use: Residential	
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	d Zone 2	Flood	Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b	
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.0 %	(0.0%	10	0.0%	0.0%	
Development lifetime	100 years						
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulnerab	ole' 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 (Bridge Reach and Li	mehouse Reach) is lo	ocated approximately 350n	n southeast of the site.			
Geology		edrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation, Seaford Chalk Formation and Newhaven Chalk Formation (undifferentiated) - Chalk uperficial deposits: Alluvium - Clay, Silt, Sand and Peat					
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	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 - 2100	1 in 200-year retur	n period event - 2125	1 in 1000-year return period event	
from tidal sources and surface water,	100.00% (4.40m AODN)	100.00% ((5.77m AODN)	100.00% (6	6.10m AODN)	100.00% (5.28m AODN)	
based off mapping available from the	Percentag	e of site at risk of flo	ooding from surface water	er based on the EA's	'Risk of Flooding from	Surface Water Map'	
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	ım' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario	
	0.0%			25.8%		74.2%	
Description of Surface Water Flow	Under the 'high' risk scenario, the entire s	site is shown to remai	n dry. Under the 'medium'	risk scenario, surface	water is shown to accumi	ulate along the southeastern boundary. Under the	
Paths	'low' risk scenario, the majority of the site	is shown to be affect	ted by surface water.				
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure	•	_			with an actual crest level	of between 4.50m and 5.20m AODN. The current	
(inc. SoP):	condition rating is unknown. The design s	-	-				
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to the lifetime of any development.	o raise an existing def	ence wall, it is estimated to	o cost in the region of £	£250,000 to upgrade the	150m of defences in order to protect the site for	
Flood Warning Area?	Yes						
	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rati	ing Classification du	uring the design flood ev	ent (2125) (The domir	nant hazard rating on th	e subject site has been highlighted in the	
Hozord Poting	respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	_	g acc. g ca	···· (= · = •) (· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mode	erate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating	
	0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	100.00%	
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 particular where floor levels cannot be raised. Flood Hazard should be appraised against the proposed development layout to ensure that users and occupants of the site can achieve safe access and egress.						



SNF24										
Site Area (l	На): 0.052	Ex	isting Land Use: Brownf	ield	Propo	osed Land Use: Residential				
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	d Zone 2	Flood	I Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b				
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.0 %	1	0.0%	10	0.0%	0.0%				
Development lifetime	100 years				·					
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulnerate	evelopment which has a 'more vulnerable' classification will be subject to the Exception Test.								
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	cidents within the site: None. cidents within close proximity of the site: None.								
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Bridge Reach and Li	e River Medway (Bridge Reach and Limehouse Reach) is located approximately 470m southeast of the site.								
Geology	Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation Superficial deposits: Head - Clay and Silt	drock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation, Seaford Chalk Formation and Newhaven Chalk Formation (undifferentiated) - Chalk perficial deposits: Head - Clay and Silt								
	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from tidal sources during the defenced scenario for key return period events. Maximum flood level on site shown in brackets.									
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year retu	rn period event - 2100	1 in 200-year retur	n period event - 2125	1 in 1000-year return period event				
from tidal sources and surface water,	100.00% (4.40m AODN)	100.00%	(5.77m AODN)	100.00% (6	6.10m AODN)	100.00% (5.28m AODN)				
based off mapping available from the	Percentag	e of site at risk of flo	ooding from surface wat	er based on the EA's	'Risk of Flooding from S	urface Water Map'				
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario			'Low' risk scenario				
	59.8%			10.9%		16.1%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, surface wa	iter is shown to accur	nulate across the majority	of the site.						
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset condition rating is unknown. The design s	_		-	with an actual crest level o	f between 4.50m and 5.20m AODN. The current				
High-Level Indication of Defence	Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to	raise an existing def	fence wall, it is estimated t	o cost in the region of £	£250,000 to upgrade the 15	50m of defences in order to protect the site for				
Costs	the lifetime of any development.									
Flood Warning Area?	Yes									
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rati respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	_	uring the design flood ev	ent (2125) (The domir	nant hazard rating on the	subject site has been highlighted in the				
nazaiu Kauny	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating				
	0.00%		0.00%		36.13%	63.87%				



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

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

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

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

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



CCB8								
Site Area (l	На): 0.157	Ex	cisting Land Use: Brownf	ield	Proposed Land Use: Residential			
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood	Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b		
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.0 %		0.0%	100	.0%	0.0%		
Development lifetime	100 years							
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulnerable	e' classification will	be subject to the Exception	n Test.				
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site:	cidents within the site: None.						
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway is located approximatel	y 180m northwest	of the site.					
Geology		edrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation - Chalk uperficial deposits: Alluvium - Clay, Silt, Sand and Peat						
	Percentage of site at risk of floor	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from tidal sources during the defenced scenario for key return period events. Maximum flood level on site shown in brackets.						
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year retu	ırn period event - 2100	1 in 200-year return	period event - 212	25 1 in 1000-year return period event		
from tidal sources and surface water,	56.80% (4.19m AODN)	100.00%	(5.77m AODN)	100.00% (6.	09m AODN)	100.00% (4.92m 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 Water Map'						
EA	'High' risk scenario	'Medium' risk scenario				'Low' risk scenario		
	0.0%			0.0%		100.0%		
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under the 'high' and 'medium' risk scenario	o, the entire site is s	shown to remain dry. Under	r the 'low' risk scenario,	surface water is sh	nown to accumulate across the entire site.		
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset sh	nows the existing de	efences consist of natural h	nigh ground with an actu	al crest level of be	tween 4.75m and 4.93m AODN. The current condition		
(inc. SoP):	rating is unknown. The design standard of	-	-					
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,152/m to r the lifetime of any development.	raise an existing en	nbankment, it is estimated t	to cost in the region of £	200,000 to upgrad	e the 150m of defences in order to protect the site for		
Flood Warning Area?	Yes							
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	g Classification d	uring the design flood ev	ent (2125) (The domina	ant hazard rating	on the subject site has been highlighted in the		
nazara namig	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Significa	ant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating		
	0.00%		0.00%		19.42%	80.58%		
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 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.							



GN15										
Site Area (На): 5.869	Ex	isting Land Use: Brown	ield	Proposed Land Use: Residential					
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	nd Zone 2	Flood Zone 3		Flood Zone 3b				
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	1.4 %		1.9%	96.7%		~53.5% *refer to text below				
Development lifetime	100 years									
Exception Test required?	Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted v Test if it is located within Flood Zone 3b. D	Development which has a 'more vulnerable' classification will be subject to the Exception Test. * Any development classified as 'Less Vulnerable', 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly /ulnerable' uses should not be permitted within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b). Development which is classified as 'essential infrastructure' will be subject to the Exception fest if it is located within Flood Zone 3b. Development that is classified as 'water-compatible' should be designed and constructed to: remain operational and safe for users in times of lood; result in no net loss of floodplain storage; and not impede water flows and not increase flood risk elsewhere.								
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site:	ncidents within the site: None. ncidents within close proximity of the site: None.								
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Gillingham Reach) is l	ne River Medway (Gillingham Reach) is located along the northern border of the site.								
Geology	Bedrock: Thanet Formation - Sand, Silt and Clay, Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation, Seaford Chalk Formation and Newhaven Chalk Formation (undifferentiated) - Chalk Superficial deposits: Beach and Tidal Flat Deposits (undifferentiated) - Clay, Silt and Sand, Alluvium - Clay, Silt, Sand and Peat									
	Percentage of site at risk of floor	oding from tidal so	urces during the defenc	ed scenario for key return period	events. Maximu	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 retu	ırn period event - 2100	1 in 200-year return period ever	nt - 2125	1 in 1000-year return period event				
from tidal sources and surface water,	98.53% (4.93m AODN)	100.00%	(5.72m AODN)	100.00% (6.02m AODN)	100.00% (5.35m AODN)				
based off mapping available from the	Percentage	of site at risk of fl	ooding from surface wat	er based on the EA's 'Risk of Floo	oding from Surf	face Water Map'				
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Media	ım' risk scenario	'Low' risk scenario					
	2.4%			10.6%		38.2%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, water is sho the 'low' risk scenario but this is due to the		-	of the site. Surface water is also sho	own to accumula	ate within the northern part of the site under				
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset sh current condition rating is unknown. The defence the current condition rating is unknown.	_	_		actual crest level	l of between 4.80m and 5.38m AODN. The				
High-Level Indication of Defence		raise an existing de	fence wall, it is estimated t	o cost in the region of £1,550,000 to	upgrade the 10	000m 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 Ratin respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	g Classification d	uring the design flood ev	ent (2125) (The dominant hazard	rating on the su	ubject site has been highlighted in the				
nazaru Kating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Significant' Hazard	Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating				
	0.00%		0.18%	44.92%		54.90%				



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

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

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

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

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

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



RWB25										
Site Area (l	На): 0.593	Ex	kisting Land Use: Brownf	ïeld	Pro	posed Land Use: Residential				
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood	d Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b				
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.47 %		0.12%	99	0.41%	~34.6% *refer to text below				
Development lifetime	100 years									
Exception Test required?	uses should not be permitted within the Flocated within Flood Zone 3b. Developme	evelopment which has a 'more vulnerable' classification will be subject to the Exception Test. Any development classified as 'Less Vulnerable', 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly Vulnerable' es should not be permitted within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b). Development which is classified as 'essential infrastructure' will be subject to the Exception Test if it is cated within Flood Zone 3b. Development that is classified as 'water-compatible' should be designed and constructed to: remain operational and safe for users in times of flood; result in net loss of floodplain storage; and not impede water flows and not increase flood risk elsewhere.								
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	dents within the site: None. dents within close proximity of the site: None.								
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Limehouse Reach) is	e River Medway (Limehouse Reach) is located along the northern border of the site.								
Geology		edrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation - Chalk uperficial deposits: Alluvium - Clay, Silt, Sand and Peat								
	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from tidal sources during the defenced scenario for key return period events. Maximum flood level on site shown in brackets.									
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year ret	urn period event - 2100	1 in 200-year retur	n period event - 2125	1 in 1000-year return period event				
from tidal sources and surface water,	100.00% (4.95m AODN)	100.00%	(5.76m AODN)	100.00% (6.09m AODN)	100.00% (5.32m 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%		17.3%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under the 'high' and 'medium' risk scenar	io, the entire site is	shown to remain dry. Unde	r the 'low' risk scenario	, there are two localised	areas onsite shown to flood from surface water.				
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset so condition rating is unknown. The design s		_	red high ground and ar	n embankment with an a	ctual crest level of 5.87m AODN. The current				
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,152/m to the lifetime of any development.	raise an existing en	nbankment, it is estimated	to cost in the region of	£425,000 to upgrade the	350m of defences in order to protect the site for				
Flood Warning Area?	Yes									
Hazard Pating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2125) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)									
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	lerate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating				
	0.00%		0.00%		3.06%	96.94%				



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

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

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

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

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

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



GN3										
Site Area (l	На): 1.235	Ex	cisting Land Use: Brownf	ïeld	Р	roposed Land Use: Residential				
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood	Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b				
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	22.4 %		15.7%	61	1.9%	0.0%				
Development lifetime	100 years									
Exception Test required?	uses should not be permitted within the F	unctional Floodplainent that is classified a	(Flood Zone 3b). Develop as 'water-compatible' shoul	ment which is classified d be designed and con	d as 'essential infrastru	ulnerable', 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly Vulnerable' cture' will be subject to the Exception Test if it is rational and safe for users in times of flood; result in				
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	idents within the site: None. idents within close proximity of the site: None.								
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Gillingham Reach) is	ne River Medway (Gillingham Reach) is located approximately 80m north of the site.								
Geology		Bedrock: Thanet Formation - Sand, Silt and Clay 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	urn period event - 2100	1 in 200-year retur	n period event - 2125	1 in 1000-year return period event				
from tidal sources and surface water,	58.39% (4.81m AODN)	87.73% ((5.73m AODN)	99.40% (6	.03m AODN)	78.16% (5.38m AODN)				
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'									
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Medium' risk scenario			'Low' risk scenario				
	9.1%			10.8%		45.8%				
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 sunknown. The design standard of protect	_	_	red high ground with ar	n effective crest level o	f3.63m AODN. The current condition rating is				
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,152/m to the lifetime of any development.	raise an existing en	nbankment, it is estimated	to cost in the region of	£600,000 to upgrade t	ne 500m of defences in order to protect the site for				
Flood Warning Area?	Yes									
Hozord Bating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2125) (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	'Moo	lerate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating				
	11.01%		11.81%		75.35%	1.20%				



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

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

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

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

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



HHH22 & HHH31							
Site Area (H	a): 170.876	Ex	cisting Land Use: Greenf	ield	Proposed Land Use: Residential		
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	nd Zone 2	Flood	Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b	
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	94.68 %	1	1.47%	3.8	85%	0.0%	
Development lifetime	100 years						
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulnerable	e' classification will l	be subject to the Exception	n 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: 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.				
Geology	Bedrock: London Clay Formation - Clay an Superficial deposits: Head - Clay, Silt, San		Terrace Deposits, 2 - Sar	nd and Gravel, Alluvium	- Clay, Silt, Sand and Pe	eat	
	Percentage of site at risk of floor	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from tidal sources during the defenced scenario for key return period events. Maximum flood level on site shown in brackets.					
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year retu	ırn period event - 2100	1 in 200-year returi	n period event - 2125	1 in 1000-year return period event	
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0	0.00m AODN)	0.00% (0.0	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	
	2.3%			1.5%		4.0%	
Description of Surface Water Flow	Under all modelled scenarios, water is sho	wn to flow along pa	rts of the site, however, th	is is due to the presenc	e of a drainage ditches.	There are also a few localised areas shown to be	
Paths	at risk of surface water flooding.						
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure		nows the existing de	efences consist of an emba	ankment with an effective	e crest level of 5.05m AC	DDN, with a condition rating of 3. The design	
(inc. SoP):	standard of protection is 1 in 1000 years.						
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,152/m to reprotect the site for the lifetime of any devel	_	bankment, it is estimated	to cost in the region of f	£4,400,000 to upgrade ap	proximately 3,800m of defences in order to	
Flood Warning Area?	Yes	оринени.					
	Percentage of site in each Hazard Ratin	g Classification du	uring the design flood ev	rent (2125) (The domin	nant hazard rating on th	e subject site has been highlighted in the	
Hazard Rating	respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)						
Tidzara Nating	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	ant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating	
	0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	0.00%	
Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	The site is located in Flood Zones 2 and 3, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment. SuDS should be considered to be included within the development where possible, in accordance with the NPPF and its planning practice guidance. All major development will require a Surface Water Management Strategy to be produced to show how SuDS will be included to manage surface water runoff from the site. Floor levels should be raised above the design flood level, including the Environment Agency's recommended additional freeboard requirements where practicable. Flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered for inclusion. The Sequential Approach should be applied to the layout of the site by locating the most vulnerable elements in the lowest risk areas. The Sequential Approach should also be applied to the internal layout of buildings, in particular where floor levels cannot be raised. Flood Hazard should be appraised against the proposed development layout to ensure that users and occupants of the site can achieve safe access and egress.						



SR53									
Site Area (F	la): 99.005	Ex	kisting Land Use: Brownf	field	Pi	oposed Land Use: Residential			
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood	I Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	30.0 %	:	38.2%	31	1.9%	~2.0% *refer to text below			
Development lifetime	100 years								
Exception Test required?	Vulnerable' uses should not be permitted Test if it is located within Flood Zone 3b.	evelopment which has a 'more vulnerable' classification will be subject to the Exception Test. * Any development classified as 'Less Vulnerable', 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly ulnerable' uses should not be permitted within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b). Development which is classified as 'essential infrastructure' will be subject to the Exception est if it is located within Flood Zone 3b. Development that is classified as 'water-compatible' should be designed and constructed to: remain operational and safe for users in times of bod; result in no net loss of floodplain storage; and not impede water flows and not increase flood risk elsewhere.							
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	idents within the site: None. idents within close proximity of the site: None.							
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway is along the eastern, s	southern and wester	n border of the site.						
Geology		Bedrock: Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation, Seaford Chalk Formation and Newhaven Chalk Formation (undifferentiated) - Chalk, Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation - Chalk Superficial deposits: Head - Clay And Silt, River Terrace Deposits, 3 - Sand and Gravel, Alluvium - Clay, Silt, Sand and Peat, Beach and Tidal Flat Deposits (undifferentiated) - Clay, Silt and Sand							
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	ooding from tidal so	ources during the defenc	ed scenario for key re	eturn period events. M	aximum flood level on site shown in brackets.			
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year ret	urn period event - 2100	1 in 200-year retur	n period event - 2125	1 in 1000-year return period event			
from tidal sources and surface water,	11.85% (5.15m AODN)	94.35%	(5.85m AODN)	98.51% (6	.21m AODN)	49.05% (5.78m AODN)			
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'								
LA	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	um' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario			
	4.8%			7.4%		14.8%			
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, there are n	numerous localised a	reas of surface water flood	ling onsite.	•				
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset so condition rating is unknown. The design s	· ·			with an actual crest lev	el of between 4.70m and 5.87m AODN. The current			
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	to cost in the region of £	£5,850,000 to upgrade	approximately 3800m of defences in order to protect			
Flood Warning Area?	Yes								
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2125) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)								
Tiuzula Natiliy	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	lerate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating			
	2.55%		5.14%		59.67%	21.57%			



The site is located in Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.

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

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

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

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

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



CCB35									
Site Area (На): 2.700	Existin	ng Land Use: Mostly Gre	enfield	Prop	Proposed Land Use: Non-Residential			
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	d Zone 2	Flood	I Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b			
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	61.5%	1	0.3%	28	3.2%	0.0%			
Development lifetime	75 years								
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulnerab	evelopment which has a 'more vulnerable' classification will be subject to the Exception Test.							
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site								
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Chatham Reach) is I		245m west of the site.						
Geology	Bedrock: Seaford Chalk Formation - Cha Superficial deposits: River Terrace Depos	edrock: Seaford Chalk Formation - Chalk perficial deposits: River Terrace Deposits, 1 - Sand and Gravel							
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	ooding from tidal so	urces during the defence	ed scenario for key re	eturn period events. Ma	ximum flood level on site shown in brackets.			
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year retu	rn period event - 2100	1 in 200-year retur	n period event - 2125	1 in 1000-year return period event			
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	28.15% (4	4.95m AODN)	54.46% (6	.09m AODN)	0.00% (0.00m AODN)			
based off mapping available from the	Percentag	e of site at risk of flo	ooding from surface wat	er based on the EA's	'Risk of Flooding from	Surface Water Map'			
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Mediu	um' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario			
	1.1%			0.5%		2.4%			
Description of Surface Water Flow	Under all modelled scenarios, there are a	a few localised areas	of surface water flooding.						
Paths Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure	The FA's Snatial Flood Defence dataset	shows the existing de	rences consist of a wall w	ith an actual crest level	of between 5 60m and	5.66m AODN. The current condition rating is			
(inc. SoP):	unknown. The design standard of protect	_		iar arrastaar sreet isve	or both con c.com and				
High-Level Indication of Defence	_	_	ence wall, it is estimated t	o cost in the region of £	£850,000 to upgrade ap	proximately 550m of defences in order to protect			
Costs	the site for the lifetime of any developme	nt.							
Flood Warning Area?	Yes								
	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rati respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	_	ıring the design flood ev	rent (2125) (The domin	nant hazard rating on t	he subject site has been highlighted in the			
Hazard Rating	'Low' Hazard Rating		erate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating			
	9.22%		7.69%		34.36%	3.20%			
	The site is located in Flood Zones 1, 2 ar	nd 3, and therefore wi	Il require a detailed Flood	Risk Assessment.					
	SuDS should be considered to be include	ed within the developr	ment where possible, in ac	ccordance with the NPF	PF and its planning prac	ice guidance. All major development will require a			
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		_	uding the Environment Ag	gency's recommended	additional freeboard req	uirements where practicable. Flood resistance and			
. 3	resilience measures should be considere		o sito by locating the most	t vulnorable elemente i	the lowest risk areas	The Sequential Approach should also be applied to			
	the internal layout of buildings, in particul	-		vuillerable eleffierits if	i uie iuwesi IISK areas.	The Sequential Approach should also be applied to			
	Flood Hazard should be appraised again			hat users and occupan	ts of the site can achiev	e safe access and egress.			
	1 6		-	<u> </u>		-			



SMI6										
Site Area (F	ła): 57.714	Ex	cisting Land Use: Brown	ïeld	Prop	osed Land Use: Non-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'	20.9%		10.0%	69.	1%	~28.2% *refer to text below				
Development lifetime	75 years									
Exception Test required?	uses should not be permitted within the F	unctional Floodplain ent that is classified a	(Flood Zone 3b). Develop as 'water-compatible' shoul	ment which is classified d be designed and cons	as 'essential infrastruc	Inerable', 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly Vulnerable' ure' will be subject to the Exception Test if it is ational and safe for users in times of flood; result in				
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	cidents within the site: None.								
Watercourses/Rivers	The River Medway (Gillingham Reach) is	ne River Medway (Gillingham Reach) is located along the northeastern border of the site.								
Geology	Bedrock: Thanet Formation - Sand, Silt and Clay, Seaford Chalk Formation - Chalk Superficial deposits: Alluvium - Clay, Silt, Sand and Peat									
	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from tidal sources during the defenced scenario for key return period events. Maximum flood level on site shown in brackets.									
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year retu	ırn period event - 2100	1 in 200-year return	period event - 2125	1 in 1000-year return period event				
from tidal sources and surface water,	38.49% (5.06m AODN)	65.63% ((5.81m AODN)	81.41% (6.3	32m AODN)	44.05% (5.42m AODN)				
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from surface water based on the EA's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map'									
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Medit	um' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario				
	3.9%			3.8%		12.5%				
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, there are r	numerous localised a	reas of surface water flood	ling onsite.						
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset design standard of protection is 1 in 1000	_	efences consist of a wall w	ith an effective crest leve	el of between 4.60m A	DDN. The current condition rating is unknown. The				
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to the site for the lifetime of any developme	· ·	fence wall, it is estimated t	o cost in the region of £2	2,400,000 to upgrade a	pproximately 1550m of defences in order to protect				
Flood Warning Area?	Yes									
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rate respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	_	uring the design flood ev	rent (2125) (The domina	ant hazard rating on t	he subject site has been highlighted in the				
- Inamed Halling	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Moo	erate' Hazard Rating	'Significa	ant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating				
	6.90%		5.66%		29.34%	38.87%				



The site is located in Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3, and therefore will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.

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

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

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

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

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



HHH35									
Site Area (H	la): 57.440	Ex	cisting Land Use: Greenf	ield	Proposed Land Use: Non-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'	84.9%		5.1%	10	.0%	0.0%			
Development lifetime	75 years								
Exception Test required?	Development which has a 'more vulneral	ble' classification will	be subject to the Exception	n Test.					
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site	Incidents within the site: None. Incidents within close proximity of the site: EA Recorded Flood datasets shows the surrounding area was affected from the sea in 1953 due to waves overtopping the defences.							
Watercourses/Rivers	The Hoo Flats are located approximately	965m south of the si	te.						
Geology		sedrock: London Clay Formation - Clay and Silt Superficial deposits: Head - Clay and Silt, River Terrace Deposits, 1 - Clay and Silt, Alluvium - Clay, Silt, Sand and Peat							
	Percentage of site at risk of flo	ooding from tidal so	ources during the defenc	ed scenario for key re	turn period events. Max	imum flood level on site shown in brackets.			
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year retu	ırn period event - 2100	1 in 200-year return	n period event - 2125	1 in 1000-year return period event			
from tidal sources and surface water,	0.00% (0.00m AODN)	10.57% (5.74m AODN)	15.49% (6.	04m AODN)	6.268% (5.04m AODN)			
based off mapping available from the EA	Percentag	e of site at risk of fl	ooding from surface wat	er based on the EA's '	Risk of Flooding from	Surface Water Map'			
EA	'High' risk scenario	'Mediu	um' risk scenario		'Low' risk scenario				
	1.0%			0.4%		1.2%			
Description of Surface Water Flow		nown to flow along pa	arts of the site, however, th	is is due to the presence	e of a drainage ditches.	There are also a few localised areas of surface			
Paths Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure	water flooding. The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset	chows the existing de	ofences consist of an emb	ankment and wall with a	n actual crest level of he	tween 5.12m and 7.10m AODN, and has a			
(inc. SoP):	condition rating of 3. The design standard	_		ankinent and wall with a	in actual crest level of be	tween 3.12m and 7.10m AODN, and has a			
High-Level Indication of Defence	_	_	fence wall, it is estimated t	o cost in the region of £	4,750,000 to upgrade ap	proximately 3100m of defences in order to protect			
Costs	the site for the lifetime of any developme	nt.							
Flood Warning Area?	Yes								
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rat respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)	_	uring the design flood ev	rent (2125) (The domin	ant hazard rating on th	e subject site has been highlighted in the			
inizara rading	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	erate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	ant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating			
	4.61%		2.14%		6.04%	2.60%			
Required Actions / Recommended Mitigation Measures	Surface Water Management Strategy to Floor levels should be raised above the cresilience measures should be considered	ed within the develop be produced to show design flood level, inc ed for inclusion. lied to the layout of the lar where floor levels	ment where possible, in according to the Environment Agree site by locating the most cannot be raised.	ccordance with the NPP d to manage surface wa ency's recommended a vulnerable elements in	ter runoff from the site. Idditional freeboard requite the lowest risk areas. The	ce guidance. All major development will require a irements where practicable. Flood resistance and the Sequential Approach should also be applied to safe access and egress.			



ннн36											
Site Area (H	a): 114.109	Ex	xisting Land Use: Brown	field	Proposed Land Use: Non-Residential						
Flood Zone Classification based on	Flood Zone 1	Floo	od Zone 2	Flood	I Zone 3	Flood Zone 3b					
the EA's 'Flood Map for Planning'	0.1%		10.2%	89	9.7%	~1.1% *refer to text below					
Development lifetime	75 years										
Exception Test required?	uses should not be permitted within the Flocated within Flood Zone 3b. Developme	evelopment which has a 'more vulnerable' classification will be subject to the Exception Test. Any development classified as 'Less Vulnerable', 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly Vulnerable' ses should not be permitted within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b). Development which is classified as 'essential infrastructure' will be subject to the Exception Test if it is cated within Flood Zone 3b. Development that is classified as 'water-compatible' should be designed and constructed to: remain operational and safe for users in times of flood; result in one toos of floodplain storage; and not impede water flows and not increase flood risk elsewhere.									
Flood History	Incidents within the site: None.	dents within the site: None. dents 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		e Hoo Flats and Slede Ooze are located along the southern border of the site.									
Geology		edrock: London Clay Formation - Clay and Silt uperficial deposits: River Terrace Deposits, 1 - Clay and Silt, Alluvium - Clay, Silt, Sand and Peat									
	Percentage of site at risk of flooding from tidal sources during the defenced scenario for key return period events. Maximum flood level on site shown in brackets.										
Percentage of site at risk of flooding	1 in 200-year return period event	1 in 200-year ret	urn period event - 2100	1 in 200-year retur	n period event - 2125	1 in 1000-year return period event					
from tidal sources and surface water,	2.04% (4.94m AODN)	25.61%	(5.75m AODN)	95.57% (6	.00m AODN)	17.95% (5.42m AODN)					
based off mapping available from the	Percentag	e of site at risk of f	looding from surface wat	er based on the EA's	'Risk of Flooding from	Surface Water Map'					
EA	'High' risk scenario		'Medi	um' risk scenario	sk scenario 'Low' risk scenario						
	2.3%			3.3%		12.4%					
Description of Surface Water Flow Paths	Under all modelled scenarios, water is sh surface water flooding.	nown to flow along pa	arts of the site, however, th	is is due to the presenc	e of a drainage ditches.	There are also numerous areas of localised					
Existing Flood Defence Infrastructure (inc. SoP):	The EA's Spatial Flood Defence dataset condition rating of 3. The design standard	_		ankment and wall with a	an actual crest level of be	tween 5.12m and 7.10m AODN, and has a					
High-Level Indication of Defence Costs	Based on an average cost of £1,526/m to the site for the lifetime of any developme	_	efence wall, it is estimated t	to cost in the region of £	£2,450,000 to upgrade ap	oproximately 1600m of defences in order to protect					
Flood Warning Area?	Yes										
Hazard Rating	Percentage of site in each Hazard Rating Classification during the design flood event (2125) (The dominant hazard rating on the subject site has been highlighted in the respective colour – Refer to Table 2.2)										
nazaru Kauny	'Low' Hazard Rating	'Mod	derate' Hazard Rating	'Signific	cant' Hazard Rating	'Extreme' Hazard Rating					
	6.76%		16.41%		33.22%	28.67%					



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

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

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

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

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

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



A. Appendices

Appendix A.1 – Site Location Map



Appendix A.1 – Site Location Map