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1 Introduction

This Technical Annex has been prepared in support of the main report: ‘How Land Use Allocation Decisions are Accounting for the Implications of Climate Change on Flood Risk’.

The annex contains background information that has been used to inform the main report on the following matters:

Appendix A – Task 1: 42 Local Authorities Selected For This Study
A list and broad characteristics of the 42 Local Authorities and Plan Types selected for this study.

Appendix B – Task 2: Review of Flood Risk Evidence Base Informing Development Plans
Proformas used to provide a high level review of the flood related evidence base informing development plan production for the Local Authorities selected for this study.

Appendix C – Task 2: Review of Strategic Allocations at Risk of Flooding
Proformas used to capture the information on the strategic allocations at risk of all types of flooding.

Appendix D – Task 3: Multi Criteria Analysis Framework Worksheets
Multi Criteria Analysis for the 14 example Local Authorities examined.

Appendix E – Task 3: Cost Analysis
A summary of the key assumptions and outputs for the cost analysis undertaken for the 14 example Local Authorities examined.
Appendix A

Task 1: 42 Local Authorities Selected For This Study
### Table 1: List and broad characteristics of Local Authorities selected for this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Plan</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Population (2010)</th>
<th>% Population Change 2000 - 2010</th>
<th>Residence based weekly earnings</th>
<th>% of land at risk of fluvial/tidal flooding</th>
<th>% of land at risk of pluvial flooding</th>
<th>Is it a coastal authority?</th>
<th>Main Settlement</th>
<th>Year Plan was adopted / submitted to PINs</th>
<th>Principality Urban / Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adopted Site Allocation DPDs</td>
<td>Ashford District</td>
<td>115,500</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>£502</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ashford</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barking and Dagenham London Boro.</td>
<td>179,700</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>£501</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>London (Barking, Dagenham)</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brent London Boro.</td>
<td>256,600</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
<td>£494</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>London (Wembley and Kilburn)</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central Bedfordshire</td>
<td>255,200</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>£560</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Dunstable and Leighton Buzzard</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colchester District</td>
<td>181,000</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>£530</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hambleton District</td>
<td>87,600</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>£476</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Northallerton</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Havering London Boro.</td>
<td>236,100</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>£586</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>London (Romford)</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horsham District</td>
<td>130,800</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>£587</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Horsham</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid Devon District</td>
<td>76,100</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>£421</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Tiverton</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middlesbrough</td>
<td>142,400</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>£416</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Middlesbrough</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Norfolk District</td>
<td>101,700</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>£429</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Cromer</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Redbridge London Boro.</td>
<td>270,500</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>£589</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>London (Ilford)</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slough</td>
<td>131,100</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>£508</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Slough</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Cambridgeshire District</td>
<td>146,400</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>£608</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Camborne</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Plan</td>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Population (2010)</td>
<td>% Population Change 2000 - 2010</td>
<td>Residence based weekly earnings</td>
<td>% of land at risk of fluvial/tidal flooding</td>
<td>% of land at risk of pluvial flooding</td>
<td>Is it a coastal authority?</td>
<td>Main Settlement</td>
<td>Year Plan was adopted / submitted to PINs</td>
<td>Principally Urban / rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Strategy with Strategic Allocations</td>
<td>Spelthorne District</td>
<td>93,500</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>£639</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Staines</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sutton London Boro.</td>
<td>194,200</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>£582</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>London (Sutton)</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tonbridge and Malling District</td>
<td>118,800</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>£600</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>West Malling and Borough Green</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waveney District</td>
<td>117,500</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>£447</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lowestoft</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Allocations DPD currently being examined</td>
<td>Havant Borough Council</td>
<td>116,800</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
<td>£483</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Havant</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Breckland District</td>
<td>130,900</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>£427</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Thetford</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chelmsford District</td>
<td>169,500</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>£603</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Chelmsford</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Peterborough Poole</td>
<td>173,400</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>£436</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Peterborough</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>154,200</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>£533</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandwell District</td>
<td>292,800</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>£426</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Oldbury and Smethwick</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Tyneside District</td>
<td>153,700</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>£452</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Shields</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wakefield District</td>
<td>325,600</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>£441</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Wakefield</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wandsworth London Boro.</td>
<td>289,600</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>£692</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>London (Vauxhall, Wansdworth and Battersea)</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Plan</td>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Population (2010)</td>
<td>% Population Change 2000 - 2010</td>
<td>Residence based weekly earnings</td>
<td>% of land at risk of fluvial/tidal flooding</td>
<td>% of land at risk of pluvial flooding</td>
<td>Is it a coastal authority?</td>
<td>Main Settlement</td>
<td>Year Plan was adopted / submitted to PINs</td>
<td>Principally Urban / rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Strategy and Area Action Plans</td>
<td>Plymouth Core Strategy and adopted AAPs</td>
<td>258,700</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>£445</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td>Between 2007 and 2010</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDPs/ LP</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>798,800</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>£478</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carlisle</td>
<td>104,500</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>£417</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Carlisle</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>101,000</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>£446</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sunderland</td>
<td>283,500</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
<td>£424</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Sunderland</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hartlepool</td>
<td>91,300</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>£471</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Hartlepool</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leicester</td>
<td>306,600</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>£402</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Leicester</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warrington</td>
<td>198,900</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>£498</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Warrington</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sefton District</td>
<td>272,900</td>
<td>-3.7%</td>
<td>£470</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Southport</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solihull</td>
<td>206,100</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>£552</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Solihull</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Holland</td>
<td>84,600</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>£455</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Spalding</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Gloucestershire</td>
<td>264,800</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>£510</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yate</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Somerset</td>
<td>91,500</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>£391</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Western Super Mare</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>York</td>
<td>202,400</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>£492</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Task 2: Review of Flood Risk Evidence Base Informing Development Plans
**ASC Planning Proforma 1 - SFRA**

**Report Date:** 02/02/2012  
**Prepared By:** Roya Jodieri  
**LA:** Ashford District

**Interviewed:**  
**E-mail Address:**  
**Telephone:**

**Position:**

## Was an SFRA produced?  
**Yes**

**Note:**  
The Core Strategy was adopted in July 2008. A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) urban sites and Infrastructure DPD has been produced by the LPA and the EA to support the Urban sites and Infrastructure DPD Issues and Options proposals (2010)- consultation has just finished on this document and it is expected to be adopted early 2012. A Tenterden and Rural Sites Flood Risk Assessment (2009) also accompanies the Tenterden and Rural Sites DPD (adopted 2010). These are read along side the Borough-wide Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) adopted October 2006, which pre-dates PPS 25. This proforma will focus the SFRA.

### What level was the SFRA completed too?  
**Level 1**

**Note:**  
The SFRA does not state what level it was completed to, however as it predates PPS25 Guidance and will reach at least a Level 1, so have noted that the SFRA has been completed to Level 1.

### Did it consider all sources of flood risk?  
- [x] All  
- [ ] Fluvial  
- [ ] Pluvial  
- [ ] Tidal

**Note:**  
The SFRA considers all sources of flood risk including tidal flooding. The FRA urban sites and infrastructure DPD only considers fluvial and pluvial sources of flood risk.

### Did it include national data sets?  
- [x] SMP  
- [x] CFMP  
- [ ] NAFR  
- [ ] Historic flood maps

**Note:**  
SFRA: LCILP has not been used. However UK Climate Impact Programme (UKCIP), a national database has been used instead. The River Stour CFMP has been used. It also took into account the SMP.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did it include information from other stakeholders?</td>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note:</td>
<td>Flood zone maps and Indicative Flood Plain maps provided by the EA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did it include an allowance for climate change?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note:</td>
<td>1. As a precautionary approach, a 20% increase in peak flows by 2050 is used. 2. The precautionary principle is used, excluding development from the flood extent arising from the 100-year flood + 20% case. 3. Climate change is discussed throughout the SFRA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did they consider climate change (what scenarios explored)?</td>
<td>Select...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note:</td>
<td>Current policy is based on the latest recommendations of the UK Climate Impact Programme (UKCIP). (UCKIP 2002) The prediction is for an increase in rainfall intensities that is likely to increase the frequency and intensity of flooding. As a precautionary approach, a 20% increase in peak flows by 2050 is used. (para 7.6 climate change). As the PPS25 was not published prior to the SFRA, the SFRA notes that once the PPS25 is published, the SFRA will be reviewed again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did they deal with uncertainty about future flood risk?</td>
<td>Select...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note:</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the SFRA make recommendations relating to land allocations?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What were these recommendations?</td>
<td>The SFRA gives guidance on how the Council will make objective judgements on land allocations relative to a risk based approach to development through the application of the sequential test (as described in PPG 25). It supplements the guidance on site specific FRA. The SFRA makes 5 area specific recommendations. The recommendations include: allowing development as long as there are appropriate ground floor uses i.e. non-habitable, flood storage as a pre-condition for development, flood zone 3c undevelopable with an exception that the proposal demonstrates a reduction in flood risk/ an over-riding sustainability benefit, and Greenfield run off less than Greenfield rate. Further, the SFRA mentions a range of measures available to mitigate flood risk, including: land raising, non habitable ground floors, secondary defences, ‘green’ solutions such as water holdings, temporary barriers, flood resilient design and flood warning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
procedures.

Were these recommendations applied to the plan?

Note:

The Core Strategy includes a number of policies directly relevant to flood risk/flooding and development. The seem to echo the recommendations made in the SFRA. The general measures include: development should not be undertaken in the floodplain- a sequential test must be taken; All development should include appropriate SUDS to avoid flooding and met pre-development run off rate; the use of ‘green’ measures i.e. pools encouraged (i.e. design measures). The Core Strategy does mention area specific measures too, for example, development is not to take place in one area highlighted in the SFRA as high risk. The SFRA discusses urban sites, however the urban area DPD has not yet been adopted.

Click here to sign this section
**ASC Planning Proforma 1 - SFRA**

**Report Date:** 01/03/2012  
**Prepared By:** RJ  
**Interviewed:** LA: Barking and Dagenham London B...  
**E-mail Address:**  
**Department:**  
**Telephone:**  
**Position:**

---

**Was an SFRA produced?** Yes  
**Note:**  
The SFRA was produced in April 2008. The Core Strategy was adopted in 2010.

---

**What level was the SFRA completed to?** Level 2  
**Note:**  
The SFRA was completed to Level 1 (in April 2008) and Level 2 final (in November 2010).

---

**Did it consider all sources of flood risk?**

- [x] All  
- [ ] Fluvial  
- [ ] Pluvial  
- [ ] Tidal  

**Note:**  
The SFRA considers all sources of flood risk.

---

**Did it include national data sets?**

- [ ] SMP  
- [x] CFMP  
- [x] NAFR  
- [ ] Historic flood maps  

**Note:**  
EA: The EA sources specific flood risk information to inform the development of the SFRA. In addition, the EA is a statutory consultee under PPS25 and therefore must be satisfied with the findings and recommendations for sustainable flood risk management into the future. For this reason, the EA has been consulted during the development of the SFRA to discuss potential flood risk mitigation measures and planning recommendations.

Drainage Authority- Thames Water: Responsible for the management of urban drainage (surface water) and sewerage within the Borough. Consulted to discuss...
the risk of localised flooding associated with the existing drainage/sewer system.

Water Company- Essex and Suffolk Water: Responsible for water supply in the LB of Barking and Dagenham. Contacted for information regarding flooding from their water supply network and they stated that, although flooding incidences from burst water mains had occurred, they didn’t keep any specific records that are appropriate for release for the use of the assessment of flood risk.

Did it include information from other stakeholders?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water companies
- [ ] Drainage authorities
- [ ] Other

Note:
The Council has adopted a precautionary approach with respect to climate change for the allocation of sites. For this reason, the Sequential Test, as well as the Level 2 SFRA assessment(s), have been carried out based upon Zone 3a High Probability defined to include an appropriate allowance for climate change to 2115 (i.e. the expected flood risk in approximately 100 years, which covers the likely lifetime of any current development).

Did it include an allowance for climate change?  Yes

Note:
The Council has adopted a precautionary approach with respect to climate change for the allocation of sites. For this reason, the Sequential Test, as well as the Level 2 SFRA assessment(s), have been carried out based upon Zone 3a High Probability defined to include an appropriate allowance for climate change to 2115 (i.e. the expected flood risk in approximately 100 years, which covers the likely lifetime of any current development).

How did they consider climate change (what scenarios explored)?  PPS25 Annex B Figures

Note:

How did they deal with uncertainty about future flood risk?  Select...

Note:
Not clear from SFRA

Did the SFRA make Yes
recommendations relating to land allocations?

What were these recommendations?

Borough sits in the floodplain of the River Thames and a number of other smaller rivers. The SFRA splits the Borough into 6 character areas and reviewed flood risk for each (different sources).

Discusses the use of the PPS25 sequential test but highlights that the SFRA does not fully address the requirements of this.

Southern party of the Borough in Zone 3a high probability- limited development here however an exemption test applies to land in zone 3 high risk as prohibiting future residential development would have a detrimental effect on regeneration. The argument must clearly demonstrate that no alternative site sits within the area of lesser flood risk.

A larger table sets out in detail the spatial planning and development control recommendations within each type of PPS25 flood zone.

SFRA recommends that a site based FRA must be carried out by the developer for all proposed developments.

Future planning decisions should consider flood zones and apply the following recommendations: 1. positive reduction of flood risk through development i.e. flood proofing and mitigation measures (SUDS, raised floors etc) 2. unreasonable to restrict future development within areas that have suffered a localised flooding incident.

Were these recommendations applied to the plan?

Note:

Policy SO.12 and CM1 of the Core Strategy state development should be guided to areas where flood risk can be avoided or alleviated/ and development should mitigate the effects of climate change.

Policy CR4: All development proposals put forward on land that is at risk of flooding (as identified on the Environment Agency’s flood zone maps or in the Council’s Strategic Flood Risk Assessment) must comply with the Sequential Test and (where appropriate) the Exception Test, as set out in PPS25. Further, states FRA must be submitted with each application as per the SFRA.

Housing has been identified in thee London Riverside area (high flood risk) but does state sequential test and exemption test have been undertaken- shows a lack of low risk land for housing/regen needs in the borough.

Developers contributions could take the form of flood defences and mitigation measures (Policy CC3).

In site allocations document, where sites are situated on part or whole of a flood risk zone then Opportunities should be taken to locate more vulnerable uses to a zone of lower flood risk within the site boundary.
ASC Planning Proforma 1 - SFRA

Report Date: 01/03/2012
Prepared By: RJ

Interviewed: LA: Breckland

E-mail Address:  
Department:  

Telephone:  
Position:  

Was an SFRA produced?  Yes

Note:
Numerous SFRAs have been produced:
SFRA in 2005
SFRA (PPS25 update) and appendix C in 2007
SFRA level 2 for Thetford Town Centre in 2009.

The Core Strategy was adopted in 2009 and the site specific policies and proposals DPD in Jan 2012.

What level was the SFRA completed to?  Level 2

Note:
Level 2 in 2009. This proforma will examine the SFRAs from 2007 and the level 2 SFRA in 2009.

Did it consider all sources of flood risk?  
✓ All
☐ Fluvial
☐ Pluvial
☐ Tidal

Note:
Broadlands River CFMP. 
other local/regional sources include: numerous flood study reports, hydraulic modelling and channel survey, terrain data, river gauging station data, search of archived information in the online newspaper Lynn News.

Did it include national data sets?  
☐ SMP
✓ CFMP
☐ NAFR
✓ Historic flood maps

Note:
Did it include information from other stakeholders?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water companies
- [ ] Drainage authorities
- [ ] Other

Note:

The EA

The Breckland Council Planning Policy Officer and Amenity Services Manager

King’s Lynn Consortium of IDBs and East Harling IDB were contacted for information on any flood events from ordinary watercourses (King’s Lynn Consortium of IDBs did not hold flood event records. East Harling IDB stated that there is regular flooding of the water meadows along the Attleborough watercourse and the River Thet at Larling, but that this has no impact on buildings. King’s Lynn Consortium of IDBs provided an AutoCad file showing the location of the drains under their jurisdiction).

Anglian Water provided information on sewer flooding, from both surface water and foul sources, from 1998 to 2006.

The Highways Agency provided data on callouts to trunk roads A11 and A47 in the Breckland District during flood events.

Did it include an allowance for climate change?  

- [ ] Yes

Note:

How did they consider climate change (what scenarios explored)?

- [ ] PPS25 Annex B Figures

Note:

As required by PPS25, climate change impacts on the runoff have been assessed. Due to the current uncertainty with regards to the type of development and its associated lifetime, it was agreed with Breckland District that two climate change scenarios for the runoff rate would be considered:

- From 2055 to 2085: +20% in the peak rainfall intensity
- From 2085 to 2115: +30% in the peak rainfall intensity

This information noted elsewhere in the SFRA but adds to the above information: The lifetimes of the developments are likely to be at least 50 years, however there is no precise information available at the moment. By agreement with the Breckland Council the following scenarios have therefore been tested:

- Addition of 20% and 30% to the 1% design peak rainfall intensity used for the present day analysis,
- Addition of 20% to the 1% design peak river flows used for the present day analysis.

From the SFRA level 2 for Thetford Town Centre: An inspection of peak flows indicates that the 1 in 25 year fluvial event accounting for the anticipated effects of climate change is less then the current 1 in 100 year flows. Therefore, as both
the current 1 in 25 year and 1 in 100 year fluvial extents are similar, there will not be any significant difference between the current and future Functional Floodplain extent.

How did they deal with uncertainty about future flood risk?

Other

Note:
See above.

Did the SFRA make recommendations relating to land allocations?

Yes

What were these recommendations?

The SFRA level 1 report details FRAs for each proposed development area. Each FRA details the methodology specific to each site for delineating the flood zones and observations are made on the level of flood risk to each town. The risk to possible development section includes how flood risk to proposed development can be reduced, this includes locating development X meters away from water courses, avoiding development in certain areas, improvement of drainage systems.

The SFRA level 2 Thetford Town Centre report explores general development control measures that can be put in place. This includes: flood resilience and resistance measures i.e. flood proofing; safe access and egress, flood warning and evacuation plans, development control policies such as undertake a sequential test, implementation of SuDs, make basements non habitable.

The TAAP (Preferred Options) identifies Thetford Town Centre as the preferred location for new retail and leisure development. The Level 2 report has focused on four areas of interest within Thetford Town Centre, which have been identified as requiring further investigation in terms of flood risk. A list of the type of buildings and uses allowed for each area dependant on the flood zone each area is located in is highlighted.

Were these recommendations applied to the plan?

Note:
Policy DC13 Flood Risk- must use sequential test, notes the type of development permitted on each flood zone. FRA must be applied to each development. flood mitigation measures must be put in place.
Policy CP5 Planning obligations- Site specific infrastructure requirements to be addressed through developer obligations may include flood defences.
Policy CP8 Natural Resources- regard must be given to the SFRA, advocates the use of SuDs, regard must be given to the DC policy on flood risk.

Site Allocations DPD: each site allocation refers back to the findings/recommendations made in the SFRA.

Click here to sign this section
ASC Planning Proforma 1 - SFRA

Report Date: 01/03/2012
Prepared By: RJ

Interviewed: LA:
Brent London Boro.

E-mail Address:
Department:
Telephone:
Position:

Was an SFRA produced? Yes

Note:
Level 1 published in December 2007.

What level was the SFRA completed to? Level 1

Note:
SFRA Level 1 has been completed for the whole Borough. SFRA Level 2 has been completed for the Wembley Master Plan Area.

Did it consider all sources of flood risk? Yes

Note:

Did it include national data sets?
- SMP
- CFMP
- Historic flood maps

Note:
Thames Catchment Flood Management Plan vision for 2057: A CFMP is being developed for the River Thames catchment. A consultation summary document has recently been provided outlining the main messages from the CFMP (Jan2007). Detailed hydraulic modelling has also been used at a local scale.

Did it include information from other stakeholders?
EA: Source of specific flood risk information to inform the development of the SFRA. In addition, the EA has been consulted during the development of the SFRA to discuss potential flood risk mitigation measures and planning recommendations.

Drainage Authority: Thames Water: Responsible for the management of urban drainage (surface water) and sewerage. TW consulted to discuss the risk of localised flooding associated with the existing drainage/sewer system. Unfortunately the feedback provided was very general in nature, providing simply a summary of the number of recorded incidents per post code- not possible to pinpoint known capacity problems and/or infrastructure at risk of structural failure.

British Waterways: Responsible for three assets within the Borough of Brent however unable to provide any information regarding the potential impact (with respect to flood risk) of a failure of their assets located within the Borough. Their statement found in Appendix F.

Did it include an allowance for climate change?  Yes

PPS25 (Appendix B) states that a 10% increase in the 1% AEP (100 year) river flow can be expected within the next 20 years, increasing to 20% within the next 50 to 100 years.

The detailed modelling of the River Brent system (and tributaries) has considered the potential impact of climate change over the next 50 years. An increase of flow of 20% has been modelled to account for climate change for the next 50 to 100 years.

In other areas (i.e. in which detailed modelling is not available), experience has shown that, in simple terms, the anticipated extent of the 1% AEP (100 year) flood affected area in 2107 can be approximated by the current 0.1% AEP (1000 year) flood outline.

How did they consider climate change (what scenarios explored)?  PPS25 Annex B Figures

How did they deal with uncertainty about future flood risk?  Select...
Did the SFRA make recommendations relating to land allocations?  
Yes

What were these recommendations?
Use of the PPS25 Sequential test as well as use of the exception test where prohibiting future development in these areas is unlikely to have a detrimental impact upon the economic and social welfare of the existing community.

Development control recommendations requiring all floor levels, access routes, drainage systems and flood mitigation measures to be designed with an allowance for climate change.

Future planning decisions should consider flood zones and apply the following recommendations: 1. positive reduction of flood risk through development i.e. flood proofing and mitigation measures (SUDS, raised floors etc) 2. unreasonable to restrict future development within areas that have suffered a localised flooding incident.

Development restrictions and development control measures are spelt out for each type of flood zone. See Flood zone 3a and 3b below: 
Flood zone 3a (Undeveloped): Areas of Functional Floodplain that are currently undeveloped should be protected for flood storage purposes. Future development should be restricted to water-compatible uses and essential infrastructure that has to be there.
Flood zone 3b (developed): only be permitted within the footprint of an existing building that is impermeable to flooding. Development must be restricted to ‘less vulnerable’ land uses. ‘More vulnerable’ land uses must be actively discouraged. A list of minimum requirements (Dev control) has been set out i.e. increased floor levels, SUDs.

Were these recommendations applied to the plan?

Note: 
Although the SFRA makes recommendations relating to land allocations, flooding does not explicitly feature in any of the Core Strategies Policies although it does sit within the supporting text. e.g. flood risk implicit in Policy CP19- all development should contribute towards achieving sustainable development, including climate change mitigation and adaptation.

Development Policies Preferred Options DPD- adaptation/mitigation flood risk measures are explicit in policy. Further, SFRA translated into Policy as FRA must be produced for each application over 1ha, and developments must follow the sequential and exception test.

Site allocations: Those sites that sit within areas more susceptible to flooding appear to have more stringent guidelines for development put upon them.

Click here to sign this section
Was an SFRA produced?  Other (please specify)

Note:
The SFRA was produced in August 2006. The District Local Plan was adopted in September 2008. The Inspector's Report discusses that some policies of the Local Plan were informed by the 2006 SFRA.

What level was the SFRA completed to?  Level 1

Note:
Unknown - the 2006 SFRA is unable to view.

Did it consider all sources of flood risk?  □ All  □ Fluvial  □ Pluvial  □ Tidal

Note:
Unknown - the 2006 SFRA is unable to view.

Did it include national data sets?  □ SMP  □ CFMP  □ NAFR  □ Historic flood maps

Note:
Unknown - the 2006 SFRA is unable to view.
Did it include information from other stakeholders?  
☐ EA  
☐ Water companies  
☐ Drainage authorities  
☐ Other

Note:  
Unknown - the 2006 SFRA is unable to view.

Did it include an allowance for climate change?  
Select...

Note:  
Unknown - the 2006 SFRA is unable to view.

How did they consider climate change (what scenarios explored)?  
Select...

Note:  
Unknown - the 2006 SFRA is unable to view.

How did they deal with uncertainty about future flood risk?  
Select...

Note:  
Unknown - the 2006 SFRA is unable to view.

Did the SFRA make recommendations relating to land allocations?  
Select...

What were these recommendations?  
Unknown - the 2006 SFRA is unable to view.

Were these recommendations applied to the plan?  
Note:
Unknown - the 2006 SFRA is unable to view.

Click here to sign this section
Was an SFRA produced? Yes

Note:
SFRA Stage 1 Report for Mid Bedfordshire has been produced. It refers to a Stage 2 SFRA which began in Winter 2007. The Core Strategy was adopted in 2009 and the Central Bedfordshire (formally Mid Bedfordshire area) Site Allocations DPD was adopted in April 2011.

What level was the SFRA completed to? Other (please specify)

Note:
Stage 1 SFRA for Mid Bedfordshire (now known as Central Bedfordshire) available online. Stage 2 SFRA which began in 2007 is referred to in the Stage 1 Report.

Did it consider all sources of flood risk?

- [x] All
- [ ] Fluvial
- [ ] Pluvial
- [ ] Tidal

Note:
Tidal flood risk not considered due to location of Borough.

Did it include national data sets?

- [x] SMP
- [ ] CFMP
- [ ] NAFR
- [x] Historic flood maps

Note:
Data sources used (local, regional and national alongside the above tick box): EA flood zone maps, publications and archive reports; hydraulic modelling data; topographical survey; flood defence and key asset information; geological data; and Anglian Water and East of England Plan Sewerage infrastructure capacity study data.

SFRA Stage 1 discusses the use of existing local flood risk information and
studies:

The Ivel Study (commissioned by the EA after the Jan 2003 flood event) which focuses on two parts: analysis and modelling focusing on data gathered from the event and pre-feasibility study looking at possible defences around flood risk areas. The Ivel corridor is extensively developed.

The Marston Vale Surface Waters Plan 2002 promotes an integrated approach to potential water issues resulting from proposed development in the Marston Vale.

Did it include information from other stakeholders?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water companies
- [ ] Drainage authorities
- [ ] Other

Note:

EA: River Ivel Study carried out by the EA, flood zone maps, statutory consultee.

Internal Drainage boards: 2 exist covering 40% of geographical area - Bedfordshire and River Ivel IDB - meetings were held with them in order to obtain the relevant data and historical records for the study.

Anglian Water: helped establish the potential impact of proposed future growth upon the public sewerage system.

Completed flooding questionnaires have been received from a number of Parish Councils in order to obtain further historic and anecdotal information relating to flooding in the study area.

Copy of a recent (2006) Anglia TV programme entitled ‘Secret Rivers’ which followed the route of the River Ivel, from its headwaters at Baldock through the Mid Bedfordshire District Council study area, to its confluence with the River Great Ouse was obtained. Information from this programme has been useful for assessing the impact of hydraulic structures, including mill structures, and would be useful as part of any future hydraulic modelling studies.

Did it include an allowance for climate change? Yes

Note:

How did they consider climate change (what scenarios explored)?

PPS25 Annex B Figures
PPS 25 recommends that climate change impacts for fluvial catchments be represented as an increase in flood levels and water level rise within the study catchment over the lifetime of the development, which for residential development is to 2115. Planning Policy Statement 25 Annex B (Table B.2) recommends a peak fluvial flow increase for the critical 1 in 100 year return period event of 20%, and is a figure widely accepted by the Environment Agency.

For the purposes of this Stage 2B study, none of the hydraulic modelling work undertaken has taken account of climate change impacts, thus a visual interpretation of the impact of climate change upon the 1 in 100 year flood outline has been taken as being the midpoint between the extent of Flood Zone 3 (1 in 100 year) and Flood Zone 2 (1 in 1000 year).

Where doubt remains, the precautionary approach should be taken whereby the extent of Flood Zone 2 should be taken as being the extent of the 1 in 100 year outline incorporating climate change.

How did they deal with uncertainty about future flood risk?

Note:

Residual risk: Explored the impact of future growth upon sewage treatment works and receiving watercourses - discusses what needs to be done at each sewage treatment works to take into account population growth- including increase in capacity.

The increase in volume of treated effluent from upstream districts will impact on river volumes- SFRA 2 states any flood mapping must include an allowance for the future increases in flow from each sewerage treatment works in order to assess the impact.

Did the SFRA make recommendations relating to land allocations?

Yes. Looks at the potential growth areas, notes which flood zones they are in and states whether they are appropriate to develop in flood risk terms. Where the area falls into flood zone 3 (the majority of potential growth areas), the SFRA states 'yes, subject to steering vulnerable development away from flood zone 3'.

SFRA stage 2 also identifies strategic flood mitigation opportunities for specific locations i.e. wetland habitat creation, flood storage facilities.

Mid Bedfordshire District Council are guided to investigate the application of a 'roof tax' or similar mechanism to supplement flood defence and strategic flood alleviation scheme development to safeguard the future of existing settlements that are deemed to be at risk of flooding currently and in the future taking into account climate change impacts.

Were these recommendations applied to the plan?

Note:
Core Strategy does explicitly state some policies have been designed in line with the SFRA. Further, it notes the restriction of growth in certain areas due to flood risk.

Site specific allocations include allowing development as long as current flooding issues are dealt with i.e. SUDs, upsizing of on-site culvert, flood alleviation measures.

Although the SFRA notes that the majority of growth areas are situated within flood zone 1, 2 and 3 and should be developed subject to the steering vulnerable development away from flood zone 3, the site allocations DPD still contains a large proportion of allocations within these growth areas.
Was an SFRA produced? Yes

Note:
A Mid Essex Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Main Report (2007) was produced which covers Braintree District Council, Chelmsford Borough Council, Colchester Borough Council and Maldon District Council. The SFRA is regarded as an advisory study informing a suite of policies within each participating authority. An SFRA Appendix B Chelmsford Supplementary Report was completed in 2008.

At the time of writing the Mid Essex SFRA, site-specific allocations were in preparation for Chelmsford town centre and core strategies had identified preferred broad locations for growth, therefore pending the finalisation of these, the growth areas were used to identify the flood risks to potential growth and development areas. If on completion of the preferred options there are any allocations that fall outside these growth areas, then the sequential test and potential exception test for these sites will need to be explored at that time.

At time of the SFRA Appendix B Chelmsford Report - a study was being carried out to assess the viability of managing flood risk through the provision of a flood alleviation scheme. The effects of this potential future management option are assessed in the SFRA. The viability study was approaching completion and preferred option of a Flood Storage Area on the River Wid combined with some minor flood defence work, would provide an increased standard of protection of 1 in 200 years (equivalent to 1 in 100 years and climate change) for existing developments and at least 9 proposed future developments in the Chelmsford town centre.

Further work is ongoing to identify the additional works required to increase the standard of protection to the remaining proposed sites in the town centre in collaboration with the Council.

What level was the SFRA completed to? Other (please specify)

Note:
An Inception Report, completed by Scott Wilson in November 2006, preceded the 'Stage 2' SFRA. The Inception Report located and identified available data and information that would be useful for completion of the SFRA.

In addition the report outlined the extents of the study areas, the modelling approach and highlighted various specific flood risk issues within the Mid Essex area that should be covered within the main SFRA report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Did it consider all sources of flood risk?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑️ All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑️ Fluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑️ Pluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑️ Tidal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Did it include national data sets?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑️ SMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑️ CFMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑️ NAFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑️ Historic flood maps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

- National Flood and Coastal Defence Database used.
- Limited Historic flood records for the Essex area.
- Local data sets also used: Essex Estuarine Strategies, 2008.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Did it include information from other stakeholders?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑️ EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑️ Water companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑️ Drainage authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑️ Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

- EA: Use of EA's flood zone maps, EA's information on geology.
- There are no Internal Drainage Boards within the study area.
- Anglian Water serves the SFRA study area for foul sewerage purposes. Both Essex and Suffolk Water and Anglian Water cover the region with regards freshwater supply and surface water drainage respectively.

**Did it include an allowance for climate change?**

**Yes**

**Note:**
Estimates of the effects of climate change on extreme water levels were based on current DEFRA guidelines. These assume a progressive increase in water levels with time. For the East of England, East Midlands, London and Southeast England the increases in peak tidal levels as a result of climate change are predicted as being 4 millimetres per year until 2025, 8.5 millimetres per year from 2025 to 2055, 12 millimetres per year from 2055 to 2085 and 15 millimetres per year 2085 to 2115. As such, using the year 2007 as a basis, 100 years of climate change equates to an increase in peak tidal levels of 1.02 metres.

The current flood zones (2007) were mapped for the main settlement and growth areas for each of the Local Authority areas. These maps present the flood zones 1, 2, 3a and 3b in relation to current levels of flood risk (2007). In addition these areas were also mapped to take into account the climate change recommended by PPS25 for residential development at 100 years (2107). These figures are included in each of the Appendices and should enable the local authorities to undertake the Sequential Test as part of a 'Level 1 SFRA'.

How did they consider climate change (what scenarios explored)?

**PPS25 Annex B Figures**

**Note:**
This SFRA was completed using the PPS25 climate change recommendations, however during the lifetime of this document it is acknowledged that climate change levels may alter. As a result future site-specific flood risk assessments may have to adapt to these changes in line with current guidance in response to changing research into climate change.

The functional floodplains for fluvial areas (Flood Zone 3b) were derived from the main fluvial models (for the rivers Chelmer, Can and Wid, Colne, Blackwater and Brahn) for the 1 in 20 year return period. In addition the fluvial functional floodplain was mapped to include an allowance on climate change by assuming a 20% increase in flows for 100 years of climate change (as recommended by PPS25 Table B.2).

To provide a greater level of detail on the fluvial flood risks, an assessment has been made on the hazard associated with the River Chelmer (Can and Wid). The hazard mapping was based on the outputs from the River Chelmer modelling (by Halcrow Group Ltd) and associated assumptions (see above paragraph 5.2.4 and onwards) for the 1 in 100 and 1 in 1000 year plus climate change outlines.

How did they deal with uncertainty about future flood risk?

**Other**

**Note:**
Future site-specific flood risk assessments may have to adapt to these changes in line with current guidance in response to changing research into climate change.

To provide a greater level of detail on the fluvial flood risks, an assessment has been made on the hazard associated with the River Chelmer (Can and Wid). The hazard mapping was based on the outputs from the River Chelmer modelling and associated assumptions for the 1 in 100 and 1 in 1000 year plus climate change outlines.

Did the SFRA make recommendations relating to land allocations?

**Yes**
What were these recommendations?

From the Mid-Essex SFRA:

The following recommendations are made by way of an indication of how to proceed with the SFRA process once the preferred options allocations are finalised:

- The LPAs should apply the Sequential Test to the development potential development sites and identify those sites they consider will be necessary to apply the Exception Test.
- If sites require the Exception Test the LPAs should provide responses to parts 'a' and 'b' of the Exception Test for each of the allocation sites.
- Following completion of the Sequential Test and parts 'a' and 'b' of the Exception test the Environment Agency should be consulted to confirm their acceptance of the LPAs arguments and justification for progressing with sites that require the Exception test. The LPA should then refer future developers to complete an FRA to meet the requirements of part c) of the Exceptions test in line with recommendations set out in PPS25.

Policies

- The LPAs should consider the consequences of including SuDS on development sites and the impact these can have on the developable area. In all cases the LPA should assess allocation sites in relation to geology and local issues to enable completion of SUDS summary.
- National and local policies should be reviewed against local flood risk issues and objectives identified by the EA. This will be discussed with Chelmsford.

From SFRA Appendix B Chelmsford: important to manage surface water and its safe disposal, particularly development on greenfield sites.

Recommendation of catchment wide and specific area strategies developed under the headings:

Flood Risk (give regard to consideration of flooding from overland flow, particularly in the town centre) SuDS (should be included in new developments, no increase in run off rates and allowance for climate change including a restriction of run off rates for both green and brownfield sites, 2 main types of geology present in borough creating different pluvial flooding rates).

Flood Mitigation (local flood protection measures within development sites should be supported by planning contributions from development permitted within the Town Centre) and the Water Environment (do not locate development within 9m of river bank, development proposals adjoining the rivers will be required to incorporate riverside paths and open spaces).

Were these recommendations applied to the plan?

Note:
Yes.

Core Strategy policies:

Policy CP2 development must take into account issues of climate change, flood risk.

Policy CP9 Areas of land within the Chelmsford area that have the function of maintaining the open character of river valleys and associated flood plains and afford the opportunity to protect and enhance sites of nature conservation importance are designated as Green Wedges.

Policy CP10 (Policy Target - no new developments to be at risk from flooding)- sequential and exception test for where development needed for wider sustainable reasons. The use of appropriate flood mitigation measures on brownfield land i.e. town centre that need to be developed/ regenerated but which sit on high risk flood zones.

Policy DC22 within Flood Zones 2 and 3, as shown on Environment Agency maps, all planning applications will require an accompanying Flood Risk Assessment.

Planning permission will only be granted for development providing it can be demonstrated that the existing flood defences or other satisfactory mitigation, including replacement flood storage capacity, provide adequate protection from flooding now and for the lifetime of the development.

In Flood Zones 2 and 3 outside Urban Areas and Defined Settlements planning permission will only be granted for development that is primarily open in character, or for essential transport and utilities infrastructure that cannot be located elsewhere.
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Was an SFRA produced?  No

Note: The Local Plan was produced in 2006. The only SFRA available was produced in 2009 therefore after the plan was adopted.

Although flooding is mentioned in the Local Plan, there are no mention of any studies relating to flood risk that were undertaken.

What level was the SFRA completed to?  

Select...

Note: It appears that an SFRA / other flooding studies did not inform the Local Plan.

Did it consider all sources of flood risk?

- All
- Fluvial
- Pluvial
- Tidal

Note: It appears that an SFRA / other flooding studies did not inform the Local Plan.

Did it include national data sets?

- SMP
- CFMP
- NAFR
- Historic flood maps

Note: It appears that an SFRA / other flooding studies did not inform the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Select…</th>
<th>Note:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did it include information from other stakeholders?</td>
<td>EA, Water companies, Drainage authorities, Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>It appears that an SFRA/ other flooding studies did not inform the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did it include an allowance for climate change?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It appears that an SFRA / other flooding studies did not inform the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did they consider climate change (what scenarios explored)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It appears that an SFRA / other flooding studies did not inform the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did they deal with uncertainty about future flood risk?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It appears that a SFRA/ other flooding studies did not inform the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the SFRA make recommendations relating to land allocations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What were these recommendations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It appears that an SFRA/ other flooding studies did not inform the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were these recommendations applied to the plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It appears that an SFRA/ other flooding studies did not inform the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ASC Planning Proforma 1 - SFRA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Date:</th>
<th>01/03/2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepared By:</td>
<td>RJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA:</td>
<td>City of Peterborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail Address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Was an SFRA produced?**  Yes

**Note:**
- SFRA Level 2 published 2010.
- Core Strategy adopted 2011.
- Peterborough Site Allocations Submission Version submitted in April 2011.

**What level was the SFRA completed to?**  Level 2

**Note:**
- SFRA Level 2 published 2010.

**Did it consider all sources of flood risk?**
- [ ] All
- [X] Fluvial
- [X] Pluvial
- [ ] Tidal

**Note:**

**Did it include national data sets?**
- [X] SMP
- [X] CFMP
- [X] NAFR
- [X] Historic flood maps

**Note:**
- River Nene CFMP.
- Environment Agency's ASTSWF (Areas Susceptible to Surface Water Flood Risk) data.
- Local data sets also used: EA Topological data, hydraulic models.
Did it include information from other stakeholders? 

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water companies
- [ ] Drainage authorities
- [ ] Other

Note:
EA, Anglian Water, Internal Drainage Boards, Defra, the Council's Highways team provide information on previous sewer flooding and those areas deemed to be at potential risk.

Anglian Water has indicated that they are happy to work closer with the Council through a wider Water Cycle Strategy (WCS) study to confirm which proposed development sites require off site network and pumping station upgrades including its implications (e.g. financial, environmental and timing constraints). For the WCS study, the results from an enhanced sewer model that is currently being developed would be available.

Therefore, it is essential that Anglian Water is closely involved in the selection of Preferred Options and site allocations (including their phasing plans) to achieve the most beneficial outcome for the City. It is also important that the developers of major sites to inform their Flood Risk Assessments with the results of consultations with Anglian Water and where necessary the Environment Agency, in respect of sewerage flooding in all parts of the network. This is because sewer flooding can arise in new areas with no historical issues, in particular with the cumulative impact of climate change and new development.

The Highways section of the Council has been consulted to obtain highway flooding related incidents.

The Environment Agency’s Groundwater Team was consulted to obtain any information records of previous ground water flooding incidents in the area. In addition, Defra funded groundwater flooding scoping report and associated maps were reviewed.

Did it include an allowance for climate change?  Yes

Note:

How did they consider climate change (what scenarios explored)?  PPS25 Annex B Figures

Note:
The Level 1 SFRA has broadly assessed the possible impacts of climate change by producing Flood Zone 3a outline for 50 year’s time (2057) taking into account the impact of climate change on river flows and sea level rise. In the absence of modelled Flood Zones (i.e. ignoring the presence of defences) as per PPS25 allowances over a long-term duration and as a conservative approach, it was considered that Flood Zone 3a in 2057 is to be identical to the present-day Flood Zone 2.

Using this approach, the currently allocated sites have been broadly assessed against the potential risk from climate change. In a similar way, potential new development sites can be assessed as shown in Table 4. However, they will need further assessment as per the guidance in Annex B of PPS25 by fully taking into account the presence of existing flood defences through an updated Level 2 SFRA or site-specific FRAs over the expected design life of proposed development (residential 100 years; commercial 60 years - based on the current Environment Agency guidance although this will need confirmation through the final PPS25 Practice Guide expected in spring 2008).

How did they deal with uncertainty about future flood risk? Sensitivity Test

Note:
As the interaction between fluvial and tidal flooding sources will become more significant over time, sensitivity testing for long term horizons (at least 100 years) is recommended when significant development or regeneration options are considered in, or adjacent to Flood Zones 2 or 3.

Following the Sequential and Exception Test (if applicable), if new sites are located within Flood Zones 2 or 3 then the climate change impacts will need further assessment and sensitive testing through a Level 2 SFRA update and site-specific SFRAs by taking into account the presence of existing flood defences (e.g. within the eastern parts of the City and along the Nene corridor).

Did the SFRA make recommendations relating to land allocations? Yes

What were these recommendations?
Additional work carried out by the EA during spring 2009 resulted in changes to the defined flood zones so this proforma has used the recommendations from the SFRA level 2.

States the strategic sites at risk of flooding due to overtopping. Further, discusses how SFRA level 2 has updated the results from SFRA level 1. This includes revised flood zones. A large number of strategic sites have not seen a change in their flood zones and still sit within flood zone 1. But further investigation may be required into the hazard that surface water flooding presents to the Rivergate site in order to provide clarity on the level of risk which should be taken into consideration in any future development plans.

The SFRA details all sites which have had a change in the flood zone and how it has changed e.g. a number have seen an increase of land in flood zone 3 and therefore decrease in land which is in flood zone 1 and 2.

The SFRA states which sites need to have more analysis on them to deem the suitability and sustainability of the sites for development i.e. Regional Freight Interchange site and Railworld.

The Exception Test was carried out for Fletton Quays, which was deemed to pass all three parts. The development at Fletton Quays is a keystone development for the regeneration and renewal of the City Centre and Peterborough as a whole. The development is on previously developed brownfield land and it is stated that it can be made safe through minor changes in layout, appropriate signing and participation in the EA flood warning scheme.

The recommendations list consists of 26 short bullet points. These include flood protection and mitigation measures and directions on which land should be avoided (although not site specific) i.e. inclusion of SuDs, raised defences, emergency planning, rapid inundation zones, prevention of the increase in impermeable surfaces, No development should take place in Flood Zone 3b other than water compatible uses, No development should take place within the designated 9m maintenance strip adjacent to watercourses, Future site allocations should take into account both flood risk, flood hazard and the vulnerability of the development to ensure full compliance with PPS25.

Were these recommendations applied to the plan?

Note:
Yes.

Policy CS7 Regional Freight Interchange - requirement to look how flood risk issues, including flood safety are addressed, including implications on and off site.

A section on flood risk within the Core Strategy details the findings and implications from SFRA level 1 and 2 on the Borough.

Flood risk Policy CS22: states that the allocation of sites for development and the granting or refusal of planning permission on such sites and any other site will be informed by both SFRAs. It also states Development in Flood Zones 2 and 3 will only be permitted following the successful completion of a sequential test, exception test if necessary, suitable demonstration of meeting an identified need, and through the submission of a site specific FRA demonstrating appropriate flood risk management measures and a positive approach to reducing flood risk overall.

No development will be permitted in rapid inundation zones, or areas not defended to an acceptable standard, other than in exceptional circumstances, unless the proposed development is classified as a water compatible use or essential infrastructure (subject to the exception test). In Zone 3a, residential development will only be permitted where the site consists of previously developed land. SuDs must be implemented.

The Site Allocations DPD states all Housing sites located within Flood Zones 3a and 3b (based on Environment Agency maps at December 2009) were rejected.

Through undertaking the sequential approach for housing allocations, the Council were able to allocate enough suitable sites on land with the lowest probability of flooding (Flood Zone 1).

For employment sites, Council were not able to identify enough suitable and available sites in this lowest risk category and it was necessary to consider the suitability of sites within Flood Zone 2 and 3. SFRA 2 was used to assist.

Employment is however categorised as 'less vulnerable'. It proposal submitted for employment site allocated in DPD, a site specific FRA will need to be included.
**ASC Planning Proforma 1 - SFRA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Date:</th>
<th>Prepared By:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01/03/2012</td>
<td>RJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewed:</td>
<td>LA: Colchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail Address:</td>
<td>Department:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td>Position:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Was an SFRA produced?

**Yes**

**Note:**

A Mid Essex Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Main Report (2007) was produced which covers Braintree District Council, Chelmsford Borough Council, Colchester Borough Council and Maldon District Council. The SFRA is regarded as an advisory study informing a suite of policies within each participating authority.

There is an Appendix C Colchester Supplementary Report which provides information specific to Colchester, which outlines the main flood risks posed to the potential growth areas in the Borough.

Colchester Core Strategy was adopted in December 2008 and the Colchester Site Allocations DPD was adopted in 2010.

### What level was the SFRA completed to?

**Level 2**

**Note:**

An Inception Report, completed by Scott Wilson in November 2006, preceded this ‘Stage 2’ SFRA. The Inception Report located and identified available data and information that would be useful for completion of the SFRA.

In addition the report outlined the extents of the study areas, the modelling approach and highlighted various specific flood risk issues within the Mid Essex area that should be covered within the main SFRA report.

### Did it consider all sources of flood risk?

- [ ] All
- [ ] Fluvial
- [x] Pluvial
- [x] Tidal

**Note:**

### Did it include national data sets?

- [x] SMP
- [x] CFMP
- [x] NAFR
Historic flood maps

Note:
National Flood and Coastal Defence Database used.
Limited Historic flood records for the Essex area.
Local data sets also used: Essex Estuarine Strategies, 2008

Did it include information from other stakeholders?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water companies
- [ ] Drainage authorities
- [ ] Other

Note:
EA: Use of EA’s flood zone maps, EA’s information on geology.

There are no Internal Drainage Boards within the study area.

Anglian Water serves the SFRA study area for foul sewerage purposes. Both Essex and Suffolk Water and Anglian Water cover the region with regards freshwater supply and surface water drainage respectively.

Did it include an allowance for climate change?

Yes

Note:
Estimates of the effects of climate change on extreme water levels were based on current DEFRA guidelines. These assume a progressive increase in water levels with time. For the East of England, East Midlands, London and Southeast England the increases in peak tidal levels as a result of climate change are predicted as being 4 millimetres per year until 2025, 8.5 millimetres per year from 2025 to 2055, 12 millimetres per year from 2055 to 2085 and 15 millimetres per year 2085 to 2115.

As such, using the year 2007 as a basis, 100 years of climate change equates to an increase in peak tidal levels of 1.02 metres.

The current flood zones (2007) were mapped for the main settlement and growth areas for each of the Local Authority areas. These maps present the flood zones 1, 2, 3a and 3b in relation to current levels of flood risk (2007). In addition these areas were also mapped to take into account the climate change recommended by PPS25 for residential development at 100 years (2107).

These figures are included in each of the Appendices and enable the local authorities to undertake the Sequential Test as part of a ‘Level 1 SFRA’.

How did they consider climate change (what scenarios explored)?

PPS25 Annex B Figures

Note:
This SFRA was completed using the PPS25 climate change recommendations, however during the lifetime of this document it is acknowledged that climate change levels may alter. As a result future site-specific flood risk assessments may have to adapt to these changes in line with current guidance in response to changing research into climate change.

The functional floodplains for fluvial areas (Flood Zone 3b) were derived from the main fluvial models (for the rivers Chelmer, Can and Wid, Colne, Blackwater and Brain) for the 1 in 20 year return period. In addition the fluvial functional floodplain was mapped to include an allowance on climate change by assuming a 20% increase in flows for 100 years of climate change (as recommended by PPS25 Table B.2).

To provide a greater level of detail on the variation of fluvial and tidal flood risks an assessment of hazard has been made for the main fluvial rivers and tidal areas for Mid Essex. The scenarios modelled include the 1 in 200 year plus climate change scenario and the 1 in 1000 year plus climate change scenario.

How did they deal with uncertainty about future flood risk?

Note:
Future site-specific flood risk assessments may have to adapt to these changes in line with current guidance in response to changing research into climate change.

To provide a greater level of detail on the variation of fluvial and tidal flood risks an assessment of hazard has been made for the main fluvial rivers and tidal areas for Mid Essex. The scenarios modelled include the 1 in 200 year plus climate change scenario and the 1 in 1000 year plus climate change scenario.

Did the SFRA make recommendations relating to land allocations?

What were these recommendations?

From the Mid-Essex SFRA:

The following recommendations are made by way of an indication of how to proceed with the SFRA process once the preferred options allocations are finalised:

- The LPAs should apply the Sequential Test to the development potential development sites and identify those sites they consider will be necessary to apply the Exception Test,
- If sites require the Exception Test the LPAs should provide responses to parts ‘a’ and ‘b’ of the Exception Test for each of the allocation sites.
- Following completion of the Sequential Test and parts ‘a’ and ‘b’ of the Exception test the Environment Agency should be consulted to confirm their acceptance of the LPAs’ arguments and justification for progressing with sites that require the Exception test. The LPA should then refer future developers to complete an FRA to meet the requirements of part c) of the Exceptions test in line with recommendations set out in PPS25.

Policies
- The LPAs should consider the consequences of including SuDS on development sites and the impact these can have on the developable area. In all cases the LPA should assess allocation sites in relation to geology and local issues to enable completion of SUDS summary.
- National and local policies should be reviewed against local flood risk issues and objectives identified by the EA. This will be discussed with Colchester.
From Appendix C, the Colchester SFRA supplementary report:

Specific assessment of the flood risks and issues relating to the key regeneration area of East Colchester. It also outlines the flood implications arising from various water resource projects in the Borough, notably the Ely and Ouse Essex Transfer Scheme and the Abberton Reservoir extension.

Preferred Policy Direction: Development proposals would be expected to make efficient use of land and take a sequential approach that gives priority to accessible locations and previously developed land (PDL). Proposals should seek to promote sustainability by minimising and/or mitigating pressure on the natural and built environment, utilities and infrastructure, and areas at risk of flooding.

Flood Risk & Catchment Wide Strategies: ensure sequential test is undertaken and vulnerability classification of the proposed development is appropriate to the flood zone classification; FRA to be undertaken for all developments in flood zone 2 and 3 (assess risk of flooding to the development and identify mitigation options, and make sure there is no overall loss in flood storage capacity). FRAs are required for all developments in Flood Zone 1 that are greater than 1.0ha. However, if a critical drainage problem has been identified on a development in Flood Zone 1 Flood Risk Assessments will then required for developments that are greater than 0.5ha or over 10 dwellings.

Flood Risk & Area Specific Strategies:

Flood risk is a key issue for the borough and findings of this SFRA fed into preferred development locations of the final Core Strategy.

Policy NE1: direct development away from land at risk of fluvial and coastal flooding, including areas at risk from climate change.

Policy P14: direct development away from land at risk from coastal flooding. Ensure flood risk considerations to surrounding area from structural failure of Abberton Reservoir expansion.

Flooding constraints must be considered in the East Growth Area which aims to deliver mixed-use developments orientated towards a river.

Consideration of flooding from the failure of defences should be considered for all the Borough but particular regard to East Colchester (benefits from Colne Barrier).

There are other general site mitigation measures (i.e. SUDS policy requirements, max surface water run off rates and drainage capacity, min no development set back from rivers-8m, emergency planning particularly for vulnerable use) that are put forward. The list is too extensive to include here - for further information refer to the ‘Recommendations’ chapter of the SFRA.

Were these recommendations applied to the plan?

Note:
Yes.

Core Strategy states the need for regeneration in the East Colchester growth area- Regeneration Area for over 2,600 new homes. A significant part of the area is within Flood Zone 3, where there is a high probability of flooding. The sequential test has been applied within the Regeneration Area and has demonstrated that there are no reasonably available alternative sites in areas of lower flood risk and so development is acceptable in principle.

Residential uses should be directed to upper storeys and commercial development should be included on the ground floor. FRA required for all development proposals which will need to demonstrate that development will not increase flood risk and that safe access and egress can be provided.

Many of the larger sites in the Site Allocations DPD incorporate design measures to mitigate against flood risk i.e. raising floor levels, creation of ponds, incorporation of SUDS. Interestingly some sites advocate buildings that have a degree of robust flexibility for adaptation to climate change and flood risk environment over time.

- Aim to direct vulnerable uses away from Flood zone 3.
- SUDs required in many site allocations.
- Core Strategy policy: need to direct development away from flood risk areas.

[Click here to sign this section]
### Was an SFRA produced?  
**Yes**

**Note:**
In January 2006 Hambleton District Council issued its Stage 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) to support ‘Allocations’ in the LDF.

Addendum SFRA document (2009) has been produced to supplement the January 2006 SFRA and it is intended to be read in conjunction with the January 2006 document. Its purpose is to provide new flood maps and update information where there have been changes since January 2006.

The addendum document follows the same format of the 2006 SFRA. Both documents have been examined in this proforma.

### What level was the SFRA completed to?  
**Level 1**

**Note:**

### Did it consider all sources of flood risk?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Selected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluvial</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
Tidal flooding is not present in this area.

### Did it include national data sets?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Set</th>
<th>Selected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFMP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAFR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic flood maps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
The SFRA states that they have not used national data sets to highlight areas...
susceptible to surface water flooding, they have used local and County level data/knowledge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did it include information from other stakeholders?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔ EA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
Yes, the document as produced in consultation with a number of bodies:

- **EA:** All of the maps and plans used are based from the EA.
- **Internal Drainage Boards.**
- **Parish and Town Councils** representing the settlements covered in the SFRA.
- **Yorkshire water services** (alongside input into several parts of the SFRA, provided comments and suggested alterations to introductory text and village narratives) and **Northumbrian Water** (Comments on village narratives in NWL area).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did it include an allowance for climate change?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
SFRA Stage 1 was published in January 2006 therefore accounting for the fact that climate change scenarios (in particular PPS 25 annex B) have not been utilised. SFRA supplement (2009) explicitly states that the flood maps do not show the effects of climate change.

The SFRA discusses making allowances for climate change when referring to policy, such as the Draft PPS25, however surprisingly it does not appear that they have factored these into the flood risk forecasts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How did they consider climate change (what scenarios explored)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Select...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
NA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How did they deal with uncertainty about future flood risk?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Select...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
NA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did the SFRA make recommendations relating to land allocations?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What were these recommendations?

SFRA stage 1 states survey work has been undertaken to identify flood risk issues in Hambleton's five market towns and a selection of the District's larger villages in order to identify any flooding related issues that will need to be taken into account if land in or adjacent to those settlements is to be allocated for future development in the new Hambleton Local Development Framework.

At the time of commissioning the study it was not known which settlements would require allocations. The inclusion of a settlement does not therefore indicate that it will have allocations in the Local Development Framework. Similarly the absence of a settlement from the list does not indicate that it will not have allocations.

SFRA 1 (2006): A table summarises the various types of flooding conditions and ancillary information indicated within the bounds of each town or village detailed in the report. Each geographic area i.e. market towns and villages are then discussed in detail with reference to pluvial and fluvial flooding, highlighting areas in high flood risk zones thereby restricting development. This is also shown visually on a map. The SFRA Stage 1 Report does not discuss in depth recommendations for each individual area but is more a detailed description of the flood risks.

SFRA Supplementary (2009) provides new or updated information for a number of geographic areas. The relationship of the updated maps to each site allocation is noted. A number of areas have an increase in flood zones 2 and 3 and reduction in flood zone 1 (e.g. Stokesley). In other cases the new data has shifted the flood zones thus making allocations for proposed development now being situated in less vulnerable areas.

Were these recommendations applied to the plan?

Note:

Yes.

The Core Strategy has policies in relation to flood risk:

Policy CP21 aiming to protect the population from flooding and protect the population from the effects of climate change. This will be an important part of creating safe sustainable communities.

Policy DP43: providing a robust policy for managing the effects of flood risk by ensuring development is prioritised to sustainable locations with low risk of flooding, and requiring mitigation and relief measures where appropriate.

The SFRA does not provide explicit recommendations for each of the sites therefore unable to comment on site specifics within the site allocations DPD. However, for a majority of sites within the site allocations DPD, the SFRA is referred to in the context of describing where the site sits in relation to flood zones.
### ASC Planning Proforma 1 - SFRA

**Report Date:** 01/03/2012  
**Prepared By:** FB / RJ  
**LA:** Hartlepool Borough Council  
**E-mail Address:**  
**Department:**  
**Telephone:**  
**Position:**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Was an SFRA produced?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**  
An SFRA was not produced for the Local Plan (adopted 2006).

The Local Plan does not refer to any flood studies or an SFRA. Further to this, the Inspector’s Report does not refer to any flood studies or an SFRA.

An SFRA was not produced for the Local Plan (adopted 2006). Two SFRA’s have since been produced (2007 and 2010) to inform the evidence base for the Hartlepool Local Development Framework.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What level was the SFRA completed to?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Select...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**  
An SFRA was not produced for the Local Plan (adopted 2006).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did it consider all sources of flood risk?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**  
An SFRA was not produced for the Local Plan (adopted 2006).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did it include national data sets?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic flood maps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**  
An SFRA was not produced for the Local Plan (adopted 2006).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did it include information from other stakeholders?</td>
<td>checkbox (EA, Water companies, Drainage authorities, Other)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: An SFRA was not produced for the Local Plan (adopted 2006).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did it include an allowance for climate change?</td>
<td>Select...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: An SFRA was not produced for the Local Plan (adopted 2006).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did they consider climate change (what scenarios explored)?</td>
<td>Select...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: An SFRA was not produced for the Local Plan (adopted 2006).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did they deal with uncertainty about future flood risk?</td>
<td>Select...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: An SFRA was not produced for the Local Plan (adopted 2006).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the SFRA make recommendations relating to land allocations?</td>
<td>Select...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What were these recommendations?</td>
<td>An SFRA was not produced for the Local Plan (adopted 2006).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were these recommendations applied to the plan?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: An SFRA was not produced for the Local Plan (adopted 2006).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Click here to sign this section
Was an SFRA produced? Yes

Note:
The Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH-10 LPAs and Hampshire County Council) commissioned a joint SFRA for the whole sub-region. This was produced in December 2007. Havant's Core Strategy was adopted in 2011.

What level was the SFRA completed to? Level 2

Note:
Final SFRA report summarises the background and policy for the development of SFRAs, the guiding principles for undertaking a SFRA, the outputs of the SFRA and strategic flood risk management guidance for the LPA.

Individual Guidance Document for Havant sits in the Appendix- developed to assist local authority planners and the Environment Agency when allocating future development sites in line with PPS25 and when specifying the requirements for and assessing the compliance of site specific FRAs. Guidance is bespoke to Havant and its flood risks.

Did it consider all sources of flood risk?

- All
- Fluvial
- Pluvial
- Tidal

Note:
The primary source of flood risk to Havant is from the sea - some parts of the Borough are currently at risk of flooding from extreme tides.

The secondary source of flood risk to Havant Borough is from fluvial sources.

Historically, Havant has also been susceptible to flooding from other sources including; groundwater, surface water and flooding caused by infrastructure failure.

Did it include national data sets?

- SMP
- CFMP
- NAFR
Historic flood maps

Note:
Surface water flooding incidents have been provided by Southern Water.

The SFRA has collated and analysed a considerable volume of flood risk information for the PUSH sub-region. The mapping deliverables have been delivered in three groups, each of which are designed to be used by all or some of the key LPA and Environment Agency end users. These are designed to contain a manageable amount of information that fits together as a coherent ‘package’.

They have been termed ‘Output Packages’ and are described below:
- Output Package 1: PPS25 Sequential test and Relevant Supporting information (flood zone maps from the EA)
- Output Package 2: Social Vulnerability of and Flood Hazard/Danger to Existing Development- created by the Flood Hazard Research Centre (FHRC) at Middlesex University.
- Output Package 3: Defences Levels and Associated Investment Indices

Did it include information from other stakeholders?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water companies
- [ ] Drainage authorities
- [ ] Other

Note:
The SFRA has highlighted the range and extent of information held by the LPA, the Environment Agency and the Water Companies. It recommended that a partnering approach between these Stakeholders should be adopted for the future development and improvement of flood risk and flood defence asset information. Furthermore, a partnering approach to strategic flood risk management can help to ensure that sustainable development is delivered across the sub-region.

EA: The PUSH SFRA has been carried out under the continued guidance of local Environment Agency Development Control and Flood Risk specialists, ensuring that the Environment Agency were able to carry out their high level role in line with Making Space for Water. Flood zones maps provided by the EA.

Portsmouth Water and Southern Water inputted to the study.

Further, the following organisations have also significantly inputted into this study: DCLG, British Geological Survey, Standing Conference on Problems Associated with the Coastline (SCOPAC), Channel Coastal Observatory.

Did it include an allowance for climate change?

- [ ] Yes

Note:
PPS25 and its practice guide recognise the effects of climate change as important factors in decisions regarding new development and flood risk. In order to allow consideration of the effects of climate change, Map Set 1E shows revised outlines for Flood Zones 2 and 3 for a number of years over the next century. The outlines were produced for 2025, 2055, 2085 and 2115. This is in line with recent Defra guidance on climate change, which provided allowances for sea level rise to 2025, 2055, 2085 and 2115 and indicative sensitivity ranges for increased river flows due to climate change from 2025 onwards.

In tidal areas, these climate change outlines were derived by projecting the Environment Agency extreme sea levels inland using a methodology defined by the Environment Agency.

There are no consistent estimates across the sub-region for how climate change may increase the areas at risk of fluvial flooding. The SFRA has assumed that by 2025, increases in flows in the river will mean that Flood Zone 3 will extend to cover the area defined by Flood Zone 2. Again, this is a conservative approach that should be updated in the future when more detailed information becomes available.

Taken from the Havant specific appendix:

The SFRA has generated predicted tidal outlines for a number of years up to 2115 (see SFRA Map Set 1E). These outlines account for the most up-to-date predicted rises in sea-level over the coming century due to climate change and therefore allow the identification of locations that will be most vulnerable to this change due to their local topography. In Havant Borough, Hayling Island is the most sensitive area to sea level rise, particularly the southern half of the island. With much of the island low-lying, predicted sea-level rise could result in extreme tidal events inundating more of the island. In addition to this effect of rising sea levels, it is anticipated that climate change will result in an increase in fluvial flood flows. This may put additional pressure on areas in the town of Havant adjacent to the streams.

---

**How did they consider climate change (what scenarios explored)?**

**EA Guidance**

**Note:**

Mapping of flood zones taking into account climate change taken from Defra guidance on climate change.

Tidal areas climate change outlines taken from EA.

Fluvial flooding taking into account climate change- no data sets available so they have used their own estimates.

---

**How did they deal with uncertainty about future flood risk?**

**Other**

**Note:**
There are no consistent estimates across the sub-region for how climate change may increase the areas at risk of fluvial flooding. The SFRA has assumed that by 2025, increases in flows in the river will mean that Flood Zone 3 will extend to cover the area defined by Flood Zone 2. Again, this is a conservative approach that should be updated in the future when more detailed information becomes available.

This SFRA provided a snapshot of flood risk issues throughout the PUSH sub-region using flood risk, climate change and flood defence asset information available in 2007. The datasets used in this assessment are likely to be updated, expanded or revised in the future.

It was recommended that the SFRA is considered to be a live study that is reviewed and updated at appropriate intervals to account for new information, so that it can continue to provide a sound basis for future spatial planning decisions.

Currently, there is no guidance on the appropriate frequency of updates to SFRAs. The SFRA recommends that updates are undertaken following significant revisions to key flood risk datasets and policy guidance or, as a minimum, every 3 to 5 years.

Did the SFRA make recommendations relating to land allocations? Yes

What were these recommendations?
The Appendix Guidance Note details the findings of the SFRA in relation to Havant i.e. areas at highest risk from different types of flood risk. It discusses in detail the key physical characteristics which may constrain development. Interestingly it notes that approximately 58% of Havant Borough is currently covered by existing development, suggesting that much future development will need to be concentrated on brownfield sites.

A number of environmentally designated areas represent a significant constraint on development in the Borough, covering approximately 24% of its area. As such there may be only limited Greenfield land upon which development can be permitted following consideration of other planning constraints.

Vulnerability of existing communities: within Flood Zones 2 and 3 (i.e. those areas potentially likely to experience flooding) the wards generally have a high social vulnerability to flooding on the mainland and average social vulnerability to flooding on Hayling Island. It is likely that future investment flood defences measures will need to strike a balance between protecting high risk areas on Hayling Island and areas of high social vulnerability on the mainland.

To sustain future development in Havant Borough, particularly on Hayling Island, significant investment in flood defences and flood defence infrastructure will be required.

The SFRA discusses in depth the use of the sequential test and the exception test and table 1 of PPS25, which sets out what building use should be allowed in each flood zone, is referred to and states the use of this table is advocated.

The SFRA suggests that the draft South East Plan housing allocation in line with the Sequential Test can be achieved in the Borough however the need for potential commercial regeneration of the town centre and possible ‘windfall’ sites may mean that Havant Borough Council will need to consider development within Flood Zones 2 and 3.

Where the Sequential Test alone cannot identify acceptable sites for urban regeneration or where windfall sites, having satisfied the Sequential Test, are located in Flood Zones 2 or 3, the Exception Test may need to be applied.

SFRA identifies existing areas at risk of tidal flooding and gaps in existing flood defences and the possible use of Section 106 Developer Contributions to update the flood defences.

Were these recommendations applied to the plan?

Note:
Policy CS6 Regeneration of the Borough:

Planning permission will be granted for development which positively contributes by type of use and design and by its comprehensive approach to the social, economic and/or physical regeneration of the whole borough; particularly when it is focused in the following place as shown on the Proposals Map: South Hayling Island, with particular focus on: (b) Flood and erosion management measures.

Policy CS15 Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk:

Development in areas at risk of flooding now and in the future as identified on the latest EA flood risk maps and SFRA climate change maps will only be permitted where: sequential, exception test undertaken, site in low hazard area as defined by SFRA, site specific FRA, the scheme incorporates flood protection, flood resilience and resistance measures, appropriate flood warning and evacuation, incorporate SUDs.

Policy CS21: Council will seek on-site or financial Developer contributions where appropriate. This includes flood defences.

Strategic site: Havant Thicket Reservoir (a winter storage reservoir) The risk of flooding during storm events should be fully assessed in a flood risk assessment and mitigation put in place to minimise all risks.

Strategic site: Dunsbury Hill Farm (major new employment site)
The Hermitage Stream runs to the south west of the site and the adjoining area is located within Flood Zone 3 and is subject to fluvial flooding. An FRA is required and scheme must incorporate water drainage and SUDs.

Strategic site: Major Development Area and Waterlooville Town Centre Integration (an urban extension- mixed use development of 3000 dwellings) one of site constraints is that It is situated part of site is situated in flood zones 2 and 3. Other development requirements include Drainage systems that provide a strategy for off-site improvements, provision of land for the realignment of watercourses and minimisation of any risk of flooding; this should include sustainable urban drainage systems where appropriate.
### ASC Planning Proforma 1 - SFRA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Date:</th>
<th>01/03/2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepared By:</td>
<td>RJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA:</td>
<td>Havering London Boro.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail Address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Was an SFRA produced?** Yes

**Note:**
SFRA Level 1 and 2 combined issued 2007.

It is noted in the Inspectors Report (2008) that the SFRA had not been taken into account in the allocation of sites - refer to the recommendations question for more information.

**What level was the SFRA completed to?** Level 2

**Note:**

**Did it consider all sources of flood risk?**
- [x] All
- [ ] Fluvial
- [ ] Pluvial
- [ ] Tidal

**Note:**

**Did it include national data sets?**
- [x] SMP
- [x] CFMP
- [ ] NAFR
- [ ] Historic flood maps

**Note:**
Local and Regional data sets: hydraulic modelling, topographical data, previous FRAs which although do not cover the entire Borough, cover parts of it.
Did it include information from other stakeholders?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water companies
- [ ] Drainage authorities
- [ ] Other

**Note:**

The EA provided a lot of the background data. General internet searches were also carried out to pinpoint areas of flood risk.

Thames Water provided information regarding sewer flooding events over the past ten years on a broad scale.

Did it include an allowance for climate change?  **Yes**

**Note:**

How did they consider climate change (what scenarios explored)?

**PPS25 Annex B Figures**

**Note:**

Map 5 shows the current Flood Zone 3 against the predicted Flood Zone 3 in 2107, accounting for the predicted effect of increasing sea levels and river flows caused by climate change (following the guidelines outlined in PPS25 Annex B).

Table B.1 of PPS25 gives recommended contingencies for net sea level rise up to 2115. For the south east coast, sea level is predicted to rise by 0.67m within 100 years (to 2107). When the effect of the estuary is taken into account by modelling, levels are likely to rise by 0.85m at Havering over the next 100 years.

How did they deal with uncertainty about future flood risk?  **Other**

**Note:**

None found.

Did the SFRA make recommendations relating to land allocations?  **Yes**

What were these recommendations?


The appendix sets out flood risk advice for site specific allocations.

The appendix gives a detailed examination of flood risk at each SSA site, including the effect of defences and residual flood risk.

For each SSA there is a summary of:

Flood risk vulnerability classification of proposed development and whether the Exception Test would be required
Flood Zone map
Sources of flooding with detailed maps where appropriate
Flood defences
Residual risk
Effect of climate change
Requirements for a Flood Risk Assessment – specific to issues at the site
Requirements for passing Part ‘c’ of the Exception Test

This guidance focuses on the technicalities of flood risk management rather than the other planning issues an LPA must consider in selecting allocations.

It is assumed that:
These other planning issues have been considered separately.
For land to be allocated within the high risk zone, the full range of planning issues has been evaluated.
It has been determined through the SEA (Strategic Environmental Assessment) and SA (Sustainability Appraisal) that the land is the most suitable for development.

The SFRA level 1 and 2 report:

A FRA must be submitted for different types of applications (more high risk), must seek flood risk reduction measures, use of SuDs required on all new development, extra conditions laid on riverside developments.

It recommends what development control policy should be used for each flood zone and also describes considerations specific policy to certain areas of the Borough of Havering i.e. AAPs.

Were these recommendations applied to the plan?

Note:
There is very limited mention of the SFRA or even flooding in the Site Allocations DPD. The only time flooding / the SFRA is quoted is in relation to what must be undertaken for each site -

‘In line with DC48 a Flood Risk Assessment must be carried out which satisfies the requirements of Havering’s Strategic Flood Risk Assessment’.

The Appendix to the SFRA provides a detailed overview of what should be included in the FRA for each site. However, only through the above generalised sentence can you say the recommendations have been applied to the plan.

The Core Strategy includes Policy DC48 (Flood Risk) which states the risk of flooding should be minimised, a sequential test must be undertaken, must have regard to the London Plan Drainage hierarchy and submit an FRA for each site.

Information from the Inspectors Report:

The Site Specific Allocations DPD was submitted in the absence of a SFRA specifically for Havering. An SFRA should at least inform the site specific allocations. The Council acknowledge that no sequential test had been applied to the allocation of sites with the Havering SFRA only completed in November 2007 after the Site Specific Allocations DPD had been submitted for examination.

The Council acknowledged that if the sequential test had been applied to the sites in the London Riverside area, there would be no justification for housing on some sites unless the exception test is passed. Having regard to the exception test, London Riverside is identified as an ‘Opportunity Area’ in the London Plan and is within the Thames Gateway Growth Area identified in the Government’s Sustainable Communities Plan.

The London Plan requires the borough to plan for compact mixed urban communities at South Dagenham along A1306 East and in Rainham. Site Specific Allocations have been developed with regard to the Draft London Thames Gateway Development Corporation Regeneration Strategy 2006 and East London SFRA. The Consultation on a Practice Guide Companion to PPS25 Development and Flood Risk highlighted that more than half of the sites in the Thames Gateway fall within Flood Zone 3 but considered the re- allocation was not possible for such a large scale of proposed development. Therefore the Sequential Test should be applied to develop mitigation measures to reduce the residual flood risk and in particular risk to life.

A number of regional policies involve housing in Flood Zone 3a based on their current state. The sites comprise a significant component of the housing supply in Havering. Redevelopment would provide the opportunity to introduce measures to make new development safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere and, where possible, reduce flood risk overall. The sites are generally large enough to allow flexibility in respect of densities and measures to compensate for the challenges of the site. Without the London Riverside sites the Council would not be able to implement the Core Strategy or meet the housing requirement.
Was an SFRA produced? Yes

What level was the SFRA completed to? Level 1

Did it consider all sources of flood risk? All

Did it include national data sets? SMP, CFMP, NAFR, Historic flood maps

Did it include information from other stakeholders? EA, Water companies

Specific mention is also made to sewer flooding and groundwater flooding.
Did it include an allowance for climate change?  Yes

Note:
West Sussex County Council
Parish Councils
Water companies
Highways Agency

How did they consider climate change (what scenarios explored)?  EA Guidance

Note:
An allowance for climate change was included and this was agreed with the EA

How did they deal with uncertainty about future flood risk?  Other

Note:
To reference to uncertainty about future flood risk.

Did the SFRA make recommendations relating to land allocations?  Yes

What were these recommendations?
Of the 47 potential allocations assessed within the SFRA only 4 contained areas within Flood Zones 2 and 3. The SFRA recommended the re-allocation of development within these sites allowing only informal open spaces and water compatible development within these flood zones.

Were these recommendations applied to the plan?

Note:
Yes these recommendations were applied to the allocations in the Site Allocations DPD.
## ASC Planning Proforma 1 - SFRA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Date:</th>
<th>01/03/2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepared By:</td>
<td>FB / RJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewed:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA:</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail Address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Was an SFRA produced?  
**No**

**Note:**  
An SFRA was not produced for the Review of the UDP, however a SFRA has since been produced (2007) to inform the development of the LDF.

### What level was the SFRA completed to?  
**Select...**

**Note:**  
An SFRA was not produced to inform the UDP.

### Did it consider all sources of flood risk?  
- [ ] All  
- [ ] Fluvial  
- [ ] Pluvial  
- [ ] Tidal

**Note:**  
An SFRA was not produced to inform the UDP.

### Did it include national data sets?  
- [ ] SMP  
- [ ] CFMP  
- [ ] NAFR  
- [ ] Historic flood maps

**Note:**  
An SFRA was not produced to inform the UDP.

### Did it include information from other stakeholders?  
- [ ] EA  
- [ ] Water companies
Drainage authorities

Other

Note:
An SFRA was not produced to inform the UDP.

Did it include an allowance for climate change?  
Select...

Note:
An SFRA was not produced to inform the UDP.

How did they consider climate change (what scenarios explored)?  
Select...

Note:
An SFRA was not produced to inform the UDP.

How did they deal with uncertainty about future flood risk?  
Select...

Note:
An SFRA was not produced to inform the UDP.

Did the SFRA make recommendations relating to land allocations?  
Select...

What were these recommendations?
An SFRA was not produced to inform the UDP.

Were these recommendations applied to the plan?

Note:
An SFRA was not produced to inform the UDP.

⚠️ Click here to sign this section
ASC Planning Proforma 1 - SFRA

Report Date: 02/02/2012
Prepared By: FB
Interviewed: LA: Leicester
E-mail Address: Department:
Telephone: Position:

Was an SFRA produced? Yes

Note: SFRA was published in 2004 - pre-PPS25 Guidance.

What level was the SFRA completed to? Other (please specify)

Note: The SFRA was published in 2004; before the publication of PPS 25, therefore it does not specify what level the SFRA was completed to.

Did it consider all sources of flood risk?

- All
- Fluvial
- Pluvial
- Tidal

Note: 

Did it include national data sets?

- SMP
- CFMP
- NAFR
- Historic flood maps

Note: The work was completed in 2004 and as such involved the development of Flood Zones to be used within the local authority area.

Did it include information from other stakeholders?

- EA
- Water companies
Did it include an allowance for climate change? Yes

Note:

How did they consider climate change (what scenarios explored)? Select...

Note:

Other - An agreed value for climate change was not available at the time, therefore DeFRA guidance was used and allowance of 20% increase in flow was incorporated.

How did they deal with uncertainty about future flood risk? Other

Note:

An agreed value for climate change was not available at the time, therefore DeFRA guidance was used and allowance of 20% increase in flow was incorporated.

Did the SFRA make recommendations relating to land allocations? Yes

What were these recommendations?

Floodplain compensation is required to mitigate the loss of flood storage in areas of proposed redevelopment.

The Leicester Masterplan proposals at the Science and Technology Park and waterside have been assessed and subject to mitigation measures on parts of the Science and Technology Park, which are in Zone 3a.

Were these recommendations applied to the plan? Yes

Note:

Yes - need for mitigation of flood risk and development and the protection and enhancement of the flood plain is recognised in policy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Was an SFRA produced?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Published in June 2009.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What level was the SFRA completed to?</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did it consider all sources of flood risk?</td>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tidal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Includes groundwater flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did it include national data sets?</td>
<td></td>
<td>SMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CFMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NAFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic flood maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note:</td>
<td></td>
<td>A CFMP was being prepared by the EA at the same time as the SFRA was published.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did it include information from other stakeholders?</td>
<td></td>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Water companies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Did it include an allowance for climate change?  Yes

How did they consider climate change (what scenarios explored)?  EA Guidance

How did they deal with uncertainty about future flood risk?  Other

It is not explicit within the SFRA how future flood risk, residual risk and uncertainty have been assessed.

Did the SFRA make recommendations relating to land allocations?  Yes

The SFRA makes a number of recommendations on the types of development that should be permitted within each of the different flood zones.

Were these recommendations applied to the plan?

The recommendations that can occur / would be appropriate within different zones is carried forward in the individual allocations.

For example, in regards to the allocation at Farleigh Meadows it specifically states that in the area of the site that is in Flood Zone 3 housing is not appropriate and proposes informal open space in this area.

Click here to sign this section
Was an SFRA produced? **Yes**

Note:
- Tees Valley Strategic Flood Risk Assessment was carried out in February 2007.
- A partial update of the SFRA was carried out as a Strategic Surface Water Flooding Study in March 2010, which identifies candidate Critical Drainage Areas, with an investigation into surface water flooding, a new set of fluvial and tidal Flood Zone maps were produced.

What level was the SFRA completed to? **Level 1**

Note:

Did it consider all sources of flood risk?  

- All  
- Fluvial  
- Pluvial  
- Tidal

Note:

Did it include national data sets?  

- SMP  
- CFMP  
- NAFR  
- Historic flood maps

Note:
- Other data sets referenced:
  - Current Development Plan allocations to 2006;
  - Areas likely to be developed beyond the life of the existing LDPs;
  - Critical Ordinary Watercourse (COW) designations;
  - Catchment topography: LiDAR (Light Detection and Ranging) data;
- Existing Section 105 investigations for watercourses in the borough and other hydraulic models;
- Current flood risk management strategies including details of flood defence assets;
- Design/post construction documentation for recent flood defence schemes;
- Proposed land use changes.

Did it include information from other stakeholders?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water companies
- [ ] Drainage authorities
- [ ] Other

Note:

Did it include an allowance for climate change?

- Yes

Note:

How did they consider climate change (what scenarios explored)?

PPS25 Annex B Figures

Note:

An allowance was made for 30% increase in peak flow, sea level rise allowance.

How did they deal with uncertainty about future flood risk?

- Other

Note:

For sites within Flood Risk Zone 2:

Proposals should demonstrate that safe access and egress to the development can be maintained during an extreme flood event and that development is set at an appropriate level so that the residual risks are managed to acceptable levels.

A further level of analysis may be required where development is planned behind, or adjacent to, existing defences in order to test the sustainability and robustness of the mitigation measures.

For sites within Flood Risk Zone 3:

It is up to the developer to demonstrate how in planning terms this safety can be achieved and how the residual risks will be managed. A clear distinction between commercial flood standards of protection and management of loss of life should be explored in the FRA. A greater reliance on flood warning may be required, which is not always a tangible alternative to accepting a lower standard of protection.
Did the SFRA make recommendations relating to land allocations?  Yes

What were these recommendations?
The majority of potential sites are located in Flood Zone 1. They are, therefore, considered to be at little or no risk to flooding from watercourses.

Recommendations to the Council are made to the Council with respect to development of the allocation/potential development site on a site-by-site basis.

Were these recommendations applied to the plan?

Note:
In the case of Middlesbrough a number of sites identified as being at risk of flooding are taken forward into the Site Allocation DPD.

A small proportion of the land that makes up the Greater Middlehaven area is within the floodplain. The Council policy response is to ensure that flood mitigation measures are included within development proposals, with planning applications to be accompanied by a flood risk assessment. The sustainability appraisal recognised overall that the regeneration of Greater Middlehaven would have beneficial impacts upon the achievement of sustainability objectives.

Parts of the older housing areas in Middlesbrough fall within a floodplain. There is a recognised need that mitigation measures should be incorporated into redevelopment proposals where flooding is identified as a risk. The sustainability appraisal recognises that the proposals for neighbourhood and housing market renewal will have a positive economic, social and environmental impact.

A number of Employment Land allocations are taken forward despite being at risk of flooding, in recognition of the perceived major beneficial effect in terms of meeting the economic and social sustainability objectives. e.g. development on Riverside Park has the potential, to impact upon the floodplain. The Council response has been to request that proposals coming forward in affected areas reflect these concerns to minimise potential impacts.

Click here to sign this section
Was an SFRA produced? **Yes**

Note: The SFRA was published in 2008 as a joint study for Norfolk.

What level was the SFRA completed to? **Other (please specify)**

Note: The SFRA was completed in 2 stages - stage 1 and stage 2.

Stage 1 acts as an inception report and provides details on the information available and the specific issues facing each authority.

This was then used as the basis for procuring consultants to complete Stage 2, which involved more detailed work.

Did it consider all sources of flood risk?  
- [ ] All
- [ ] Fluvial
- [ ] Pluvial
- [ ] Tidal

Note:

Did it include national data sets?  
- [ ] SMP
- [ ] CFMP
- [ ] NAFR
- [ ] Historic flood maps

Note:  
Surface water management plans
Did it include information from other stakeholders?

- EA
- Water companies
- Drainage authorities
- Other

Note:
- Water Companies
- Drainage Boards

Did it include an allowance for climate change? Yes

Note:

How did they consider climate change (what scenarios explored)? PPS25 Annex B Figures

Note:
The allowance for climate changes was based on that set out in PPS25.

How did they deal with uncertainty about future flood risk? Other

Note:
It is not explicit within the SFRA how future flood risk, residual risk and uncertainty have been assessed.

Did the SFRA make recommendations relating to land allocations? Yes

What were these recommendations?

Stage 1 report - This report highlights that of the 40 (approximately) areas being considered for development through the SADPD, 3 are located (partly) within Zones 2 or 3. All 3 sites are for employment uses and the Assessment recognises that in the emerging SADPD those parts of the sites at risk of flooding should be used for landscaping or car parking.

Stage 2 report - Development proposals in North Norfolk should be tested against the flood probability maps in the SFRA, which indicate flood probability associated with river systems, together with the sustainable drainage suitability maps and tables, and the Environment Agency maps indicating risk of coastal flooding.

Were these recommendations applied to the plan?
Note:
Policy in the Core Strategy is in accordance with this advice.

Click here to sign this section
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Was an SFRA produced?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A level 1 SFRA was produced in 2009.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsequently Level 2 SFRAs have been produced separately for Clevedon, Nailsea, Portishead, larger villages and Weston-super-Mare.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What level was the SFRA completed too?</strong></td>
<td>Select...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Did it consider all sources of flood risk?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Fluvial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Pluvial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Tidal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Did it include national data sets?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] SMP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] CFMP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] NAFR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Historic flood maps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Did it include information from other stakeholders?</strong></td>
<td>Select...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note:

Did it include an allowance for climate change?  
Select…

Note:

How did they consider climate change (what scenarios explored)?  
Select…

Note:

How did they deal with uncertainty about future flood risk?  
Select…

Note:

Did the SFRA make recommendations relating to land allocations?  
Select…

What were these recommendations?  

Were these recommendations applied to the plan?  

Note:

Click here to sign this section
# ASC Planning Proforma 1 - SFRA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Date:</th>
<th>01/03/2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewed:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail Address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared By:</td>
<td>FB / DG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA:</td>
<td>Plymouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Was an SFRA produced?  
Yes  

**Note:**  
The SFRA was produced in 2006 and a Level 2 report was published in 2008.

### What level was the SFRA completed to?  
Level 2  

**Note:**  

### Did it consider all sources of flood risk?  
- All  
- Fluvial  
- Pluvial  
- Tidal  

**Note:**  

### Did it include national data sets?  
- SMP  
- CFMP  
- NAFR  
- Historic flood maps  

**Note:**  
LCLIP used in the 2006 report
Did it include information from other stakeholders?  
- EA  
- Water companies  
- Drainage authorities  
- Other

Note:

Did it include an allowance for climate change?  
Yes

Note:

How did they consider climate change (what scenarios explored)?  
EA Guidance

Note:
In the 2008 Level 2 report it states that it has used EA Climate Change flood outlines.

How did they deal with uncertainty about future flood risk?  
Other

Note:
It is not explicit within the SFRA how future flood risk, residual risk and uncertainty have been assessed.

Did the SFRA make recommendations relating to land allocations?  
Yes

What were these recommendations?
The Level 2 SFRA provides a spatial overview of the scale of flood risk affecting potential development sites across different areas of the district. This includes highline where proposed development is in Zones 2/3 for more vulnerable uses and stresses that when some developments types currently proposed for Flood Zone 3 areas would not be permitted due to its vulnerability classification as part of the Sequential Test and should be moved to areas with a lower probability of flooding.

It highlights that the Exceptions Test should be applied to a number of non-water compatible developments in FZ 2 and 3 and that they will require specific flood risk assessments to be undertaken.

Were these recommendations applied to the plan?

Note:
The Core Strategy has a specific section on Flood Risk.

The Core Strategy recognises that:

As a city framed by the sea and two major river systems, Plymouth needs to respond appropriately to the issue of flood risk. The Core Strategy contains a Flood Risk Diagram which illustrates the distribution of land considered to be in the Environment Agency’s medium and high probability Flood Zone 2 and 3.

The risk of coastal and river flooding will increase as a result of the predicted effects of climate change, including rising sea level and increased winter rainfall.

The Core Strategy states that:

To achieve a programme of sustainable development Plymouth will need to adapt to this situation by taking steps to defend existing properties and direct new growth to areas with little or no risk of flooding.

The majority of development allocations in the LDF will be outside areas of medium to high probability of flooding. However, significant challenges exist with the need to deliver social and economic regeneration in Millbay, the City Centre and the East End, but also to respond appropriately in these areas to risk of flooding now and in the future.

The Council’s Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2006) indicates that by 2080, in the absence of appropriate defences, sea level rise will result in annual flood events in these areas. Without appropriate mitigation measures, floods in these areas could be caused either directly by tide and waves and/or indirectly by sea level rise reducing the capacity of surface water drainage systems.

Development within these areas will therefore need to be informed by detailed Flood Risk Assessments that demonstrate how it will make a positive contribution to reducing or managing flood risk. This will involve a number of measures including:

- Locating vulnerable types of development to avoid risk from flooding
- Raising floor and land levels
- Improving capacity and effectiveness of drainage infrastructure
- Providing flood defences and flood warning measures.

Within the Area Action Plans that support the Core Strategy there are references to specific developments and the need to provide an assessment of the risk of flooding, with text to reflect that:

Development should be designed to avoid unnecessary development in areas of high risk and to minimise the impact of development on flooding, or provide mitigation measures to reduce the impacts of potential flooding.
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**ASC Planning Proforma 1 - SFRA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Date:</th>
<th>01/03/2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepared By:</td>
<td>FB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA:</td>
<td>Poole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail Address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Was an SFRA produced?**  
Yes

**Note:**  

**What level was the SFRA completed to?**  
Level 2

**Note:**  

**Did it consider all sources of flood risk?**
- All
- Fluvial
- Pluvial
- Tidal

**Note:**

**Did it include national data sets?**
- SMP
- CFMP
- NAFR
- Historic flood maps

**Note:**

**Did it include information from other stakeholders?**
- EA
- Water companies
| Note: | | | |

| Did it include an allowance for climate change? | Yes | |
| Note: | | | |

| How did they consider climate change (what scenarios explored)? | EA Guidance | |
| Note: | | | |

The scenarios considered are the 5%, 1%, 0.5% and 0.1% annual probability flood (equivalent to the 20-year, 100-year, 200-year and 1000-year return period floods). A breach scenario is also considered near Poole Bridge where the wall protecting the Old Town is at its highest.

Climate change scenarios were modelled for the years 2086 and 2126. These dates correspond to the end of the Local Development Framework plus a 60-year lifetime for commercial buildings and a 100-year lifetime for residential buildings.

| How did they deal with uncertainty about future flood risk? | Other | |
| Note: | | | |

It is not explicit within the SFRA how future flood risk, residual risk and uncertainty have been assessed.

| Did the SFRA make recommendations relating to land allocations? | Yes | |
| What were these recommendations? | | | |
A range of general flood protection, mitigation and adoption measures were outlined within both the Level 1 and level 2 SFRAS, these included:

* Land should be allocated in a way which will be sustainable in the future and takes into account possible flood risk.

* All new developments should be designed, where possible, to reduce flood risk to the development and elsewhere

More specifically in regards to allocations the Level 2 SFRA stated that:

To provide protection for the future situation, the Regeneration Areas A (Hamworthy side) and B (West Quay Road side) will both need defences, such as flood walls or embankments, with elevation sufficient to prevent any significant wave overtopping for a 0.5% joint probability event. As schemes come forward these developments will need to provide their own defences and also ensure their defences form part of strategic flood defence measures required for the Regeneration Area sites.

Additional defences will also be required outside the Regeneration Areas (to combat water overtopping into adjoining land and so preventing water spreading to the Regeneration Areas and other central areas like Hamworthy and the town centre) in the following zones:

* North of Regeneration Area B, close to the railway station
* South of Regeneration Area B, east of Poole Bridge
* East of Regeneration Area A, east of Poole Bridge.

Were these recommendations applied to the plan?

Note:
The need to incorporate mitigation and adaptation measures into developments was set out within policies in the Core Strategy. This also included policy in regards to the creation of flood defences.
ASC Planning Proforma 1 - SFRA

Report Date: 01/03/2012
Prepared By: FB

Interviewed: LA:
Reading

E-mail Address: Department:

Telephone: Position:

Was an SFRA produced? Yes
Note: The SFRA was produced in 2009.

What level was the SFRA completed to? Level 1
Note:

Did it consider all sources of flood risk?
- All
- Fluvial
- Pluvial
- Tidal

Note:

Did it include national data sets?
- SMP
- CFMP
- NAFR
- Historic flood maps

Note: EA Flood Zone Maps

Did it include information from other stakeholders?
- EA
- Water companies
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Note:</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Companies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Did it include an allowance for climate change?**  
Yes

**Note:**

**How did they consider climate change (what scenarios explored)?**  
PPS25 Annex B Figures

**Note:**

**How did they deal with uncertainty about future flood risk?**  
Other

**Note:**

The SFRA states that the Environment Agency (Thames Region) generally adopt a 300mm allowance for uncertainty within areas that have been modelled in some detail. However, it acknowledges that the degree of uncertainty in areas reliant upon the Environment Agency’s national generalised computer model will clearly be somewhat higher.

It therefore states that it is incumbent on developers to carry out a detailed Flood Risk Assessment as part of the design process and that a review of uncertainty should be undertaken as an integral outcome of this more detailed investigation.

**Did the SFRA make recommendations relating to land allocations?**  
Yes

**What were these recommendations?**
The SFRA made recommendations for both spatial planning and development control. The spatial planning section made reference to the types of development that should be promoted in these areas, for example in relation to developed areas in Zone 3b it states the need to proactively seek to reduce risk by reducing the vulnerability of the existing land use.

Whilst the table of recommendations makes broad recommendations on the types and approach to development in different flood zones it does not make specific recommendations on individual allocations. A review of the level of flood risk experienced in different parts of the borough is also included which compares the level of flood risk and the scale of future development pressures experienced. This highlights that in some areas of the city, for example Reading Centre, there will be a need to complete the sequential and exceptions test through the development of the AAP for the area. This can be used to help manage the level of flood risk experienced here.

In terms of development control a number of recommendations are made in regards to mitigation and adaptation measures to be incorporated into planning applications.

 Were these recommendations applied to the plan?

Note:

Policy CS35: Flooding in the Core Strategy states that:

"Planning permission will not be permitted for development in an area identified as being at high risk of flooding, where development would reduce the capacity of the flood plain to store floodwater, impede the flow of floodwater or in any way increase the risks to life and property arising from flooding."
### ASC Planning Proforma 1 - SFRA

**Report Date:** 01/03/2012  
**Prepared By:** FB  
**Interviewed:** LA: Redbridge London Boro  
**E-mail Address:**  
**Department:**  
**Position:**

### Was an SFRA produced?  
**No**

**Note:**  
The SFRA was completed in 2009 and the Site Allocations DPD was adopted in 2008 so the SFRA did not inform the Site Allocations DPD.

### What level was the SFRA completed to?  
**Select...**

**Note:**

### Did it consider all sources of flood risk?  
- All  
- Fluvial  
- Pluvial  
- Tidal

**Note:**

### Did it include national data sets?  
- SMP  
- CFMP  
- NAFR  
- Historic flood maps

**Note:**

### Did it include information from other stakeholders?  
- EA  
- Water companies
Note:

Did it include an allowance for climate change? 

Select...

Note:

How did they consider climate change (what scenarios explored)? 

Select...

Note:

How did they deal with uncertainty about future flood risk? 

Select...

Note:

Did the SFRA make recommendations relating to land allocations? 

Select...

What were these recommendations?

Were these recommendations applied to the plan?

Note:

Click here to sign this section
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Was an SFRA produced?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Note:</td>
<td>The SFRA for Sandwell was completed as part of the Black Country SFRA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What level was the SFRA completed to?</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Note:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did it consider all sources of flood risk?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did it include national data sets?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic flood maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did it include information from other stakeholders?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Did it include an allowance for climate change?  Yes

Note:

How did they consider climate change (what scenarios explored)?  PPS25 Annex B Figures

Note:

How did they deal with uncertainty about future flood risk?  Other

Note:
The SFRA highlights that it is difficult to quantify uncertainty.
The adopted flood zones underpinning the Black Country SFRA are based upon the detailed flood mapping. Whilst these provide a robust depiction of flood risk for specific modelled conditions, all detailed modelling requires the making of core assumptions and the use of empirical estimations relating to (for example) rainfall distribution and catchment response.

It states that it is incumbent on developers to carry out a detailed Flood Risk Assessment as part of the design process. A review of uncertainty should be undertaken as an integral outcome of this more detailed investigation.

Did the SFRA make recommendations relating to land allocations?  Yes

What were these recommendations?
The SFRA made recommendations what types of development land should be allocated for in different flood zones.

For example this recommends that in FZ 3b areas of functional floodplain should be protected for flood storage purposes.

In Zone 3a it states that Future development within Zone 3a High Probability should be restricted to ‘less vulnerable’ land uses, in accordance with PPS25. Although, it acknowledges that Where non-flood risk related planning matters dictate that ‘more vulnerable’ (residential) development should be considered further, it will be necessary to ensure that the requirements of the Exception Test are satisfied.

In accordance with PPS25, land use within Zone 2 Medium Probability should be restricted to the ‘water-compatible’, ‘less vulnerable’ and ‘more vulnerable’ category (including residential development), or essential infrastructure, to satisfy the requirements of the Sequential Test. Where non-flood risk related planning matters dictate that ‘highly vulnerable’ development should be considered further, it will be necessary to ensure that the requirements of the Exception Test are satisfied.

A number of development management recommendations were made in regards to the levels of flood risk experienced, to help mitigate and adapt to the level of flood risk experienced.

Were these recommendations applied to the plan?

Note:
Analysis of the Submission Draft Allocations DPD indicates that sites have been included within this document that are within flood zones 2 and 3. However, this highlights for those sites affected by flood risk that this risk exists and that it will need to be considered in any respective planning applications.

Click here to sign this section
Was an SFRA produced? No

Note:
An SFRA was subsequently produced in 2009 and is in the process of being updated. As set out in the Core Documents list in Appendix 2 of the Inspector's Report (Feb 2006) it would appear that a SFRA was not completed.

What level was the SFRA completed to? Select...

Note:

Did it consider all sources of flood risk? All Fluvial Pluvial Tidal

Note:

Did it include national data sets? SMP CFMP NAFR Historic flood maps

Note:

Did it include information from other stakeholders? Select...
Did it include an allowance for climate change?  

Note:  

How did they consider climate change (what scenarios explored)?  

Note:  

How did they deal with uncertainty about future flood risk?  

Note:  

Did the SFRA make recommendations relating to land allocations?  

What were these recommendations?  

Were these recommendations applied to the plan?  

Note:  

Click here to sign this section
Was an SFRA produced? | Yes
---|---
**Note:**
The SFRA was produced in 2007 and was updated in 2009 to inform the Site Allocations DPD.

What level was the SFRA completed to? | Level 1
---|---
**Note:**

Did it consider all sources of flood risk? | All
---|---
Fluvial
Pluvial
Tidal

**Note:**

Did it include national data sets? | SMP
---|---
CFMP
NAFR
Historic flood maps

**Note:**

Did it include information from other stakeholders? | EA
---|---
Water companies
Note:
The SFRA states that Thames Water was approached for information relating to the surface and foul sewers in Slough and particularly with respect to capacity issues in parts of the Borough. However, they did not respond.

Did it include an allowance for climate change?  Yes

Note:

How did they consider climate change (what scenarios explored)?

PPS25 Annex B Figures

Note:

How did they deal with uncertainty about future flood risk?  Other

Note:
It is not explicit within the SFRA how future flood risk, residual risk and uncertainty have been assessed.

Did the SFRA make recommendations relating to land allocations?  Yes

What were these recommendations?
The SFRA noted that of the sites proposed for residential development only 2 sites that do not already have planning permissions are situated in FZ 2/3. It stated in relation to these sites it stated that if they would be need for a Level 2 SFRA to support the AAPs being developed for these two parts of the district.

The SFRA also highlights that a number of existing business areas and retail areas in Chavley and Langley would need to be subject to the completion of a sequential test.

Were these recommendations applied to the plan?

Note:
Those sites in Flood Zones 2 and 3 which were included in the Site Allocations DPD specifically include the reference to the need to complete a sequential text.
Click here to sign this section
Was an SFRA produced?  
No

Note:  
The UDP Annex B provides a list of core documents, the most relevant to this would be: CD/141 Background Paper – The Environment - Solihull MBC, March 2004.

This document is not publicly available.

A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (Level 1) was completed for Solihull Borough Council in January 2008.

What level was the SFRA completed to?  
Select...

Note:

Did it consider all sources of flood risk?

All
Fluvial
Pluvial
Tidal

Note:

Did it include national data sets?

SMP
CFMP
NAFR
Historic flood maps

Note:
Did it include information from other stakeholders?  
- [ ] EA  
- [ ] Water companies  
- [ ] Drainage authorities  
- [ ] Other

Note:

Did it include an allowance for climate change?  
Select...

Note:

How did they consider climate change (what scenarios explored)?  
Select...

Note:

How did they deal with uncertainty about future flood risk?  
Select...

Note:

Did the SFRA make recommendations relating to land allocations?  
Select...

What were these recommendations?

Were these recommendations applied to the plan?

Note:
Click here to sign this section
ASC Planning Proforma 1 - SFRA

Report Date: 01/03/2012
Prepared By: DG
Interviewed: LA:
South Cambridgeshire District
E-mail Address: 
Department: 
Telephone: 
Position: SADPD

Was an SFRA produced? Yes

Note:
A Level 1 SFRA was initially produced for South Cambridgeshire District Council in 2005 and for Cambridge City Council in 2006.
A Level 1 SFRA, completed in September 2010, supersedes both these studies.
A strategic Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP) has been produced for Cambridgeshire, to identify areas vulnerable to surface water flooding.
A Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment has been produced for the whole of the Cambridgeshire County Council area, the first of a four stage process that will be undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council as part of its obligations under the Flood Risk Regulations 2009.

What level was the SFRA completed to? Level 1

Note:

Did it consider all sources of flood risk?

- All
- Fluvial
- Pluvial
- Tidal

Note:

Did it include national data sets?

- SMP
- CFMP
- NAFR
- Historic flood maps

...
Note:
Other data included:
- Hydraulic modelling data including the River Cam Catchment Flood Risk mapping (provided by the EA);
- LIDAR data;
- Flood extent data;
- Flood defence and key asset information;
- Local Plan and Local Development Framework policy documents.

Did it include information from other stakeholders?
- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water companies
- [ ] Drainage authorities
- [ ] Other

Note:
- Internal Drainage Boards
- Cambridgeshire County Council
- Cambridgeshire Horizons
- Cambridgeshire Flood Risk Management Partnership
- Clerks of the Parish Councils
- Residents Associations
- Hobson's Conduit Trust
- Anglian Water Services Ltd

Did it include an allowance for climate change?
Yes

Note:
How did they consider climate change (what scenarios explored)?
PPS25 Annex B Figures

Note:
How did they deal with uncertainty about future flood risk?
Sensitivity Test

Note:
Sensitivity ranges for peak rainfall intensities, peak river flows, offshore wind speeds and wave heights are set out in line with the PPS25 Annex B Figures.

The SFRA evaluates the current (2010) flood risk situation and the future flood risk situation over a 105 year timeframe (2115), incorporating the impacts of climate change in line with PPS25.

Did the SFRA make recommendations relating to land allocations?
Yes
What were these recommendations?

The key recommendations of the SFRA Level 1 are:

- Ensure developers and consultants make reference to the SFRA study prior to the formulation of development proposals and planning applications.
- Ensure developers carry out site specific FRA’s for their proposals in line with the EA’s latest standing advice on flood risk and the requirements of a site specific FRA.
- Implement strategic flood mitigation opportunities such as areas of Green Infrastructure (where possible), by way of developer contributions, planning conditions, or S106 agreements.
- Maintain an up to date Emergency and Flood Evacuation Plan for the District.
- Support the implementation of SuDS by way of robust planning conditions and / or Section 106 (S106) agreements.

Were these recommendations applied to the plan?

Note:

Sites at risk of surface water flooding are allocated for housing and employment in the Site Allocations DPD.

No sites are allocated in Flood Risk Zones 2 or 3.

For each site that is known to experience flooding on occasions, the DPD states that the Council will require appropriate mitigation measures to be put in place.
Was an SFRA produced?  No

Note:
No evidence found of an SFRA supporting the Local Plan.

A SFRA Level 1 Report was published in February 2009, followed by a Level 2 Report in December 2011.

What level was the SFRA completed to?  Select...

Note:

Did it consider all sources of flood risk?

- All
- Fluvial
- Pluvial
- Tidal

Note:

Did it include national data sets?

- SMP
- CFMP
- NAFR
- Historic flood maps

Note:
Did it include information from other stakeholders? □ EA
□ Water companies
□ Drainage authorities
□ Other

Note:

Did it include an allowance for climate change? Select...

Note:

How did they consider climate change (what scenarios explored)? Select...

Note:

How did they deal with uncertainty about future flood risk? Select...

Note:

Did the SFRA make recommendations relating to land allocations? Select...

What were these recommendations?

Were these recommendations applied to the plan?

Note:
Click here to sign this section
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Was an SFRA produced?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Note:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) for South Holland District Council was published in December 2002 based on the PPG 25 guidance note.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is an example of an early forerunner for SFRA's and their inclusion with the plan making process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An update of the SFRA was carried out in January 2010, supplemented by a Water Cycle Study published in January 2011, as part of the evidence base for the emerging South Holland Local Development Framework.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What level was the SFRA completed to?</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Note:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did it consider all sources of flood risk?</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Fluvial</th>
<th>Pluvial</th>
<th>Tidal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Note:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SFRA did not consider Pluvial Flooding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SFRA considers flood risk from both tidal and fluvial sources, including flood risk from the Drainage Board systems. The present-day (year 2002) situation is evaluated, as is the situation for 50 years time (year 2052) with projected sea level rise and the impact of climate change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SFRA does not consider storm water drainage or foul drainage provision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did it include national data sets?</th>
<th>SMP</th>
<th>CFMP</th>
<th>NAFR</th>
<th>Historic flood maps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Note:
- The Wash SMP (December 1996).

Did it include information from other stakeholders?
- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water companies
- [ ] Drainage authorities
- [ ] Other

Note:
The SFRA acknowledges the following stakeholders:
- Environment Agency Anglian Region;
- Internal Drainage Boards whose districts are wholly or partly within South Holland District; the relevant Boards are South Holland, North Level, Black Sluice, The Welland and Deepings; and Wingland (part of the King’s Lynn Consortium of Drainage Boards).

Did it include an allowance for climate change?
- [ ] Yes

Note:
The SFRA has considered cases as for the year 2002 and the year 2052.

For the 2052 case, it has been assumed that all defences are maintained in their existing condition and at their existing crest level. It has also been assumed that the built infrastructure, such as roads and other development which could affect the spread of flood waters, will be the same in 2052 as in 2002.

Predicted sea level rise, at 6mm/year, has been allowed for in the assessments. This rate of rise is as currently advised by the Environment Agency and DEFRA.

The impact of predicted climate change on river flows has been included in the assessment for 2052 by considering river inflows increased by 10% from the present-day estimation. This flow increase is based on climate change impacts as assessed for the river catchments relevant to South Holland District.

How did they consider climate change (what scenarios explored)?
- [ ] Select...

Note:
Other - the SFRA pre-dates guidance referred to in the tabs above.

Key references for opinion on the impact of climate change as relevant to South Holland District are:


How did they deal with uncertainty about future flood
- [ ] Other
The SFRA has considered cases as for the year 2002 and the year 2052.

For the 2052 case, it has been assumed that all defences are maintained in their existing condition and at their existing crest level. It has also been assumed that the built infrastructure, such as roads and other development which could affect the spread of flood waters, will be the same in 2052 as in 2002.

Predicted sea level rise, at 6mm/year, has been allowed for in the assessments. This rate of rise is as currently advised by the Environment Agency and DEFRA.

The impact of predicted climate change on river flows has been included in the assessment for 2052 by considering river inflows increased by 10% from the present-day estimation. This flow increase is based on climate change impacts as assessed for the river catchments relevant to South Holland District.

Did the SFRA make recommendations relating to land allocations? No

What were these recommendations?

The whole of South Holland District is included within the Environment Agency indicative floodplain since all parts are reliant on flood defences, of some form, for their respective standard of flood protection.

Were these recommendations applied to the plan?

A specific policy - Policy SG9 Development and Flood Risk - is included in the UDP Written Statement citing the work carried out in the SFRA.

This highlights flood risk as a strategic issue within South Holland, due to the Environment Agency Flood Zone Map identifying much of the District as being at risk of flooding from rivers or the sea.

The District Council discourages new development in areas at high risk of flooding. It is aware, though, that some development may be necessary for 'operational reasons' in order to maintain service infrastructure.

The Council sets the following criteria for those proposing particular developments:

- providing an assessment of whether any proposed development is likely to be affected by flooding and whether it will increase flood risk elsewhere and of the measures proposed to deal with these effects and risks;
- satisfying the Local Planning Authority that any flood risk to the development or additional risk arising from the proposal will be successfully managed with the minimum environmental effect, to ensure the safe development and secure future occupancy of the site; and
- covering the costs of alleviation or mitigation measures including their long term monitoring and management defined by ourselves in consultation with the appropriate bodies.

This policy also identifies measures to reduce the risk of flooding or consequences of flooding may include: improving flood defences on or off site; and / or flood proofing the development through design, including for example, raising floor levels.
Was an SFRA produced?  Yes

Note:
A combined Level 1 and 2 SFRA for South Tyneside (July 2010) has been produced; building on the existing Tyne and Wear Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2007), in the following additional areas:

- Taking account of advances in risk information from data collection and processing;
- Inclusion of climate change mapping;
- Identification of functional floodplain;
- Improved understanding of flooding from other sources;
- Developing a greater focus on the application of the PPS25 Exception Test; and
- Preparing a review of current sites identified for potential development.

What level was the SFRA completed to?  Level 2

Did it consider all sources of flood risk?

- All
- Fluvial
- Pluvial
- Tidal

Note:
The SFRA provides an assessment of six sources of flooding in the South Tyneside area, comprising: fluvial, tidal, surface water, sewers, groundwater and reservoirs.

Did it include national data sets?

- SMP
- CFMP
- NAFR
- Historic flood maps

Note:
- South Tyneside Shoreline Management Plan (February 2007)
- United Kingdom Climate Impacts Programme (UKCIP) - use of UKCIP02 scenarios.
- UK Climate Projections 2009 (UKCP09) - projections of changes to climate; the marine and coastal environment; and recent trends in observed climate.

Did it include information from other stakeholders?  
☑ EA  
☑ Water companies  
☐ Drainage authorities  
☑ Other

Note:
Stakeholders cited in the SFRA included:
- South Tyneside Council  
- Environment Agency  
- Highways Agency  
- Northumbrian Water  
- Tyne & Wear Fire & Rescue

Did it include an allowance for climate change?  
Yes

Note:

How did they consider climate change (what scenarios explored)?  
PPS25 Annex B Figures

Note:

How did they deal with uncertainty about future flood risk?  
Other

Note:
- The SFRA looks at the implications of residual risk, as a consequence of overtopping or breach of defences i.e. risks that remain despite the presence of flood avoidance and mitigation measures.
- Residual risks in the South Tyneside area are associated with scenarios that have a low probability of occurring, such as higher magnitude flood events, defence failure and storm surges that overtop coastal defences.

Did the SFRA make recommendations relating to land allocations?  
Yes

What were these recommendations?
The SFRA states that whilst the aim has been to try an avoid development in flood risk areas in the first instance. However, the SFRA accepts that there is current development in flood risk areas and there will need to be a level of continued regeneration.

Key aspects highlighted by the SFRA include: minimising flood risk to people, property and the environment should be considered, whilst flood defences go some way in reducing current flood risks by providing a standard of protection.

However, the SFRA acknowledges that there is still a residual risk associated with flood defences from overtopping or failure.

Flood Warning is an integral part of flood risk management. The Environment Agency is the lead authority and has responsibility for warning the public, local authorities and emergency services.

Were these recommendations applied to the plan?

Note:
The Site Allocations DPD states that it has been informed by Strategic and Sequential Flood Risk Assessments to determine the implications for any sites that may be at risk of flooding.

The DPD highlights the role that Green Infrastructure can play in helping to manage flood risk.

Following sequential testing of all sites identified for development by the Council, 11 sites, located within elements of either Flood Zones 2 or 3, have been retained for future development.

Within these sites:
- Approximately 8ha of land, identified for development, is located within high risk Flood Zones 3a and 3b. (This area of land is primarily designated as Flood Zone 3b).
- Approximately 11.9ha of the total development site area is at risk of flooding during the 0.1% event (Flood Zone 2+3a+3b).

In order to comply with the requirements of PPS25 the Council have stipulated that Flood Zone 3b areas are designated as having Water Compatible and (potentially) Essential Infrastructural uses only.

The Council considers, that it is possible to avoid development in Flood Zone 3 without losing significant developable area, with these areas to be retained or enhanced as green space or areas of public open space.
ASC Planning Proforma 1 - SFRA

Was an SFRA produced?  Yes

Note:
Spelthorne Borough Council published its Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) in December 2006.

What level was the SFRA completed to?  Level 1

Note:

Did it consider all sources of flood risk?
- All
- Fluvial
- Pluvial
- Tidal

Note:

Did it include national data sets?
- SMP
- CFMP
- NAFR
- Historic flood maps

Note:
Other data referred to in SFRA:
- Information relating to localised flooding issues (surface water, groundwater and/or sewer related), from the Council and the Environment Agency;
- Detailed flood risk mapping;
- Environment Agency Flood Map (September 2006); and
- Topography (LiDAR).
Did it include information from other stakeholders?

- EA
- Water companies
- Drainage authorities
- Other

Note:
- Spelthorne Borough Council (Planning and Drainage)
- Thames Water

Did it include an allowance for climate change? Yes

Note:
PPS25 guidance states that a 20% increase in the 1% AEP (100 year) river flow can be expected within the next 50 years, increasing to a 30% increase in the 1% AEP (100 year) river flow can be expected within the next 100 years.

How did they consider climate change (what scenarios explored)? PPS25 Annex B Figures

Note:
The detailed modelling of the Lower Thames has considered the potential impact of climate change over the next 50 years. The anticipated extent of the 1% AEP (100 year) flood affected area in 2056, broadly resembles the current 0.1% AEP (1000 year) flood outline.

This indicates a considerable increase in the number of properties at risk of flooding. It has been estimated that flood depths within the current High Probability Flood Zone 3a may increase by up to 300 mm as a result of climate change over the next 50 years.

How did they deal with uncertainty about future flood risk? Other

Note:
The SFRA acknowledges it is hard quantify uncertainty. The adopted flood zones underpinning the Spelthorne SFRA are based upon the detailed flood mapping within the area adjoining the River Thames.

Whilst these provide a robust depiction of flood risk for specific modelled conditions, all detailed modelling requires the making of core assumptions and the use of empirical estimations relating to (for example) rainfall distribution and catchment response.

Taking a conservative approach for planning purposes, the Environment Agency (Thames Region) generally adopt a 300 mm allowance for uncertainty within areas that have been modelled in some detail. The degree of uncertainty in areas reliant upon the Environment Agency’s national generalised computer model will be somewhat higher.

As proposals on sites get taken forward, it will be incumbent on developers to carry out a detailed Flood Risk Assessment for allocated sites as part of the design process. A review of uncertainty should be undertaken as an integral outcome of this more detailed investigation.
Did the SFRA make recommendations relating to land allocations? Yes

What were these recommendations?

Policy recommendations were:

To reduce flood risk within the Borough by:
- supporting appropriate flood alleviation measures under consideration by the Environment Agency;
- promoting the application of sustainable drainage techniques for all development within the Borough;
- maintaining the effectiveness of the existing available floodplain by not permitting future development within existing open areas;
- seeking to steer vulnerable development away from flood affected areas;
- seeking a measurable reduction in the likelihood of flooding through redevelopment within existing urban areas, for example, through the provision of flood storage and/or the reduced impedance of flood flow routes; and
- ensuring flood resilient construction within flood affected areas.

Emergency planning recommendations were:
- review the flood risk response plan.

Were these recommendations applied to the plan?

Note:
The SFRA shows that 23.2% of the Borough (and 14.1% of its existing urban area) is at risk in a 1 in 100 year flood event (Zone 3) and 48% of the Borough is at risk in a 1 in 1000 year flood event (Zone 2).

The 1 in 1000 flood risk area is broadly equivalent to the 1 in 100 + 20% for climate change and the maximum of the two outlines is taken to define flood Zone 2. The 1:100 year flood risk area affects over 5,600 residential properties and large employment areas including about half of Staines town centre.

The SFRA Part interprets the full SFRA in the context of the Spelthorne Development Plan and considers the sequential approach to locating new development to avoid flood risk.

Parts of the main centres in the Borough do not meet the requirements of the sequential test, but relocation of key services and functions away from the major centres is considered unrealistic. In addition, the positive contribution which these centres make to other sustainability objectives such as accessibility and using previously developed land suggest that it would be appropriate to consider some locations to be taken forward in the Allocations DPD on the basis of the exceptions test.

Land in areas at higher flood risk – 1:20 (referred to in PPS25 as ‘functional flood plain’ or Zone 3b) would not, however, be appropriate for further consideration since these are areas of generally fast flowing floodwater where there are particular risks to people and property.

The Site Allocations DPD takes forward sites which are identified as being at risk for flooding.

The SFRA demonstrates that relocation of existing urban development is, however, unrealistic.

Instead, measures to alleviate flooding are recommended and the approach of using redevelopment to secure betterment is proposed. Strategic Policy SP7 and the supporting DC policies consider the matter further and the Allocations DPD will use assessment of flood risk information for individual sites.

On a site by site basis, under the subject of 'development criteria' for specific allocation, information on flood risk is included based on the flood maps referred to in the SFRA and the Core Strategy.

Click here to sign this section
### ASC Planning Proforma 1 - SFRA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Date:</th>
<th>01/03/2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepared By:</td>
<td>DG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA:</td>
<td>Sunderland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position:</td>
<td>UDPLP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Was an SFRA produced?** Yes

**Note:**

- This SFRA was published in July 2007, building on the Tyne & Wear SFRA, presenting information relating to Sunderland City Council area.

The UDP Alteration No. 2 (Central Sunderland) Adopted Policies, was adopted in September 2007.

The SFRA has since been updated by Sunderland City Council in June 2010 as part of the evidence gathering stage of the Sunderland Local Development Framework.

**What level was the SFRA completed to?** Other (please specify)

**Note:**

- A sequential test of the flood risk posed to potential housing sites and key employment locations.
- An assessment of potential sites to be allocated for development and how likely those sites located in Flood Zones 2 and 3 will pass the Exception Test.

**Did it consider all sources of flood risk?**

- [ ] All
- [x] Fluvial
- [ ] Pluvial
- [ ] Tidal

**Note:**

**Did it include national data sets?**

- [x] SMP
- [x] CFMP
- [ ] NAFR
- [x] Historic flood maps

**Note:**

- Catchment Topography (LiDAR)

**Other data referenced:**

- Critical Ordinary Watercourse (COW) designations and investigations.
- Critical Ordinary Watercourse (COW) designations and investigations
- Section 105 investigations for watercourses
- Hydrometric data

Did it include information from other stakeholders?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drainage authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
Whilst others may have been involved, the only stakeholders explicitly referenced within the SFRA are: Sunderland City Council Officers and the Environment Agency.

Did it include an allowance for climate change?  Yes

Note:

How did they consider climate change (what scenarios explored)?  PPS25 Annex B Figures

Note:

How did they deal with uncertainty about future flood risk?  Other

Note:
It is not explicit within the SFRA how future flood risk, residual risk and uncertainty have been assessed.

Did the SFRA make recommendations relating to land allocations?  Yes

What were these recommendations?
Zones 2 and 3 of the SFRA extend along the corridor of the River Wear and include the Port of Sunderland.

Zones 2 and 3 affect the following allocated sites to the extent of the approximate percentages shown:
- Vaux/ Galleys Gill/ Farringdon Row (SA55A.2) (percentage not known)
- The Port (SA6A.2) (59%)
- Groves (SA6A.1) (12%)
- Pallion Yard (SA6B.2) (20%)
- Bonnersfield / St. Peter's University Campus (NA3B.1) (26%)
- Sunderland Strategic Transport Corridor (SA52A) (bridge crossing location)

The SFRA considers the likelihood of passing the test for each of the above sites, with all but the Port achieving ‘high’ probability, the Port being ‘medium’.

Were these recommendations applied to the plan?

Note:
The City Council takes the view that the scale of encroachment of potential flood risk areas onto these substantial sites, with large areas for development unaffected by flood risk, indicates that a risk-based sequential test is not appropriate to the entirety of each site.

The Council consider that no alternative sites, on the scale of those in the Alteration, offering similar development opportunities, exist elsewhere in the city. The Council view is that there are no sequentially preferable sites.

The Council cite that due to the importance for the regeneration and economy of the city that the redevelopment of these sites is progressed, whilst taking account of measures necessary to mitigate the potential impact of partial flooding.

Applications for sites falling within Flood Zones 2 and 3 must be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment, to include design measures to take account of potential flood problems.

The Local Plan states that to help towards mitigating the impact of flooding the council will give consideration to the following measures:-
- Developing a ‘water compatible’ green corridor along the banks of the River Wear, as indicated in specific site policies; and
- Retaining, along the bank top, an 8 metre maintenance access strip that is void of development.
ASC Planning Proforma 1 - SFRA

Report Date: 01/03/2012
Prepared By: DG

Interviewed: LA:
Sutton London Boro

E-mail Address: 

Department:

Telephone: 
Position:
SADPD

Was an SFRA produced? Yes

Note:
- Level 1 Final Report, December 2008
- Sutton Level 2 Final Report, July 2009

What level was the SFRA completed to? Level 2

Note:

Did it consider all sources of flood risk?

- All
- Fluvial
- Pluvial
- Tidal

Note:

Did it include national data sets?

- SMP
- CFMP
- NAFR
- Historic flood maps

Note:
- Hydraulic Modelling
- Flood Defence Data
- Topographic Data (LiDAR)
- Sewer Flooding Data
- Overland Flow / Surface Water Flooding Data
- Groundwater Flooding Data
- Artificial Sources / Infrastructure Failure Data
Did it include information from other stakeholders?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water companies
- [ ] Drainage authorities
- [x] Other

Note:


Did it include an allowance for climate change?  Yes

Note:

The Environment Agency holds a model of the River Wandle which has been recently been modified and re-run for the 2008 Wandle Flood Risk Mapping Study.

The EA has provided the draft flood outlines from the Wandle hydraulic model for use within this study. This modelling includes climate change and functional floodplain outlines.

How did they consider climate change (what scenarios explored)?  PPS25 Annex B Figures

Note:

The Flood Zones are defined considering the effects of climate change. For fluvial systems PPS25 requires an increase of 20% in peak flows to be used when mapping climate change flood zones up to 2115.

The Environment Agency's recent fluvial modelling studies for the River Wandle and River Ravensbourne have considered climate change and produced outputs to show the potential impacts. However no climate change information is currently available for the Beverley Brook therefore the Environment Agency has recommended that surrogate flood outlines relating to higher return periods should be used where necessary, in accordance with the precautionary principle.

The Level 2 Report, in accordance with PPS25, models the Beverley Brook and River Wandle including an increase of 20% in peak flows to account for climate change increases in fluvial systems.

How did they deal with uncertainty about future flood risk?  Other

Note:
The SFRA outlines methods of managing residual flood risk, whilst acknowledging that the methods set out will not be appropriate for all development types or all geographical areas. Emphasising the importance of looking at this on a site-by-site basis.

Those listed include:

- Recreation, Amenity and Ecology: ranging from the development of parks and open spaces through to river restoration schemes.
- Secondary Routes: to reduce the risk of residual flooding following a failure or overtopping of the primary defences, such as embankments or raised infrastructure e.g. roads, railways, etc.
- Land Raising.
- Finished Floor Levels: where developing in flood risk areas in unavoidable, the most common method of mitigating flood risk is to ensure habitable floor levels are raised above the maximum flood water level.
- Flood Resistance: flood barriers and door flood guards for individual properties. Considered appropriate for existing properties, however, it is not recommended for new development.
- Flood Resilience: measures applicable to existing properties that can reduce residual flood risk and improving the insularity of homes in flood risk areas.

Did the SFRA make recommendations relating to land allocations? Yes

What were these recommendations?

The Level 1 Report made recommendations on how to proceed with the SFRA process:

- Apply the Sequential Test to potential development sites
- If sites require the Exception Test a Level 2 SFRA should be undertaken
- Provide responses to parts 'a' and 'b' of the Exception Test
- Consult with the Environment Agency
- SFRA output should be used by the Borough to assess flood risk to windfall sites

The Level 2 provides policy guidance recommendations for:

- Building Design
- Flood Risk Assessments and Vulnerability
- Developments behind Flood Defences
- The Beverley/Pyl Brook and River Wandle
- Surface Water Flooding and the Use of SUDS
- Water Resources (Supply and Demand)
- Residual Risk and Emergency Planning

Were these recommendations applied to the plan?

Note:
The results of the Sequential Test, based upon the SFRA, shows that only one site identified in the Site Development Policies DPD is a potential Exception Test candidates.

This site is: (A32) Wandle Valley Trading Estate.

Sequential Test results show that the Exception Test is not required for development in Sutton town centre as all sites lie in Flood Zone 1 ‘Low Probability’.

The majority of the remaining sites will require developers to submit site specific Flood Risk Assessments. The Site Allocations DPD sets out a number of Site Specific FRA Requirements, including:

- All proposals for new development in Flood Zone 2 and 3;
- Planning Applications for development proposals of 1ha or greater.
- For development proposals of 1 hectare or greater in Flood Zone 1
- Where proposed developments or change of use to a more vulnerable class may be subject to other sources of flooding; or
- Where the Environment Agency, Internal Drainage Board and/or other bodies have indicated that there may be drainage problems.
### ASC Planning Proforma 1 - SFRA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Date:</th>
<th>01/03/2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepared By:</td>
<td>DG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA:</td>
<td>Tonbridge &amp; Malling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail Address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position:</td>
<td>SADPD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Was an SFRA produced?**

Yes

**Note:**

Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council carried out a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Stage 2 Report in August 2006.

**What level was the SFRA completed to?**

Other (please specify)

**Note:**

The SFRA is referred to as a Stage 2 Report.

**Did it consider all sources of flood risk?**

- All
- Fluvial
- Pluvial
- Tidal

**Note:**

**Did it include national data sets?**

- SMP
- CFMP
- NAFR
- Historic flood maps

**Note:**

**Ground Surface Data:**
- Photogrammetry Data
- Ground Survey Data
- Aerial Photography

**Main River Data:**
- River Medway Flood Risk Mapping, Phase 3 Study, 2004
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did it include information from other stakeholders?</td>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drainage authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
The Environment Agency and Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council jointly commissioned the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did it include an allowance for climate change?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How did they consider climate change (what scenarios explored)?</td>
<td>PPS25 Annex B Figures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
For tidal flooding an allowance was made for a 6mm rise in sea levels per annum. The extent of flooding during a defended 1 in-100 year event allowed an additional 20% flow to be added to account for climate change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How did they deal with uncertainty about future flood risk?</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
Advice in PPS25 was still in draft when this SFRA was being produced (2006), there is no reference within this 'Stage 2' report about how the SFRA proposed to deal with the uncertainty around future flood risk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did the SFRA make recommendations relating to land allocations?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What were these recommendations?**
The outcome of the sequential test found that a majority of the future residential growth, anticipated to take place within the Borough during the next 15 years, outside of Tonbridge central area, will be in locations at no risk from flooding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were these recommendations applied to the plan?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
The SFRA found that for some required development no reasonable options are available in Flood Zones 1 or 2 in order to deliver key national, regional and local sustainable development objectives, particularly in relation to town centres.

This applied specifically to the regeneration of Tonbridge Town Centre and the proposed regeneration of Aylesford riverside. The focus of the SFRA is on Tonbridge and Aylesford because these areas are where future development or redevelopment is anticipated within a high risk flood zone.

Those sites at risk of flooding allocated for Housing; Employment; and Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt, are subject to:
- any necessary mitigation measures identified through a Flood Risk Assessment; and
- mitigation of any local flooding issues.
Was an SFRA produced?  Yes

Note:
Calder Valley Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2008)
Central Wakefield Area Action Plan Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (January 2009)

What level was the SFRA completed to?  Level 1

Did it consider all sources of flood risk?
- [✓] All
- [ ] Fluvial
- [ ] Pluvial
- [ ] Tidal

Note:

Did it include national data sets?
- [ ] SMP
- [✓] CFMP
- [ ] NAFR
- [ ] Historic flood maps

Note:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did it include information from other stakeholders?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- EA</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Water companies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Drainage authorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did it include an allowance for climate change?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did they consider climate change (what scenarios explored)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- PPS25 Annex B Figures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did they deal with uncertainty about future flood risk?</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The SFRA notes a number of residual risks for the Calder Valley, namely extreme flood events greater than the design capacity of the river system or the failure of flood defences.

The SFRA notes that the EA Flood Maps do not provide the level of detail needed to assess the residual risk, especially those which lie behind flood defences.

The Calder Valley SFRA outlines that it may be appropriate for each Council to consider undertaking a SFRA Level 2 in specific development locations to better understand actual residual risks and floodplain mechanisms.

The Central Wakefield Area Action Plan SFRA acknowledges that whilst the River Calder and Ings Beck are defended - River Calder to a 1 in 100 year standard and a varying standard along Ings Beck, continued works will provide a uniform standard of protection (SoP) of 1 in 100 years across central Wakefield - residual risks are still present.

These risks again are linked to the exceedence or failure of the current flood risk management measures, such as the Wakefield flood defence scheme.

In order to gain a greater understanding of the flood mechanisms in central Wakefield, detailed 1D-2D modelling of the River Calder and central Wakefield was developed to assess the residual risks.

Two main scenarios were investigated:
- defence overtopping during the extreme 1000 year event: and
- the possibility of defence gates being left open or failing during the 100 year event.

Did the SFRA make recommendations relating to land allocations? Yes

What were these recommendations?

The Calder Valley SFRA provides recommendations for the Councils to consider in order to evaluate sites for development allocation:

- Sites should be assessed against the SFRA Flood Maps.
- If a site is considered to be critical to regeneration and/or the Core Strategy, a FRA (including sequential and if necessary exceptions tests) in order to justify the sustainability and deliverability of the allocation.
- Departures from the Sequential Flood Risk Test involving the need for development in higher risk zones need to be justified.
- The developer will need to undertake a detailed FRA to address the relevant parts of the Exceptions Test.
- Developable area may be further reduced by the need for a maintenance easement where there is a watercourse within or adjacent to a site.
- Where development sites encroach into Flood Zone 3, the Council should recommend water compatible uses or public open space.
- Employment or residential developments proposed within the higher risk flood zones, the FRA should consider the likely depth of flooding as this will indicate the mitigation measures required and whether or not the Exception Test is likely to be passed.
- A site specific FRA should consider all sources of flooding and mitigation measures required to compensate for the loss of floodplain storage.

Were these recommendations applied to the plan?

Note:
The Wakefield Site Allocations DPD sets out Principles of Site Development with a specific section relating to Flood Risk.

This section recognises:

- The impact of climate change and the potential increase to the risk of flooding through rising sea levels, increased winter rainfall and the occurrence of more extreme weather events.
- Underlines the importance of the SADPD to be sensitive to this risk, avoiding it where possible and managing it elsewhere.

This section acknowledges the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, which looks at flood risk at a strategic level, mapping all forms of flood risk in the district as part of the evidence base to locate new development primarily in low flood risk areas (Zone 1).

The SADPD notes that the ability to accommodate growth in flood zone 1 areas is constrained by the Green Belt and the availability of developable sites within the district.

As a result, a number of sites are being brought forward which lie within areas identified as being susceptible to flooding. One of the key challenges is achieving the most appropriate balance between the need to prioritise the use of previously developed land within urban areas, whilst avoiding flood risk and managing it elsewhere.

The Council seeks to address this by adopting a sequential approach to the release of development land, with priority being given to sites demonstrated to be at least risk from flooding.

In accordance with the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, sites have only been allocated where the level of flood risk is acceptable in relation to the type of development proposed and residual risk can be adequately managed.

In line with the recommendations of the SFRA, all proposals on sites at risk of flooding will be expected to be accompanied by a site specific Flood Risk Assessment at the Development Management stage, detailing compliance with the sequential/exception tests and addressing localised flood risk issues/mitigation measures.

In addition, the Council will seek to ensure that flood mitigation measures are accommodated in the design of new developments, through flood water storage, surface water run-off management, and sustainable drainage techniques where appropriate.

Recent advances in the geographic information available for the district has highlighted areas that are susceptible to surface water flooding.

This information will continue to evolve during the plan period. The most up to date information available at the time should be used by developers to inform site specific flood risk assessments and surface water management plans.

A list of the sites located within higher flood risk areas, together with details of how they have been selected or rejected sequentially is set out in an appendix to the Site Allocations DPD - Technical Paper (Volume 3).
### Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) Information

**ASC Planning Proforma 1 - SFRA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Date:</th>
<th>01/03/2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepared By:</td>
<td>DG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA:</td>
<td>Wandsworth London Boro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail Address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position:</td>
<td>SAE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Was an SFRA produced?** Yes

**Note:**

- Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, Wandsworth Level 2 Final Report, April 2009

**What level was the SFRA completed to?** Level 2

**Note:**

**Did it consider all sources of flood risk?**

- [x] All
- [x] Fluvial
- [ ] Pluvial
- [ ] Tidal

**Note:**

**Did it include national data sets?**

- [x] SMP
- [x] CFMP
- [ ] NAFR
- [x] Historic flood maps

**Note:**

Other data sets used included:

- Hydraulic Modelling
- Flood Defence Data
- Topographic Data
- Sewer Flooding Data
- Groundwater flooding data
- Artificial Sources / Infrastructure Failure Data
Did it include information from other stakeholders?  

- EA
- Water companies
- Drainage authorities
- Other

Note:
- Thames Water
- London Boroughs of Wandsworth, Merton, Sutton and Croydon

Did it include an allowance for climate change?  Yes

Note:
Increased use of the Thames Barrier will allow fewer high tides to flow upstream into central London each year therefore the estimated extreme water levels within the study area not expected to increase with climate change.

How did they consider climate change (what scenarios explored)?  

PPS25 Annex B Figures

Note:
In line with PPS25, the SFRA makes an allowance for 20% in peak flows to be used when mapping climate change flood zones up to 2115.

The SFRA considers a 20% increase in rainfall intensity is considered up to 2085, and a 30% increase up to 2115.

How did they deal with uncertainty about future flood risk?  Other

Note:
The SFRA outlines various methods available for the management of residual flood risk:
- Recreation, Amenity and Ecology
- Secondary Defences
- Land Raising
- Finished Floor Levels
- Flood Resistance
- Flood Resilience

Did the SFRA make recommendations relating to land allocations?  Yes

What were these recommendations?
Due to large areas of tidal floodplain in the Borough, a large amount of the potential allocation sites in Wandsworth fall within the floodplain and as such may require the application of the Exceptions Test.

Were these recommendations applied to the plan?
Note:
The reasons why sites are allocated despite the known flood risk are:
Part A – Wider Sustainability to the Community
Part B – Redevelopment of Previously Developed Land
Part C – Safe from Flood Risk i.e. an FRA must demonstrate that the development will be safe, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, reduce flood risk overall.

The Site Specific Allocations Document sets out the main sites where development or other change is anticipated in the borough, where the Council has particular objectives or is supporting or promoting specific proposals.

The document explores various issues relating to opportunities and constraints for the sites identified, which are discussed under sub-headings, one of which is flood risk, outlining: what Flood Zone the site is located in; referencing the Strategic Flood Risk assessment (SFRA) for specific details; and what a site specific Flood Risk Assessment is likely to require.
Was an SFRA produced?  No

Note:
The UDP was adopted by the Council in January 2006 prior to the publication of PPS 25 (December 2006).

There is no reference to an SFRA in the UDP or supporting documents.

An SFRA was completed in January 2008, and updated with a Level 1 and 2 SFRA Assessment in September 2011, as evidence base documents for the Warrington Local Development Framework.

What level was the SFRA completed to?

Note:

Did it consider all sources of flood risk?

- All
- Fluvial
- Pluvial
- Tidal

Note:

Did it include national data sets?

- SMP
- CFMP
- NAFR
- Historic flood maps

Note:
Did it include information from other stakeholders? □ EA  
□ Water companies  
□ Drainage authorities  
□ Other

Note:

Did it include an allowance for climate change? Select...

Note:

How did they consider climate change (what scenarios explored)? Select...

Note:

How did they deal with uncertainty about future flood risk? Select...

Note:

Did the SFRA make recommendations relating to land allocations? Select...

What were these recommendations?

Were these recommendations applied to the plan?

Note:
Click here to sign this section
### ASC Planning Proforma 1 - SFRA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Date:</th>
<th>01/03/2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepared By:</td>
<td>DG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA:</td>
<td>Waveney District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail Address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position:</td>
<td>SADPD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Was an SFRA produced?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Note:</td>
<td>Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, February 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What level was the SFRA completed to?</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Note:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did it consider all sources of flood risk?</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tidal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Note: | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did it include national data sets?</th>
<th>SMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CFMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NAFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historic flood maps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Note: | |

- Suffolk and Waveney Shoreline Management Plan (SMP)
- East Suffolk Catchment Flood Management Plan (CFMP)

Other data included:
- Topographic data used in the SFRA consists of LiDAR (Light Detection and Ranging) and SAR (Synthetic Aperture Radar) data, provided by the Environment Agency
- Hydrometric Data
Critical Ordinary Watercourses

Did it include information from other stakeholders?

- Environment Agency
- Waveney District Council
- Suffolk Coastal District Council

Did it include an allowance for climate change? Yes

Note:

How did they consider climate change (what scenarios explored)? PPS25 Annex B Figures

Note:

The functional flood plains outline for the tidal locations have been mapped using the 1 in 20 water level provided in the “Report on extreme tide levels – Environment Agency, Anglian region, Eastern and Central areas”, Royal Haskoning 2007.

In accordance with PPS25 and Environment Agency guidelines one hundred years of climate change, in terms of net sea level rise, was added to the 1 in 20 year levels to determine the impact of climate change on the extent of flood zone 3b.

The outline contour was then defined based on the resulting water levels, whilst taking all man-made structures and current defences into account. No floodwater overtopped the defence at Sizewell, thus limiting the functional floodplain to the immediate coastline only.

According to guidelines in PPS25, the effect of 100 years of climate change on fluvial watercourses should be taken into account by assuming a 20% increase in peak flows. Thus in order to establish the water levels resulting from the 1 in 20yr + climate change event, the river models were re-run for the 1 in 20 plus 20% climate change increase. Flood outlines were mapped from the revised modelling results which take into account the presence of defences.

Functional floodplain has been mapped for areas at risk from river and coastal flooding. It does not include areas solely at risk from other sources of flooding such as sewer and surface water flooding.

How did they deal with uncertainty about future flood risk? Other

Note:
Sets out options for managing residual flood risk:
- Recreation, Amenity and Ecology
- Secondary Defences
- Land Raising
- Finished Floor Levels
- Flood Resilience
- Flood Warning and Emergency Procedures

Did the SFRA make recommendations relating to land allocations? Yes

What were these recommendations?
The following recommendations are made by way of an indication of how to proceed with the SFRA process once the site allocations document is being finalised:

- The LPAs should apply the Sequential Test to the potential development sites and identify those sites they consider will be necessary to apply the Exception Test.
- If sites require the Exception Test the LPAs should provide responses to parts ‘a’ and ‘b’ of the Exception Test for each of the allocation sites.
- Following completion of the Sequential Test and parts ‘a’ and ‘b’ of the Exception test the Environment Agency should be consulted to confirm their acceptance of the LPAs arguments and justification for progressing with sites that require the Exception test. The LPA should then refer future developers to complete an FRA to meet the requirements of part c) of the Exception Test in line with recommendations set out in PPS25.

Policies:
- The LPAs should consider the consequences of including SuDS on development sites and the impact these can have on the developable area. In all cases the LPA should assess allocation sites in relation to geology and local issues to enable completion of the Sustainable Drainage Systems;
- National and local policies should be reviewed against local flood risk issues and objectives identified by the Environment Agency for the districts of Waveney and Suffolk Coastal.

Were these recommendations applied to the plan?

Note:
The Site Specific Allocations document identifies land for housing, employment, community and mixed uses. Sites in settlements at risk of flooding are promoted within the Site Allocations DPD.

A number of site specific policies are included, with 'flood risk' forming a site specific criterion, with a requirement as follows:

"A Flood Risk Assessment should be prepared as part of the application process to assess and mitigate the risk of flooding from surface water drainage."
# ASC Planning Proforma 1 - SFRA

**Report Date:** 01/03/2012  
**Prepared By:** FB  
**Interviewed LA:** York  
**E-mail Address:**  
**Telephone:**  
**Department:**  
**Position:**  

**Was an SFRA produced?** No  
**Note:** A SFRA has since been completed (2011) to inform the development of the LDF

**What level was the SFRA completed to?** [Select...]

**Did it consider all sources of flood risk?**  
- [ ] All  
- [ ] Fluvial  
- [ ] Pluvial  
- [ ] Tidal

**Note:**

**Did it include national data sets?**  
- [ ] SMP  
- [ ] CFMP  
- [ ] NAFR  
- [ ] Historic flood maps

**Note:**

**Did it include information from other stakeholders?**  
- [ ] EA  
- [ ] Water companies

**Note:**
Did it include an allowance for climate change? Select...

How did they consider climate change (what scenarios explored)? Select...

How did they deal with uncertainty about future flood risk? Select...

Did the SFRA make recommendations relating to land allocations? Select...

What were these recommendations?

Were these recommendations applied to the plan?

Note: Click here to sign this section
Appendix C

Task 2: Review of Strategic Allocations at Risk of Flooding
Local Authority Wide

Total amount of land allocated for development in the local authority by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land in entire district outside of flood risk zones (ha)

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones, and national designations (ha)

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones (ha)

Amount of land inside flood risk zones (ha)

All Strategic allocations

Total amount of land allocated for strategic development by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>12.38</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land allocated for strategic development within flood zones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Amount of Land</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Select...</td>
<td>Select...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What proportion of all allocated land in the authority falls within this definition of a strategic allocation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Note:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 out of 3 sites (within the threshold) fall within areas at risk of flooding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is the mean allocation size within the authority?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Note:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Individual Strategic Allocations - Note only allocations in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to be included. This record will be completed for each individual allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

| Select... |

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

| Select... |

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

| Select... |

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

| Select... |
Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Select...

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

Select...

Click here to sign this section
ASC Planning Proforma 2 - Plan Making Process

Report Date: 24/02/2012
Interviewed: LA: Barking and Dagenham
E-mail Address:
Telephone:

Prepared By: RJ
Department:
Position:

Local Authority Wide
Total amount of land allocated for development in the local authority by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>259.73</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land in entire district outside of flood risk zones (ha) Amount of Land (ha) Note

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones, and national designations (ha)

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones (ha)

Amount of land inside flood risk zones (ha)

All Strategic allocations
Total amount of land allocated for strategic development by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>255.1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land allocated for strategic development within flood zones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Amount of Land</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majority Flood Zone 3</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 2</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>31.96</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What proportion of all allocated land in the authority falls within this definition of a strategic allocation?
Amount of land (ha) Note:
2 out of 8 sites (within the threshold), fall within areas at risk of flooding.

What is the mean allocation size within the authority?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Note:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Individual Strategic Allocations - Note only allocations in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to be included. This record will be completed for each individual allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>South Dagenham West and Dagenham Leisure Park: SSA SM2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Fluvial and Pluvial

Dagenham Leisure Park is in Flood Zone 1. South Dagenham West is mostly in Flood Zone 3a. A section of the south part of the site is in Flood Zone 3b. The section of the site north of the Ford Pressing Plant is predominantly in Zone 1 and Zone 2 with the southern part of this section in flood Zone 3. The north east corner of Merrielands retail park is in flood Zone 2 and Zone 1.

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
Yes

The Sequential Test and parts a) and b) of the Exception Test have been undertaken for the site. It is necessary, however, for the applicant to undertake part c) of the Exception Test and prepare a flood risk assessment.

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

3. Over riding regeneration need

The reasons are not explicit within the report, however it is probable that it is the culmination of different factors: an over-riding need for regeneration of the area and houses- it is noted as a Key Regeneration Area and 'Significant Housing Site' (over 2000 houses proposed), the sequential test was undertaken and therefore could be classified as the best location.

The site allocation DPD states:

Opportunities should be taken to locate more vulnerable uses to a zone of lower flood risk within the site boundary. If this is not possible, the development should be directed towards those areas of the site that have a lower degree of flood hazard and lengthy inundation rates (based upon the flood hazard and rate of the inundation maps contained in the SFRA).

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?
Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Site Reference
South Dagenham East: SSA SM4

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Fluvial

Flood zone 2 and 3.

Zone 3a high probability and undefended

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
Yes

Ensure flood risk is properly managed. The Sequential Test and parts a) and b) of the Exception Test have been undertaken for the site. It is necessary, however, for the applicant to undertake part c) of the Exception Test and prepare a flood risk assessment.

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)
The reasons are not explicit within the report, however it is probable that the need for large-scale housing sites (over 2000 proposed), improvements to public transport and the sequential test was undertaken and therefore could be classified as the best location.

The site allocation DPD states:

Opportunities should be taken to locate more vulnerable uses to a zone of lower flood risk within the site boundary. If this is not possible, the development should be directed towards those areas of the site that have a lower degree of flood hazard and lengthy inundation rates (based upon the flood hazard and rate of the inundation maps contained in the SFRA).

Site Allocation DPD also says:

Inclusion of a strategic Green Grid Green open space that can contribute to a sustainable urban drainage system for the new residential development. The inclusion of a water element could provide flood attenuation as well as a valuable recreational, ecological and environmental resource on a site abutted on two sides by infrastructure.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A
Local Authority Wide
Total amount of land allocated for development in the local authority by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>15.67</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land in entire district outside of flood risk zones (ha)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones, and national designations (ha)</th>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones (ha)

Amount of land inside flood risk zones (ha)

All Strategic allocations
Total amount of land allocated for strategic development by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>56.35</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land allocated for strategic development within flood zones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Amount of Land</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood Risk</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What proportion of all allocated land in the authority falls within this definition of a strategic allocation?

Note:
2 out of 10 sites (within the threshold) fall within areas at risk of pluvial flooding only.
What is the mean allocation size within the authority?

Amount of land (ha)  

Note:  

Individual Strategic Allocations - Note only allocations in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to be included. This record will be completed for each individual allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>Policy D1 - The Old Maltings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pluvial  

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

No  

The Exception test has not been referred in the Inspectors Report or the Site Allocations DPD and therefore it was not used to justify the allocation.

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)  

Delivery of housing in Dereham is directly linked to the waste water infrastructure and in particular capacity within the local waste water treatment network. Capacity issues at Dereham reflect constraints on the ability to treat additional volumes of water to a quality capable of being discharged into the River Wensum (which is a European protected SAC site). The detailed Water Cycle Study (2010) identified that a manageable solution for waste water in Dereham could include a phased approach to housing delivery which reflects demographical changes within the existing urban area (decreasing average household occupation) and thus enables additional discharge to be accommodated (MM10). This approach has been accepted elsewhere by OFWAT - the regulatory body. As a consequence, the detailed Water Cycle Study recommends an annual housing delivery rate of up to 80 homes and to ensure this is achieved policies in relation to site D1 and includes the need to phase the delivery of the site to a timeframe where capacity is available in the Dereham Waste Water Treatment Works.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

Yes  

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA  
- [ ] Water Company  
- [ ] Drainage Board  
- [ ] ABI  
- [ ] Town/Parish Council
Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable
As per the reasons above - phased development on site alongside upgrading waste water works - nothing else was added.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes

Site Reference
Policy SH1
Residential Allocation - Coal Yard and associated buildings, north of Chapel Street

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No
It is not specified that an exception test was used to justify the allocation.

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)
The site is in the centre of the village with good access to services and facilities. Benefits also include significant visual improvements to the street scene of Chapel Street, part of which lies within the Shipdham Conservation Area.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- EA
- Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council

The CS allocates 100 dwellings to Shipdham but a recent planning permission on land off Parklands Estate reduces the requirement to 85. It is proposed that only one site be allocated in the village to accommodate that growth (SH1) and despite residents’ concerns regarding traffic and drainage infrastructure, there were no objections to development in Shipdham from either the Highways Authority or Anglian Water.

The proposed revisions to the allocations at Shipdham, as summarised above, were advertised for public consultation and a significant number of representations were submitted. It is clear that many respondents support the original allocation of 85 dwellings to the north of Chapel Road (for example over 75% of those with an address in Shipdham) and have placed more weight on the sustainability credentials of the site than the impact the development may have on the character of the village.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Reject

Unusual scenario in that the residents objected to the original allocation of 100 dwellings on the site. This was reduced to 85 creating an increase in support for the site. The Inspector wants to empower the community and have regard to the Localism Act. Further, a lack of alternative sites led to the Inspector retaining the allocation.

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)

No alternatives, support for the site once the number of dwellings on site reduced, improvement to the site and the surrounding area.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

No
**ASC Planning Proforma 2 - Plan Making Process**

**Report Date:** 24/02/2012  
**Prepared By:** RJ  
**Interviewed:** LA: Brent  
**E-mail Address:**  
**Telephone:**

**Local Authority Wide**
Total amount of land allocated for development in the local authority by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>70.07</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land in entire district outside of flood risk zones (ha)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones, and national designations (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Amount of land inside flood risk zones (ha)

**All Strategic allocations**
Total amount of land allocated for strategic development by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land allocated for strategic development within flood zones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Amount of Land</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All in Zone 3</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All in Zone 2</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood Risk</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood Risk</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What proportion of all allocated land in the authority falls within this definition of a strategic allocation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Note:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 out of 39 sites (within the threshold), fall within areas at risk of flooding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is the mean allocation size within the authority?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Note:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Strategic Allocations - Note only allocations in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to be included. This record will be completed for each individual allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>Shubette House / Karma House / Apex House: W4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Pluvial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

No

The sequential test has been used but there is no mention of the Exception Test.

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

3. Over riding regeneration need

Wembley is identified as the main focus for growth and economic development in the borough. This is an opportunity for a mixed use scheme in an important location delivering a mix of employment opportunities. The site is well served by public transport and is close to existing and planned shops and services.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council
Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Site Reference
Amex House: W6

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Fluvial and Pluvial

Fluvial (Flood zone 2) and pluvial flooding.

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

The sequential test was used but there is no mention of the Exception test used to justify the allocation.

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
3. Over riding regeneration need
An overriding need for wider regeneration of the Wembley Park Area and the use of development control policies to manage flood risk on site.

From the Site Allocations DPD:

Mixed use including residential and workspace for creative industries including managed affordable workspace to support the wider regeneration of the Wembley Park area. Development should seek to conserve and enhance the Nature Conservation designation. To assist this, an undeveloped buffer strip of 8 metres from the River Brent will be required. The Council will prepare planning guidance for this site.

From the site allocations DPD (text suggested by the Inspector):

Any development should not be in excess of the existing buildings footprint, should not impede flood water flows and should not increase surface water run-off or reduce water storage.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

No

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Recommended changes to the 'Flood Risk Comments' section within the site allocations DPD for this site so that it reads:

‘Any development should not be in excess of the existing buildings footprint, should not impede flood water flows and should not increase surface water run-off or reduce flood water storage. The FRA should include: demonstration that the site layout has been designed sequentially to place development in areas of lowest flood risk; design criteria for proposed development to ensure it is not at risk of flooding; demonstration of safe access/egress from the site during a flood event. Flood zones are subject to change and modelling and remodelling is carried out on a quarterly basis by the Environment Agency, therefore it must be ensured that the most up to date data is used as part of the FRA.’

This changes were followed through to the site allocations document.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

Yes

Site Reference
Brent House and Elizabeth House: W8

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

It appears that an Exception test was not used to justify the allocation.

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
3. Overriding regeneration need

Elizabeth House is in a poor condition and despite its current occupation is ripe for mixed use redevelopment. Brent House however is likely to be within continued occupations for at least a further 10 years, by which time it may also be available for alternative development. A high quality redevelopment will contribute to the regeneration of Wembley as a prominent site within the town centre.

New retail activity and vitality will help secure the regeneration of the existing town centre in the light of the activity around the Wembley Stadium, while new dwellings will contribute to the delivery of the Council’s growth strategy. The site benefits from excellent public transport accessibility with a selection of rail and bus services within walking distance.

A Flood Risk Assessment will be required as the site is over 1 ha.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

No

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable
Why did the inspector retain the allocation?  
**Not Applicable**

There was no mention of flood risk for this site within the Inspectors Report. The only core strategy policies the Inspector wanted to be added to the Site Allocations DPD in relation to this site was:

- CP 16 Town Centres and the Sequential Approach to Development;
- CP 20 Strategic Industrial Locations and Locally Significant Industrial Sites;
- CP 21 A Balanced Housing Stock; and

Policy CP20 to illustrate the over-riding need for regeneration and development.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?  
**No**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>Canterbury Works: SK4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Pluvial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?  
**No**

The site allocations DPD states that this site is not located within a flood zone therefore the Exception test was not used to justify the site.

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?  
**2. Overriding employment need (driven by targets)**

This proposal will contribute to the continued development of South Kilburn by increasing the supply of residential accommodation and new offices in the area.

As per above, it is noted that this site is not subject to flooding.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?  
**No**

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why did the inspector retain the allocation?</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Reference</td>
<td>Chancel House: CE5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Pluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What reason was given for retaining the allocation?</td>
<td>3. Over riding regeneration need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This site is within the Church End Growth Area and can contribute to the regeneration of the area and help deliver new homes, including family sized accommodation. Furthermore, new development can deliver new workspace, including affordable space to support business start up. Part of the aspiration for Church End growth area is to improve the skills of local people and encourage entrepreneurial behaviour, supported by adult education. The community outreach/education centre will be able to deliver this training alongside affordable workspace for which there is a demand in the borough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As per above, it is noted that this site is not subject to flooding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

No

- EA
- Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council

No

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A

Site Reference

Asiatic Carpets: CE6

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

No

The site allocations DPD states that this site is not located within a flood zone therefore the Exception test was not used to justify the site.

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

3. Over riding regeneration need
This development would contribute to the delivery of the Council’s growth strategy, regenerate Church End and enable the provision of new employment floorspace through the development of new residential units.

As per above, it is noted that this site is not subject to flooding.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- EA
- Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council

No

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Site Reference: Oriental City and Asda: B/C1

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No
The site allocations DPD states that this site is not located within a flood zone therefore the Exception test was not used to justify the site.

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)

Mixed use development including residential, retail, food and drink and community facilities (in particular for a primary school) and leisure and re-provision of Chinese and Far-Eastern commercial and community floorspace, as per the planning permission.

The scale and type of retail development permitted will depend upon there being, in accordance with the sequential approach set out in policy CP16 of the Core Strategy, no alternative sites available, and upon the results of a retail impact assessment. Proposals should have regard for potential conflicts between uses and configure development to mitigate against these, in particular for the school use.

Proposals should include the re-provision of shopping and restaurant facilities. Proposal will be required to include cycle lane running north and south along the Edgware Road.

As per above, it is noted that this site is not subject to flooding.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

No

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No

Site Reference
Sarena House / Grove Park / Edgware Road: B/C2

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

The Site Allocations DPD states that this site is not located within a flood zone therefore the Exception test was not used to justify the site.

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

3. Over riding regeneration need

A mixed use development to include residential and workspace, a proportion of which to be managed affordable workspace. The design must have regard to, and not detract from neighbouring uses, including that of the adjacent primary school. The Council will consider the inclusion of the existing school into a comprehensive redevelopment subject to the satisfactory relocation or on-site re-provision.

Proposals should include the provision of amenity/open space. Improvements will be sought to public transport as part of any proposal to develop the site.

As per above, it is noted that this site is not subject to flooding.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

No

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why did the inspector retain the allocation?</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Reference</td>
<td>Priestly Way, North Circular Road: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Pluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Site Allocations DPD notes that the site borders Flood Zones 2 and 3 to the north and west.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sequential test was used however.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What reason was given for retaining the allocation?</td>
<td>3. Over-riding regeneration need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-riding need for regeneration, improving accessibility through the site and the site can be managed when developed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regeneration of the industrial estate including accessibility improvements. Proposals should be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment. Proposals should conserve and enhance the setting of the Welsh Harp including measures to improve the separation of industrial or business uses from the Metropolitan Open Land, Site of Special Scientific Interest and Site of Importance for Nature Conservation, while the Council will seek to secure land from development to improve pedestrian access around the Welsh Harp.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An undeveloped buffer strip of 8 metres from the reservoir should be retained.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Transport Assessment will be required to assess the impact of trip generation on the local and wider road network.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further justification of the site taken from the Site allocations DPD: The site suffers from poor access and egress to the North Circular Road (NCR) and poor circulation through the estate. Vehicles are required to use the NCR to get from one end of the estate to another, requiring a dedicated traffic signal system. Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?</strong></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Why did the inspector retain the allocation?</strong></td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Reference</strong></td>
<td>Former Unisys &amp; Bridge Park Centre: 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</strong></td>
<td>Fluvial and Pluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fluvial (flood zone 2 and 3) and pluvial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The sequential test was used however there was no mention of the Exception Test.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What reason was given for retaining the allocation?</strong></td>
<td>1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Best location and flood risk can be managed in the development of the site.

Flood risk comments the Inspector asked to be inserted into the site allocations DPD for this site (the Core Strategy has incorporated the Inspectors comments): Any development should not be in excess of the existing buildings footprint, should not impede flood water flows and should not increase surface water runoff. Development should be concentrated in the FRA and close liaison with the EA.

The FRA should include: detailed modelling; assessment of existing buildings permeability to flood waters and flood flows; introduction of SUDS; and, assess and map flood extents, depths and speeds of flood waters.

Further, the Inspector asked for the following Justification to be inserted into the Site Allocations DPD (this has been done):

'A combined site mixed use redevelopment on previously developed land in a prominent location to help deliver improved sports and leisure facilities.'

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

No

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable
Best location and flood risk can be managed in the development of the site.

Flood risk comments the Inspector asked to be inserted into the Site Allocations DPD for this site (the Core Strategy has incorporated the Inspectors comments):

Any development should not be in excess of the existing buildings footprint, should not impede flood water flows and should not increase surface water runoff. Development should be concentrated in the FRA and close liaison with the EA.

The FRA should include: detailed modelling; assessment of existing buildings permeability to flood waters and flood flows; introduction of SUDS; and, assess and map flood extents, depths and speeds of flood waters.

Further, the Inspector asked for the following Justification to be inserted into Site Allocations DPD (this has been done):

'A combined site mixed use redevelopment on previously developed land in a prominent location to help deliver improved sports and leisure facilities.'

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A

Site Reference

Wembley Point: 24

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

Fluvial and Pluvial

Fluvial (flood zone 2 and 3) and pluvial.

In Brent’s Level 2 SFRA (2010) the majority of the site was found to lie within flood risk zone 2 with part of the site affected by flood risk zone 3a.

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation? No

The site allocations DPD states:

'Vent development proposals on the site should also adhere to the requirements of national guidance on flooding, currently set out in PPS25'.

It therefore appears that the Exception Test has not been used.

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

3. Over-riding regeneration need

Over-riding need and can be managed when developed.

Redevelopment will maximise the use of this site, with development on land currently used as a car park, and provide better connections to Stonebridge Station.

Redevelopment should include an undeveloped buffer strip of 8m from the River Brent and Wembley Brook, or other mitigating measures which reduce flood risk, enhance biodiversity, improve maintenance access, amenity and water quality.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?
Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A
Local Authority Wide

Total amount of land allocated for development in the local authority by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>89.68</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land in entire district outside of flood risk zones (ha)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones, and national designations (ha)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones (ha)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of land inside flood risk zones (ha)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All Strategic allocations

Total amount of land allocated for strategic development by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>137.99</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>81.06</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land allocated for strategic development within flood zones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Amount of Land</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood Risk</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All in Zone 2</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All in Zone 2</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What proportion of all allocated land in the authority falls within this definition of a strategic allocation?

Amount of land (ha) Note:
7 out of 25 sites (within the threshold) are located in areas at risk of flooding.

What is the mean allocation size within the authority?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Note:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Strategic Allocations - Note only allocations in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to be included. This record will be completed for each individual allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>H16: Key Safety Systems Norfolk Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluvial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluvial (flood zones 2 and 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

[No]

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)

Could be managed when developed and opportunity for residential housing.

Opportunity for residential housing. The opportunity to redevelop the site and integrate development into the surrounding urban form will be most appropriate.

This site is a previously developed site within the urban area. It is identified within the SFRA as falling within an area liable to flood. More detailed discussion has been undertaken with the EA on proposed development for this site. Proposals are capable of being developed which would satisfy the concerns of the EA on flooding matters. The site remains proposed for development within the plan.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

[Yes]

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- EA
- Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council
Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable
The Inspector’s Report is not available.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Site Reference
H16: Nelson Street

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Fluvial

Fluvial (flood zone 2 and 3)

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)
   Could be managed when developed and opportunity for residential housing.
   Opportunity for residential housing.

This site is a previously developed site within the urban area. It is identified within the SFRA as falling within an area liable to flood. More detailed discussion has been undertaken with the EA on proposed development for this site. Proposals are capable of being developed which would satisfy the concerns of the EA on flooding matters. The site remains proposed for development within the plan.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was
Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

Yes

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

The Inspector's Report is not available.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A

Site Reference

H16: Cavaghan & Gray, London Rd

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

Not Applicable
As the site is surrounded by residential development, up to 70% of the site could be developed for new housing. The remainder of the site should be considered for employment use in order to reduce the overall loss of employment sites particularly in the Carlisle South area.

No mention of flood risk on the site.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory Bodies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town/Parish Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

The Inspector’s Report is not available.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Site Reference

H16: Penguin Factory, Westmorland Street

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

Fluvial and Pluvial

Fluvial (flood zone 2 and 3) and Pluvial.

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No
What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)

Could be managed when developed and opportunity for residential housing.

Opportunity for residential development as retention of employment use is not considered appropriate for this site.

This site is a previously developed site within the urban area. It is identified within the SFRA as falling within an area liable to flood. More detailed discussion has been undertaken with the EA on proposed development for this site. Proposals are capable of being developed which would satisfy the concerns of the EA on flooding matters. The site remains proposed for development within the plan.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

No

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

The Inspector's Report is not available.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A

Site Reference

H16: St Nicholas
Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)

   Opportunity for residential development.

   No mention of flood risk on the site.

Does the plan/evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- EA
- Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council

No

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

NA

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

The Inspector’s Report is not available.
Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?  
N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>H16: Morton Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Pluvial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?  
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?  
3. Over riding regeneration need  
Over riding need (regeneration) and could be managed when developed.

The area to the south west of Morton has been allocated as the major development area within Carlisle. The 41 hectares of residential land, which is in two separate allocations, is a major part of that development which also includes retail, employment and open space allocations.

This greenfield site is being developed as a major urban extension. A small part of the site bordering the Fairy Beck is identified within the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment as falling within an area liable to flood. More detailed discussions have taken place with the Environment Agency on proposed development for this site. An Environmental Impact Assessment of the site shows that proposals are capable of being developed which would satisfy the concerns of the Environment Agency on flooding matters.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?  
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?  

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town/Parish Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?  
Not applicable
NA

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

The Inspector's Report is not available.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A

Site Reference
EC22: Rickergate Area of the City Centre

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Fluvial and Pluvial

Fluvial (flood zone 2 and 3) and pluvial.

From Planning Officer at Carlisle:

Residents of the Rickergate Area were successful in their challenge to the Local Plan in getting maps defining the Rickergate Area removed, therefore there is not a defined boundary or designation for Rickergate and as such no definitive site area can be established.

For the purpose of this research a site area of the minimum threshold for a strategic employment site allocation has been used - 5ha.

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
3. Over riding regeneration need
Over-riding need (regeneration) and flood risk could be managed when developed.

The site forms one out of three part of the proposals for the regeneration of the economic, social and environmental capital of the District.

Since the floods of January 2005 the requirement for regeneration work has focussed attention on those areas worst affected by the floods. As well as residential areas within the district, the Rickergate (and a few other areas) were flooded affecting Carlisle’s economic, civic and emergency services. Redevelopment plans for these areas will be progressed during the early stages of this plan’s implementation.

Carlisle Renaissance is a partnership approach to taking forward regeneration of Carlisle following the floods. Three central areas within Carlisle have been identified for transformational redevelopment. The approach to these sites and benefits from their redevelopment will be spread out district wide. Detailed briefs will be prepared for these areas. In the Rickergate area the driver will be retail building upon the strong retail role the city centre already performs. There will be the opportunity for a mix of uses including offices, hotel and residential development. The site’s prominence when approaching the City Centre from the north will need to be taken into account in any design.

The Rickergate area was one of the key areas flooded in January 2005 and is identified as an area liable to flood in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Flood defences are being developed for central Carlisle in order to improve the City’s defences. Any proposals for development within the Rickergate area will have to ensure that they provide adequate flood defences and do no compromise other parts of the city.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- EA
- Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council

No

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

NA

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

The Inspector’s Report is not available.
Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A

Click here to sign this section
Local Authority Wide
Total amount of land allocated for development in the local authority by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>80.59</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>224.96</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land in entire district outside of flood risk zones (ha)

Amount of land ‘available’ outside of flood risk zones, and national designations (ha)

Amount of land ‘available’ outside of flood risk zones (ha)

Amount of land inside flood risk zones (ha)

All Strategic allocations
Total amount of land allocated for strategic development by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>220.2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>66.22</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land allocated for strategic development within flood zones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Amount of Land</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood Risk</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Flood Zone 2</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>7.99</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What proportion of all allocated land in the authority falls within this definition of a strategic
### Individual Strategic Allocations

- **Site Reference**: Land at Doo little Mill, Ampthill: EA 3
- **Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable**: Pluvial

### Questions

**What is the mean allocation size within the authority?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Note:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Allocation?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Note:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 out of 24 sites (within the threshold), fall within areas at risk of flooding.

**Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?**

- **Other (please specify)**
  
  It does not appear that the exception test has been undertaken (there is no reference to it in the Inspectors Report, Core Strategy or Site Allocations DPD).

**What reason was given for retaining the allocation?**

1. **Over riding employment need (driven by targets)**

Although the Inspectors Report does not refer to individual site allocations, it is highlighted that the Council is actively promoting the area and working to overcome barriers to the delivery of employment allocations. The over-riding need for employment sites has therefore been chosen.

**Note:**

The report 'does not attempt to deal in detail with each representation relating to each of the allocated sites or each of the alternative sites put forward. Rather it focuses on a number of broad issues derived from the representations made and refined in the light of the hearing statements, the expanded written representations and the discussions which took place at the Hearings'.

Further, the Inspector concluded that the site assessment process carried out by the Council was appropriate, open and robust:

'The site selection process does, therefore, provide a firm basis for the decisions made in the Plan'.

**Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?**

- **No**

**Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?**

- **No**
Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

No

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

The Inspector's Report does not refer to individual site allocations. The inspector has concluded that the site selection process was robust.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A

Site Reference

| Land At Stanford Road, Shefford: HA10 |

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

Fluvial and Pluvial

Fluvial (flood zone 2 and 3) and pluvial.

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

No

It does not appear that the exception test has been undertaken (there is no reference to it in the Inspectors Report, Core Strategy or Site Allocations DPD).

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)
This site is located to the north of the floodplain of the River Ivel. This is notwithstanding the fact that the Core Strategy states that the floodplain effectively prevents the northwards expansion of the town and that if development were to take place to the north it would be difficult to maintain coherence and proximity to the town centre.

However, there is nothing in this general statement, nor indeed in the comments by a previous Local Plan Inspector about another site to the north of the river, to stop the Council from starting afresh when assessing sites. This it did and, contrary to the indications in the Core Strategy, this particular site is in a sustainable location being only a short walk from the centre of Shefford and would integrate well with the existing built-up area. There are no insurmountable barriers to its development and such development would enable provision to be made for the preservation and enhancement of the riverside meadows. These advantages outweigh the fact that the site is in a prominent location on one of the main approaches to the town. There is, therefore, nothing unsound about the allocation of this site.

Does the plan/evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

No

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

The Inspector's Report does not refer to individual site allocations. The inspector has concluded that the site selection process was robust.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A
### Local Authority Wide

Total amount of land allocated for development in the local authority by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing</strong></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment</strong></td>
<td>375</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land in entire district outside of flood risk zones (ha)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones, and national designations (ha)</th>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Amount of land inside flood risk zones (ha)

All Strategic allocations

Total amount of land allocated for strategic development by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing</strong></td>
<td>76.88</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment</strong></td>
<td>351.78</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land allocated for strategic development within flood zones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Amount of Land</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All in Zone 3</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All in Zone 2</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What proportion of all allocated land in the authority falls within this definition of a strategic allocation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
What is the mean allocation size within the authority?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Note:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Strategic Allocations - Note only allocations in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to be included. This record will be completed for each individual allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Reference</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What reason was given for retaining the allocation?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- [ ] EA  
- [ ] Water Company  
- [ ] Drainage Board  
- [ ] ABI  
- [ ] Town/Parish Council |
| **Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?** | Not applicable |
Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

**Site Reference**
Mayphil Industrial Estate, Battlebridge

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Fluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
2. Over riding employment need (driven by targets)
Existing allocation.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?
- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council
Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A
**ASC Planning Proforma 2 - Plan Making Process**

**Report Date:** 29/02/2012  
**Prepared By:** RJ  
**Interviewed:** LA: Chesterfield  
**E-mail Address:**  
**Telephone:**

**Local Authority Wide**
Total amount of land allocated for development in the local authority by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>31.84</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>141.82</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land in entire district outside of flood risk zones (ha) | Amount of Land (ha) | Note

Amount of land ‘available’ outside of flood risk zones , and national designations (ha) |

Amount of land ‘available’ outside of flood risk zones (ha) |

Amount of land inside flood risk zones (ha)

**All Strategic allocations**
Total amount of land allocated for strategic development by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>26.58</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land allocated for strategic development within flood zones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood Risk</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Flood Zone 3/minority Flood Zone 2</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Flood Zone 2 /minority Flood Zone 3</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What proportion of all allocated land in the authority falls within this definition of a strategic allocation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Note:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 out of 9 sites (within threshold), fall within areas at risk of flooding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is the mean allocation size within the authority?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Note:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Strategic Allocations - Note only allocations in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to be included. This record will be completed for each individual allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>Policy HSN1: H38a Former Walton Works, Chatsworth Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Fluvial and Pluvial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
3. Over riding regeneration need
It is within an area of major change required for regeneration.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council
No

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable
The Borough does not keep copies of the Inspector’s Report therefore unsure on reasons why the Inspector retained the allocation.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Site Reference
Policy HSN2: H38b Former Wheatbridge Mills, Wheatbridge Road

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Fluvial and Pluvial

   Fluvial (flood zone 2 and 3) and Pluvial.

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
3. Over riding regeneration need
   It is within an area of major change required for regeneration.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No
Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

No

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

Why did the Inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

The Borough does not keep copies of the Inspector's Report therefore unsure on reasons why the Inspector retained the allocation.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A

Site Reference

H39: Part of Former UEF Site, Derby Road

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

3. Over riding regeneration need
It is within an area of major change required for regeneration.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

No

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

The Borough does not keep copies of the Inspector's Report therefore unsure on reasons why the Inspector retained the allocation.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Site Reference

H40a: A61 Corridor Regeneration Scheme before 2011

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

- Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No
What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

3. Over-riding regeneration need

The site forms part of the A61 Corridor Regeneration Scheme.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- EA
- Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council

No

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

The Borough does not keep copies of the Inspector's Report therefore unsure on reasons why the Inspector retained the allocation.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A

Site Reference

H40b: A61 Corridor Regeneration Scheme after 2011

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

Pluvial
Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
3. Over riding regeneration need
The site forms part of the A61 Corridor Regeneration Scheme.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?
- EA
- Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council

No

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable
The Borough does not keep copies of the Inspector's Report therefore unsure on reasons why the Inspector retained the allocation.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A

Click here to sign this section
## Local Authority Wide
Total amount of land allocated for development in the local authority by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>282.17</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>19.37</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land in entire district outside of flood risk zones (ha)

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones, and national designations (ha)

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones (ha)

Amount of land inside flood risk zones (ha)

## All Strategic allocations
Total amount of land allocated for strategic development by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>240.15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>10.19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>37.48</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land allocated for strategic development within flood zones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood Risk</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All in Zone 2</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All in Zone 2</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>12.88</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What proportion of all allocated land in the authority falls within this definition of a strategic allocation?

Amount of land (ha)  

Note:

What is the mean allocation size within the authority?

Amount of land (ha)  

Note:

Individual Strategic Allocations - Note only allocations in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to be included. This record will be completed for each individual allocation

Site Reference  
Kelvedon Road, Tiptree

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable  
Fluvial and Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

2. Overriding employment need (driven by targets)

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

☐ EA  
☐ Water Company  
☐ Drainage Board  
☐ ABI  
☐ Town/Parish Council
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why did the inspector retain the allocation?</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Reference</td>
<td>Davey Close (a Local Employment Zone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Fluvial and Pluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fluvial (Flood Zone 2 and 3), Pluvial and Tidal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What reason was given for retaining the allocation?</td>
<td>Over riding employment need (driven by targets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

No

### Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

### Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

There are a number of Local Employment Zones (LEZs) allocated in rural areas which balance economic, social and environmental concerns in line with the provisions of policy EC6 in PPS4: Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth.

These rural LEZs either carry forward similar allocations from the Local Plan or are new allocations based on existing rural employment sites where sustainability appraisal justifies the allocation.

I consider that sustainability appraisal has been adequately carried out in respect of these sites, and that the allocations made are justified through a balancing exercise. I consider that the correct selection has been made, with respect to those sites put forward at Regulation 25 stage, when considered against reasonable alternatives, and the document is sound in that respect.

### Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A

### Site Reference

Policy SA H1 Housing Allocations: 16. Betts Factory, Ipswich Road

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

Pluvial

### Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

No
What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

1. Over-riding housing need (driven by targets)

Over-riding housing need and could be managed when developed.

From Site Allocations DPD: The site is allocated as predominantly residential to deliver housing targets identified in the Council’s Core Strategy.

From Site Allocations DPD: Site is over a minor groundwater aquifer zone and a SuDS scheme is expected to be developed on site to ensure any potential flood risk is minimised.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

No

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

Over-riding need (regeneration) and development control policies.

The Inspector asked for the following paragraph to be added in relation to Policy SA H1 Housing Allocations:

‘Planning permission will not be granted for development unless it can be demonstrated that the wastewater treatment and sewerage infrastructure can accommodate the development within the confines of existing consents’.

Further, it was acknowledged that this site formed part of a regeneration area and helped meet the housing figures stated in the Core Strategy.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>Policy SA H1 Housing Allocations: 21. Former Cooks Shipyard, Wivenhoe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Reference</td>
<td>Policy SA H1 Housing Allocations: 21. Former Cooks Shipyard, Wivenhoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Fluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluvial (Flood Zone 2 and 3) and Tidal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What reason was given for retaining the allocation?</td>
<td>1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Site Allocations DPD: The site is allocated as predominantly residential to deliver housing targets identified in the Council's Core Strategy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why did the inspector retain the allocation?</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Over-riding need housing and regeneration need and development control policies.

The Inspector asked for the following paragraph to be added in relation to Policy SA H1 Housing Allocations:

‘Planning permission will not be granted for development unless it can be demonstrated that the wastewater treatment and sewerage infrastructure can accommodate the development within the confines of existing consents’. Further, it was acknowledged that this site formed part of a regeneration area and helped meet the housing figures stated in the Core Strategy.’

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Site Reference
Policy SA H1 Housing Allocations: 23.
Garages and land, East Bay Mill

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

Fluvial and Pluvial

Fluvial (flood zone 2 and 3), Pluvial and Tidal.

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)

From Site Allocations DPD: The site is allocated as predominantly residential to deliver housing targets identified in the Council’s Core Strategy.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council
Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Over-riding need housing and regeneration need and development control policies.

The Inspector asked for the following paragraph to be added in relation to Policy SA H1 Housing Allocations:

‘Planning permission will not be granted for development unless it can be demonstrated that the wastewater treatment and sewerage infrastructure can accommodate the development within the confines of existing consents’.

Further, it was acknowledged that this site formed part of a regeneration area and helped meet the housing figures stated in the Core Strategy.’

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Click here to sign this section
### Local Authority Wide

Total amount of land allocated for development in the local authority by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>59.11</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>173.14</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>15.37</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land in entire district outside of flood risk zones (ha):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Amount of land ‘available’ outside of flood risk zones, and national designations (ha):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Amount of land ‘available’ outside of flood risk zones (ha):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Amount of land inside flood risk zones (ha):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### All Strategic allocations

Total amount of land allocated for strategic development by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>62.74</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land allocated for strategic development within flood zones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Amount of Land</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood Risk</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood Risk</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All in Zone 2</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All in Zone 2</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What proportion of all allocated land in the authority falls within this definition of a strategic allocation?

Amount of land (ha) | Note:
--- | ---

8 out of 21 sites (within the threshold) sit within flood risk areas.

What is the mean allocation size within the authority?

Amount of land (ha) | Note:
--- | ---

Individual Strategic Allocations - Note only allocations in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to be included. This record will be completed for each individual allocation

**Site Reference**

BH6: Lyngarth Farm, Bedale

**Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable**

Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

1. **Over riding housing need (driven by targets)**

This site has been allocated because:

- Its development would have relatively little impact on the form and character of the settlement;
- It will provide housing within walking and cycling distance of Bedale town centre, schools, health and leisure facilities and public transport services;
- The site is within walking distance of and accessible to public transport;
- It is available with developer interest.

From the site allocations DPD:

Developer contributions will be required where the local sewerage system does not have capacity to accommodate the foul and/or surface water from this development.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?
Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

From the Inspector’s Report:

While not within flood zones 2 or 3 this site is in an area where there are land drainage issues. However there are no technical reasons precluding its development. Despite concerns about its impact on the highway network, there is no evidence to suggest that any adverse effects cannot be overcome and the site satisfactorily developed.

We find the benefits of the site to outweigh the limited risk to amenity. This conclusion is supported by market considerations; we are not convinced that the developer would have pursued this site for several years if there was likely to be any resistance from potential buyers, particularly given the choice that will be provided by other housing allocations.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Site Reference
EH1: Ward Trailers, York Road, Easingwold

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)

This site is allocated because:

- It is a brownfield site, and should be developed in preference to greenfield land;
- It is relatively close to the town's services and facilities and public transport;
- The area has good access both into Easingwold and onto the Easingwold bypass (via York Road);
- There was support for the development of this site during consultation.

From the site allocations DPD:

Developer contributions will be required where the local sewerage system does not have capacity to accommodate the foul and/or surface water from this development.

The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment indicates that this site has land drainage issues (standing surface water) that can, and must, be fully addressed as part of the development proposal in consultation with the Environment Agency.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
- Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?
- No

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
- Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
- Not Applicable

There is nothing within the Inspector's Report specific to flooding at this site. The justification for the site within the Site Allocations DPD, as written above, was sound.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
- N/A

Site Reference
- EM1: Stillington Road / York Road, Easingwold
Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

2. Over riding employment need (driven by targets)

This site is proposed for development because:

- It is close to services/facilities and public transport, and is therefore an appropriate location for housing;
- Locating B1 employment uses would provide a link between existing employment and housing surrounding the site;
- B2-B8 uses to the south of the allocated site would benefit from easy access to the Easingwold bypass (A19);
- Development of these areas for mixed use would provide sites to satisfy an identified employment need in the area, and strengthen the commercial offer of Easingwold.

Although consultation during the preparation of the DPD revealed some opposition to the proposed housing component, there was support for the use of this site for employment purposes.

From the Site Allocations DPD:

- Parts of this site (particularly adjoining Stillington Road) have a high water table and the southern part is known to have land drainage issues. The suitability of existing surface water drainage channels and culverts will need to be addressed and where appropriate upgraded and maintained (both issues funded by the developer).

- A public sewer crosses the site and may reduce the developable area of the land. In consultation with Yorkshire Water, the potential of the existing public sewer network to accept discharge from the proposed development will need to be considered and any improvements identified and addressed before any development is commenced.

Does the plan/evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council
No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why did the inspector retain the allocation?</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**From the Inspector's Report:**

Over-riding need for employment in the area: It is not disputed that the B1 part of the site is capable of being developed as such. The local community particularly wanted to see other employment uses on the site in order to provide jobs and assist in economic recovery. There is currently little suitable employment land remaining in the service centre and the site would provide land up to the end of the plan period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>NH1: York Trailers, Yafforth Road, Northallerton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</th>
<th>Pluvial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What reason was given for retaining the allocation?</th>
<th>1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
This site is allocated because:

It will provide significant housing numbers and a mix of types and tenures, 40% of which will be affordable homes;
It is a large brownfield site close to the town centre and its services and facilities (within 15 minutes walk), with good access to public transport services;
It will provide sustainable routes to the town centre through footpath and cycleway links across the Northallerton – Middlesbrough railway line;
The site is currently derelict and development will improve its visual appearance, particularly from the ECML and western approach to Northallerton along Yafforth Road;
The development of this site will not adversely affect the existing form and character of the settlement.

From the Site Allocations DPD:

Developer contributions will be required where the local sewerage system does not have capacity to accommodate the foul and/or surface water from this development.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

No

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

From the Inspector’s Report:

It is consistent with LDF policy DP17 to allocate this former employment site for housing as it has been marketed without success for a variety of employment uses since it became vacant in 2002. While there is a continuing need for serviced employment land, there is the opportunity to provide this nearby as part of strategic site NM5. Given the size of the site and its relationship with surrounding uses, it is feasible to create an attractive residential environment here that has a positive effect on this gateway to the town.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A
Site Reference: NM5B [North Northallerton Area] - North Northallerton Area - West of Stokesley Road

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable: Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation? No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)

Best location and flood risk can be managed when developed.

It is a strategic site for mixed development and there is a priority to use brownfield sites. Alternative sites were considered less sustainable.

From the Site Allocations DPD:

This site has previously experienced sewage disposal and flooding issues. Therefore, for development to take place on this site, the following will be required:

• suitable flood attenuation measures and sewage disposal improvements will be required as part of the comprehensive development of the North Northallerton Area to enable appropriate development to take place on this site;
• access to the southern part of this site will be gained directly from Brompton Road whilst access to the northern part of the site is likely to be taken directly from the proposed Link Road.

Developer contributions will be required towards the provision of flood alleviation measures. The Council will work with and involve the Environment Agency in meeting these improvement works. Financial contributions from the developer(s) will also be required towards improvements to the sewerage and sewage disposal infrastructure. The EA, Yorkshire Water and other relevant statutory organisations will need to be consulted on such improvements.

Does the plan/evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed? Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council
Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

As a major strategic site North Northallerton (NM5) (NM5B forms part of this strategic site) offers opportunities for place shaping and sustainable development by including substantial new employment and recreational facilities, as well as contributing to traffic relief.

SA found it to have significant positive effects; and although this site continues to attract considerable opposition, the selected strategy appropriately reflects consultation outcomes.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A

Site Reference

NM5D: North Northallerton Area - North Northallerton - East of Darlington Road

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

Fluvial and Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)
Best location and flood risk can be managed when developed.

The site forms part of a strategic area for development in the Allocations DPD, providing significant housing and employment development and also providing recreation, leisure and community facilities and strategic infrastructure. The wider area will contribute towards meeting the target of achieving at least 51% of all new development within Northallerton.

It is a strategic site for mixed development and there is a priority to use brownfield sites. Alternative sites were considered less sustainable.

From the Site Allocations DPD:
This site experiences some surface water run-off and flooding issues associated with North Beck. Therefore, for development to take place on this site, the following will be required:

• provision of balancing ponds, if necessary, as part of the comprehensive flooding and infrastructure works across the North Northallerton Area. If required, these could be created as part of engineering and earthworks for the proposed link road;
• access to this site will be gained from adjacent development sites and the proposed link road which will run through the site.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory Body</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town/Parish Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable
Best location and flood risk can be managed when developed.

As a major strategic site North Northallerton (NM5) (NM5B forms part of this strategic site) offers opportunities for place shaping and sustainable development by including substantial new employment and recreational facilities, as well as contributing to traffic relief. SA found it to have significant positive effects; and although this site continues to attract considerable opposition, the selected strategy appropriately reflects consultation outcomes.

The Inspector requested that the following text be added to the site Allocations DPD in relation to this site:

‘provision of balancing ponds, if necessary, as part of the comprehensive flooding and infrastructure works across the North Northallerton Area. If required, these could be created as part of engineering and earthworks for the proposed link road.’

The Inspectors recommendations were taken into account.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

**Site Reference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SH1: White House Farm and Crab Tree Farm, Stokesley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

Fluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)
Best location in terms of access and geographic location and flood risk can be managed when developed.

The site will have the least visual impact on the landscape and setting of the town of the realistically available options; the site has satisfactory access points to the road network with opportunity for good pedestrian links to the town centre; the various parcels of the site and their ownerships allows for appropriate phasing over the plan period.

From the Site Allocations DPD:

No residential development taking place within areas of potential flooding- the development and layout of the site should take into account the Flood Risk maps available at the time of development and ensure that no housing is constructed on land that is liable to flood (unless more accurate modelling is produced that shows a more precise flood extent acceptable to the EA). The developable area of the site has been calculated excluding the area of potential flooding. Further, the principal access road traverses land liable to flooding, and the Environment Agency should be consulted on the design and layout of this access route and location of emergency only access points.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

No

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

From the Inspector's Report:

The site sites within a package of sites and lies to the north west of the built up area which we agree is the most appropriate direction for growth. The SA found no significant negative effects. Although lying around a kilometre from the main town centre services, these sites would be within 400 metres of bus stops with local and inter town services. Moreover, no sites have been identified in this broad location that have significantly better access. As configured in the submission DPD sites SH1 and SH2 are capable of being developed without building in areas at risk of flooding; a finding with which the EA concurs.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A
Site Reference

SE1: East of Stokesley Business Park

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

Fluvial

Flood Zone 2

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

2. Over riding employment need (driven by targets)

Best location and flood risk could be managed when developed.

This site is allocated because: it would make a substantial contribution to employment land needs in the Sub Area, in a very accessible location; access is readily available and some landscaping (tree planting) has already taken place around much of the site to reduce visibility from the east; it is well related to existing employment uses; additional employment uses in this location were supported by consultation.

Taken from the Site Allocations DPD:

No development, other than essential infrastructure and water compatible uses, should take place within Flood Zone 3b, as defined by Environment Agency Flood Maps. The northern-most part of the site is within the functional floodplain as identified in the Environment Agency (EA) Flood Risk maps.

Consequently, the net developable area of the site is estimated to be approximately 5.1ha. The development layout for the site should therefore ensure that no development, other than essential infrastructure and water compatible uses, should take place within Flood Zone 3b (unless more accurate modelling is produced that shows a more precise flood extent acceptable to the EA or suitable and satisfactory mitigation measures are put in place) in line with Development Policy DP43.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

No
Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Best location and flood risk could be managed when developed.

From the Inspector's Report:

'... alongside positive economic effects, the SA found significant negative effects associated with flood risk for this site. However, the allocation as now configured provides a net developable area of some 5.1 hectares outside Flood Zone 3b (which PPS25 expects to be used for essential infrastructure only) and is supported by the EA. This allocation, together with site SE2 and existing commitments, will ensure that the employment land target for the sub area is met. It provides a logical extension to the business park that is the main employment area for Stokesley. Further development here will support, and reinforce the need for, provision of cycle and bus links to the town centre and nearby villages. However, there is no evidence to suggest that the scale of development is likely to seriously exacerbate risks to safety or congestion on the local highway network.'

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Click here to sign this section
Local Authority Wide
Total amount of land allocated for development in the local authority by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>369.8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>85.96</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land in entire district outside of flood risk zones (ha)

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones, and national designations (ha)

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones (ha)

Amount of land inside flood risk zones (ha)

All Strategic allocations
Total amount of land allocated for strategic development by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>355.7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land allocated for strategic development within flood zones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Amount of Land</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All in Zone 3</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All in Zone 3</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All in Zone 2</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All in Zone 2</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood Risk</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>109.2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What proportion of all allocated land in the authority falls within this definition of a strategic allocation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Note:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 out of 15 sites (within the threshold) sit within areas at risk of flooding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is the mean allocation size within the authority?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Note:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Strategic Allocations - Note only allocations in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to be included. This record will be completed for each individual allocation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>Ind3: Queens Meadow Business Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Pluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What reason was given for retaining the allocation?</td>
<td>2. Overriding employment need (driven by targets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Borough Council seeks as part of its economic development strategy to provide a range of offers in terms of the type, size and quality of sites available for inward investment. This site is reserved for high quality development in the form of a business park.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?</td>
<td>☐ EA  ☐ Water Company  ☐ Drainage Board  ☐ ABI  ☐ Town/Parish Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

No specific reason stated but the Inspector found this allocation to be sound.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Site Reference
Ind4: Golden Flatts

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
2. Over riding employment need (driven by targets)
The Borough Council seeks as part of its economic development strategy to provide a range of offers in terms of the type, size and quality of sites available for inward investment. This site is reserved for high quality development in the form of a business park.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Water Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Drainage Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ABI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Town/Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why did the inspector retain the allocation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| No specific reason stated but the Inspector found this allocation to be sound. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ind5: Oakesway Industrial Estate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fluvial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood zone 2 and 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What reason was given for retaining the allocation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This site is for industrial use and forms part of a cluster of what the Local Plan refers to as 'bad neighbours' and are therefore restricted in their location.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?
- EA
- Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council
No

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

No specific reason stated but the Inspector found this allocation to be sound.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Site Reference
Ind5: Brenda Road West

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No
What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

Not Applicable

This site is for industrial use and forms part of a cluster of what the Local Plan refers to as ‘bad neighbours’ and are therefore restricted in their location.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

No

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

No specific reason stated but the Inspector found this allocation to be sound.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

No

Site Reference

Ind7: North Seaton Channel

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

Pluvial
Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
2. Over riding employment need (driven by targets)
Best location and flood risk can be managed when developed.

In the south-eastern part of Hartlepool, the North Seaton Channel site has been identified as a location having potential for further deep-water port facilities.

Development proposals should take account of policy DC02 regarding flood risk. DC02 (flood risk) states the Council will pay regard to the advice of the EA in considering proposals for development within flood risk area. Developers will be required to undertake a FRA for proposals in the EA’s flood zones 2 and 3 and in the vicinity of designated main rivers. Where the development is approved, developer may be required to undertake flood mitigation measures as appropriate, incl. construction of floor levels at a safe height above predicted tidal or fluvial flooding levels. Development which would be at direct risk from flooding or likely to significantly increase the risk of flooding elsewhere to a level where life or property is endangered and where flood mitigation measures are impracticable will not be permitted.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

No

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable
No specific reason stated but the Inspector found this allocation to be sound.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Site Reference
Ind9: West of Seaton Channel

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Fluvial

Flood zones 2 and 3

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
Not Applicable

This site allocation is for potentially polluting or hazardous uses. In order to distinguish those industrial developments that should be segregated from sensitive land uses, it is proposed to separately identify areas suitable for 'potentially polluting or hazardous' uses-the uses must be confined to the 3 areas mentioned in Ind9.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

No

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable
Why did the inspector retain the allocation? 
Not Applicable

No specific reason stated but the Inspector found this allocation to be sound.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed? 
N/A

**Site Reference**  
H2: Middle Warren

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable 
Fluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation? 
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation? 
1. Overriding housing need (driven by targets)

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed? 
No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds? 

- EA
- Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council
Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A

Site Reference

H2: Marina

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

Fluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

No
Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A

Click here to sign this section
Local Authority Wide

Total amount of land allocated for development in the local authority by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>98.88</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land in entire district outside of flood risk zones (ha) | Amount of Land (ha) | Note |

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones, and national designations (ha) |

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones (ha) |

Amount of land inside flood risk zones (ha) |

All Strategic allocations

Total amount of land allocated for strategic development by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>98.88</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land allocated for strategic development within flood zones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Amount of Land</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood Risk</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>38.88</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What proportion of all allocated land in the authority falls within this definition of a strategic allocation?

Amount of land (ha) | Note:
1 out of 4 sites (within the threshold) are located within areas at risk of flooding.

What is the mean allocation size within the authority?

Amount of land (ha)  Note:

Individual Strategic Allocations - Note only allocations in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to be included. This record will be completed for each individual allocation

**Site Reference**  
Havant Public Service Village: Site 1

**Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable**  
Pluvial

**Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?**
**No**

Not specified but I do not think the Exception Test was used.

**What reason was given for retaining the allocation?**
**3. Over riding regeneration need**

The site is regarded as integral to the successful regeneration of Havant Town Centre and its wider surrounding area. The development of strategic sites is critical for the delivery of health and wellbeing, open space, sports and leisure, and cultural purposes. Since most people travel outside the borough for theatre visits it is a sustainable aspiration to improve the theatre facilities at a central location like the Havant Public Service Village.

**Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?**
**No**

**Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?**

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

**No**
Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

While this is not a particularly large site, the intention to improve the civic heart of the Borough is central to the regeneration objective of the Core Strategy.

Work to refurbish the Civic Centre is already underway with secured grant funding. Other sites within the area, including the Magistrates Court and Health Centre, are likely to come forward for redevelopment within the plan period.

At present the pedestrian route to the town centre over the railway footbridge is unattractive but HBC and HCC have previously committed funding for a major improvement to the bridge in 2013. While the complete redevelopment of the site is likely to prove difficult, the project is regarded by the Inspector as a realistic long term aspiration worthy of inclusion in the Core Strategy as a strategic site.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A
### Local Authority Wide

Total amount of land allocated for development in the local authority by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>73.27</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land in entire district outside of flood risk zones (ha):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land ‘available’ outside of flood risk zones, and national designations (ha):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land ‘available’ outside of flood risk zones (ha):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land inside flood risk zones (ha):

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### All Strategic allocations

Total amount of land allocated for strategic development by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land allocated for strategic development within flood zones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood Risk</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Flood Zone 3/minority Flood Zone 2</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What proportion of all allocated land in the authority falls within this definition of a strategic allocation?

Amount of land (ha) Note:

3 out of 6 sites (within the threshold) are located in areas at
risk of flooding.

What is the mean allocation size within the authority?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Note:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Strategic Allocations - Note only allocations in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to be included. This record will be completed for each individual allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>Policy SSA 3: Elm Park Parades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Pluvial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)

   Over-riding need (will enable a better mix of homes to be provided) and flood risk will be managed when developed.

   The Council considers this site address a deficiency in convenience floorspace and that the best way to address these issues is for the two parades to be completely redeveloped to enable the shops and homes south of the Station to be integrated into the centre.

   Redevelopment would enable a better mix of homes to be provided in terms of tenure and size. This would also enable the significant deficiency in convenience floorspace to be addressed, where the Havering Retail and Leisure Study identified a deficit of 1500-1900 square metres.

   In line with DC48, a Flood Risk Assessment must be carried out which satisfies the requirements of Havering’s SFRA.

   Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

   Yes

   Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

   - [ ] EA
   - [ ] Water Company
   - [ ] Drainage Board
   - [ ] ABI
   - [ ] Town/Parish Council
Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

Over riding need and flood risk could be managed when developed.

From the Inspector's Report:

Elm Park is identified in CP4 for consolidation being one of six district centres in the Borough. The site lies to the south of the railway line close to the station with the larger number of retail units lying to the north of the station. The sites are in private ownership and, although implementation is not as clearly possible as in other site specific allocations, I consider that SSA3 provides sufficient details to ensure that development would progress the vision and objectives of the CS. This policy reflects the vision of the CS and apart from the need to change Development Control policy numbers and refer to the need for a FRA, I find the policy sound.

The Inspector asked for the following sentence to be added to the end of the Policy in the Site Allocations DPD. This line has been added-

In line with DC48 a Flood Risk Assessment must be carried out which satisfies the requirements of Havering’s SFRA.

Further recommendations from the Inspector:

I have recommended changes to policy DC48 to meet with the advice in PPS25 Development and Flood Risk and the SFRA. This would require, among other points, development to demonstrate through a sequential test it is located in the lowest appropriate flood risk zone with regard to the advice in PPS25 and HSFRA. A flood risk assessment (FRA) which satisfies the requirements in HSFRA for all major developments in Flood Risk Zone 1 and all developments in Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3 would be necessary. The FRA would have to demonstrate that the sequential test has been undertaken and, where the vulnerability classification is not compatible to the flood zone, how the exception test has been passed, as well as matters relating to water and drainage problems. HSFRA will be reviewed and updated regularly ensuring that the FRA is undertaken in the light of the most up to date information.

In my opinion, providing the provisions of policy DC48 are met in the relevant applications for planning permission, the Site Specific Allocations would not be unsound. Nevertheless, I consider that in order to meet test vi there should be a ‘signpost’ in the relevant SSA policy directing applicants to policy DC48. This should apply to policy SSA3.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A
Site Reference

Policy SSA 11: Beam Park

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

Fluvial and Pluvial

- Fluvial (Flood Zone 2 and 3) and Pluvial.

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

1. Over-riding housing need (driven by targets)

- Over-riding need (regional housing targets) and could be managed when developed.

The partners involved in the regeneration of London Riverside are committed to achieving sustainable communities in the area. The opportunity to release this site from the Strategic Employment Area reserve enables this site to make a significant contribution to identified local and sub-regional housing need and also improve transport/access links within the area.

In line with DC48 a Flood Risk Assessment must be carried out which satisfies the requirements of Havering’s SFRA.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- EA
- Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council

No

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable
Over-riding need (regional housing targets) and flood risk can be managed when developed.

From the Inspector's Report:

SSA11 involves housing in Flood Zone 3a based on their current state. The site (along with other sites nearby) comprise a significant component of the housing supply in Havering. Redevelopment would provide the opportunity to introduce measures to make new development safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere and, where possible, reduce flood risk overall. The sites are generally large enough to allow flexibility in respect of densities and measures to compensate for the challenges of the site. Without the London Riverside sites the Council would not be able to implement the Core Strategy or meet the housing requirement.

With no specific housing numbers required to be delivered, it would allow development to be tempered to ensure that the risk of death or injury and damage from flooding is minimised whilst not increasing the risk of flooding elsewhere.

To make the allocation sound: Delete policy paragraph: ‘Sustainable drainage should be provided to attenuate flooding and open spaces must be provided in line with Green Grid principles’ and replace with: ‘In line with DC48 a Flood Risk Assessment must be carried out which satisfies the requirements of Havering’s SFRA.’ This has been done in the Site Allocations DPD.

Further recommendations from the Inspector:

I have recommended changes to policy DC48 to meet with the advice in PPS25 Development and Flood Risk and the SFRA. This would require, among other points, development to demonstrate through a sequential test it is located in the lowest appropriate flood risk zone with regard to the advice in PPS25 and HSFRA. A flood risk assessment (FRA) which satisfies the requirements in HSFRA for all major developments in Flood Risk Zone 1 and all developments in Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3 would be necessary. The FRA would have to demonstrate that the sequential test has been undertaken and, where the vulnerability classification is not compatible to the flood zone, how the exception test has been passed, as well as matters relating to water and drainage problems. HSFRA will be reviewed and updated regularly ensuring that the FRA is undertaken in the light of the most up to date information.

In my opinion, providing the provisions of policy DC48 are met in the relevant applications for planning permission, the Site Specific Allocations would not be unsound. Nevertheless, I consider that in order to meet test vi there should be a ‘signpost’ in the relevant SSA policy directing applicants to policy DC48. This should apply to policy SSA11.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>Policy SSA12: Rainham West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Fluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 2 and 3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No
What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

1. Over-riding housing need (driven by targets)

   Over-riding need (regional housing targets) and could be managed when developed.

The partners involved in the regeneration of London Riverside are committed to achieving sustainable communities in the area. The opportunity to release this site from the Strategic Employment Area reserve enables this site to make a significant contribution to identified local and sub-regional housing need and also improve transport/access links within the area.

In line with DC48 a Flood Risk Assessment must be carried out which satisfies the requirements of Havering’s SFRA

Does the plan/evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

No

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable
Over-riding need and flood risk can be managed when developed.

From the Inspector's Report:

SSA12 involves housing in Flood Zone 3a based on their current state. The site (along with other sites nearby) comprise a significant component of the housing supply in Havering. Redevelopment would provide the opportunity to introduce measures to make new development safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere and, where possible, reduce flood risk overall. The sites are generally large enough to allow flexibility in respect of densities and measures to compensate for the challenges of the site. Without the London Riverside sites the Council would not be able to implement the Core Strategy or meet the housing requirement.

With no specific housing numbers required to be delivered, it would allow development to be tempered to ensure that the risk of death or injury and damage from flooding is minimised whilst not increasing the risk of flooding elsewhere.

To make the allocation sound: Delete policy paragraph: ‘Sustainable drainage should be provided to attenuate flooding and open spaces must be provided in line with Green Grid principles’ and replace with: ‘In line with DC48 a Flood Risk Assessment must be carried out which satisfies the requirements of Havering's SFRA.' This has been done in the Site Allocations DPD.

Further recommendations from the Inspector:

I have recommended changes to policy DC48 to meet with the advice in PPS25 Development and Flood Risk and the SFRA. This would require, among other points, development to demonstrate through a sequential test it is located in the lowest appropriate flood risk zone with regard to the advice in PPS25 and HSFRA. A flood risk assessment (FRA) which satisfies the requirements in HSFRA for all major developments in Flood Risk Zone 1 and all developments in Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3 would be necessary. The FRA would have to demonstrate that the sequential test has been undertaken and, where the vulnerability classification is not compatible to the flood zone, how the exception test has been passed, as well as matters relating to water and drainage problems. HSFRA will be reviewed and updated regularly ensuring that the FRA is undertaken in the light of the most up to date information.

In my opinion, providing the provisions of policy DC48 are met in the relevant applications for planning permission, the Site Specific Allocations would not be unsound. Nevertheless, I consider that in order to meet test vi there should be a ‘signpost’ in the relevant SSA policy directing applicants to policy DC48. This should apply to policy SSA12.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A
Local Authority Wide
Total amount of land allocated for development in the local authority by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>1,535</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>319.7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land in entire district outside of flood risk zones (ha)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones, and national designations (ha)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones (ha)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Amount of land inside flood risk zones (ha)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

All Strategic allocations
Total amount of land allocated for strategic development by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land allocated for strategic development within flood zones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Amount of Land</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood Risk</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What proportion of all allocated land in the authority falls within this definition of a strategic allocation?

Amount of land (ha) | Note:
1/9 strategic allocations (within the threshold) were in areas at risk of flooding

What is the mean allocation size within the authority?
Amount of land (ha)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>Southwater Village Centre, Southwater</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Pluvial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?  
No  

It does not appear that the Exception Test was used to justify the allocation

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?  
1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)  
The Site is allocated for residential development through the Site Allocations DPD in policy AL 1 Previously developed land (PDL). Within this policy more than 30 sites are put forward for residential development and individual reasons are not given for each individual site.  
The rationale for this policy is to encourage residential development on PDL. However the policy states that development on these sites needs to be in accordance: "with the principles for Category 1 and 2 settlements set out in Policy CP5 of the Core Strategy (2007) and with the other strategy principles (including affordable housing) or development control policy requirements set out in the Core Strategy and General Development Control Policies Development Plan Documents."

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?  
No  

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?  
- EA  
- Water Company  
- Drainage Board  
- ABI  
- Town/Parish Council
Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

No specific reason was given for retaining this individual site and therefore it would appear that the Inspector accepted this policy of development occurring on PDL.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A
Local Authority Wide

Total amount of land allocated for development in the local authority by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>621.83</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land in entire district outside of flood risk zones (ha)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones, and national designations (ha)

| Amount of Land (ha) | |
|--------------------|-
|                    | |

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones (ha)

| Amount of Land (ha) | |
|--------------------|-
|                    | |

Amount of land inside flood risk zones (ha)

| Amount of Land (ha) | |
|--------------------|-
|                    | |

All Strategic allocations

Total amount of land allocated for strategic development by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>578.8</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land allocated for strategic development within flood zones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Amount of Land</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood Risk</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>22.71</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood Risk</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>77.42</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Flood Zone 3/minority</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Flood Zone 3/minority</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What proportion of all allocated land in the authority falls within this definition of a strategic allocation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Note:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 out of 67 sites (within the threshold) are located in areas at risk of flooding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is the mean allocation size within the authority?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Note:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Strategic Allocations - Note only allocations in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to be included. This record will be completed for each individual allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>E3C.2 Cross Green Industrial Estate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Pluvial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

2. Over riding employment need (driven by targets)

The need for growing the economy of the city is identified as the reason for allocating sites as part of policy E3. A number of sites were allocated as part of this policy and specific reasons for each allocations were not provided.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council
No objections to this allocation were proposed.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

**Site Reference**

E3C.19 Hunslet Business Park

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Fluvial and Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

2. Over riding employment need (driven by targets)

The need for growing the economy of the city is identified as the reason for allocating sites as part of policy E3. A number of sites were allocated as part of this policy and specific reasons for each allocations were not provided.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No
Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

No objections to this allocation were proposed.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Site Reference: E4.42 Tingley Common, Morley

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
2. Over riding employment need (driven by targets)
The need for growing the economy of the city is identified as the reason for allocating sites as part of policy E4. A number of sites were allocated as part of this policy and specific reasons for each allocations were not provided.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

No objections to this allocation were proposed.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A

Site Reference

E4.44 Skelton Grange

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

No
What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

2. Over riding employment need (driven by targets)

The need for growing the economy of the city is identified as the reason for allocating sites as part of policy E4. A number of sites were allocated as part of this policy and specific reasons for each allocations were not provided.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- EA
- Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council

No objections to this allocation were proposed.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A

Site Reference  
E4.49 Haigh Park Road

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable  
Fluvial
Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
2. Overriding employment need (driven by targets)
The need for growing the economy of the city is identified as the reason for allocating sites as part of policy E4. A number of sites were allocated as part of this policy and specific reasons for each allocations were not provided.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

No objections to this allocation were proposed.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Site Reference
E4.29 Gedlard Road, Holbeck

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Fluvial and Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

2. Over riding employment need (driven by targets)
The need for growing the economy of the city is identified as the reason for allocating sites as part of policy E4. A number of sites were allocated as part of this policy and specific reasons for each allocation were not provided.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- EA
- Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council

No objections to this allocation were proposed

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable
Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Site Reference
H3.1 Back Lane, Guiseley

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)

The need for meeting housing need in the economy of the city is identified as the reason for allocating sites as part of policy H3. A number of sites were allocated as part of this policy and specific reasons for each allocation were not provided.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?
- EA
- Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council

No objections to this allocation appear to have been proposed on flood risk grounds.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why did the inspector retain the allocation?</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Reference</td>
<td>H3.1 Hough Side Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Pluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What reason was given for retaining the allocation?</td>
<td>1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The need for meeting housing need in the economy of the city is identified as the reason for allocating sites as part of policy H3. A number of sites were allocated as part of this policy and specific reasons for each allocation were not provided.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- EA  
- Water Company  
- Drainage Board  
- ABI  
- Town/Parish Council |
No objections to this allocation appear to have been proposed on flood risk grounds.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Site Reference
H3.1A Churchwood Avenue

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)
The need for meeting housing need in the economy of the city is identified as the reason for allocating sites as part of policy H3. A number of sites were allocated as part of this policy and specific reasons for each allocation were not provided.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No
Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

No objections to this allocation appear to have been proposed on flood risk grounds.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A

Site Reference

H3.1A Westbrook Lane

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)
The need for meeting housing need in the economy of the city is identified as the reason for allocating sites as part of policy H3. A number of sites were allocated as part of this policy and specific reasons for each allocation were not provided.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?  
No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?  

EA  
Water Company  
Drainage Board  
ABI  
Town/Parish Council

No objections to this allocation appear to have been proposed on flood risk grounds.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?  
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?  
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?  
N/A

Site Reference  
H3. 2A Church Lane, Adel

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable  
Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?  
No
What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)

The need for meeting housing need in the economy of the city is identified as the reason for allocating sites as part of policy H3. A number of sites were allocated as part of this policy and specific reasons for each allocation were not provided.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

☐ EA
☐ Water Company
☐ Drainage Board
☐ ABI
☐ Town/Parish Council

No objections to this allocation appear to have been proposed on flood risk grounds.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A

Site Reference

H3.3A Rumblecroft, Otley

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

Pluvial
Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)

The need for meeting housing need in the economy of the city is identified as the reason for allocating sites as part of policy H3. A number of sites were allocated as part of this policy and specific reasons for each allocation were not provided.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- EA
- Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council

No objections to this allocation appear to have been proposed on flood risk grounds.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Site Reference: Holbeck Urban Village

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable:
Fluvial and Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation? No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)

The need for meeting housing need in the economy of the city is identified as the reason for allocating sites as part of policy H3. A number of sites were allocated as part of this policy and specific reasons for each allocation were not provided.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed? No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds? No

An objection was raised on flood risk grounds in regards to this allocation, although this was in regards to the need for an FRA for the whole area here to be completed to support development here.

The nature of the way the Inspector's Report is written means that it is unknown which stakeholder made this comment.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections? Reject

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)
The Inspector concluded on this issue that:

"As HUV lies within the 100 year floodplain the requirement for a flood risk assessment is reasonable in principle, and there could well be benefits of consistency and economy in undertaking such an assessment for the area as a whole rather than for individual sites. Given the scale of regeneration proposed in the area, a coordinated approach is sensible. Even though development around canals may not necessarily face the same risks as that along rivers [as noted in para. 38 of PPG22], there is no good reason to single out the Canal Basin for a separate assessment even if this were practicable. Provided all parties were willing to exercise some flexibility and not re-visit matters already resolved, as I note elsewhere, the requirement should not inhibit or delay development."

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

Yes.
### Local Authority Wide

Total amount of land allocated for development in the local authority by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land in entire district outside of flood risk zones (ha)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Amount of land ‘available’ outside of flood risk zones, and national designations (ha)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Amount of land ‘available’ outside of flood risk zones (ha)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Amount of land inside flood risk zones (ha)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### All Strategic allocations

Total amount of land allocated for strategic development by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land allocated for strategic development within flood zones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Amount of Land</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood Risk</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All in Zone 2</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All in Zone 2</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What proportion of all allocated land in the authority falls within this definition of a strategic allocation?

Amount of land (ha) | Note:
4 out of 19 Strategic Allocations (within the threshold) are in areas at risk of flooding

What is the mean allocation size within the authority?
Amount of land (ha)  

Individual Strategic Allocations - Note only allocations in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to be included. This record will be completed for each individual allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>E13 Gipsy Lane Brickworks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Pluvial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

2. Overriding employment need (driven by targets)

The policy justification for this site highlights that it offers a good opportunity for a high quality, business park development.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?
No objections were raised on flood risk grounds.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why did the inspector retain the allocation?</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Reference</td>
<td>H01a Bede Island South (phases 4 &amp; 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Fluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?</td>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The supporting text to this policy notes that the sequential test has been used to assess potential housing sites.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What reason was given for retaining the allocation?</td>
<td>1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site is put forward as part of a number of housing sites and specific reasons are not provided for individual sites. More generally through the brownfield sites the policy justification states that it seeks to maximise the use of previously developed land and other vacant or under used land in the City.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Site Reference
H01C Former Football Stadium, Filbert Street

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Fluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
Other (please specify)

The supporting text to this policy notes that the sequential test has been used to assess potential housing sites.

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)
The site is put forward as part of a number of housing sites and specific reasons are not provided for individual sites. More generally through the brownfield sites the policy justification states that it seeks to maximise the use of previously developed land and other vacant or under used land in the City.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- EA
- Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

**Site Reference**

E1 Beaumont Leys Lane

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Fluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No
What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

2. Over riding employment need (driven by targets)

The Site is allocated as part of a larger group of employment sites identified to meet the target set out in the Structure Plan for employment land provision in the city. Therefore a specific reason for the allocation of this individual site is not provided.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- EA
- Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council

No objections were raised in regards to this site.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A
Local Authority Wide
Total amount of land allocated for development in the local authority by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>81.25</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>13.47</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>287.7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land in entire district outside of flood risk zones (ha)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones, and national designations (ha)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones (ha)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Amount of land inside flood risk zones (ha)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

All Strategic allocations
Total amount of land allocated for strategic development by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>262.8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land allocated for strategic development within flood zones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Amount of Land</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majority Flood Zone 2</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What proportion of all allocated land in the authority falls within this definition of a strategic allocation?

Amount of land (ha)  Note:
1 out of 17 strategic allocations (within the threshold) are in areas at risk of flooding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the mean allocation size within the authority?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount of land (ha)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Strategic Allocations - Note only allocations in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to be included. This record will be completed for each individual allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>AL/CU/9 Court Farm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Fluvial and Pluvial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What reason was given for retaining the allocation?</th>
<th>1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The policy specifically states that land at the site will be allocated for development subject to:

- Provision of 1.2 hectares of Green Infrastructure, to include the retention of land in the floodplain as informal amenity open space;
- Provision of a Sustainable Urban Drainage Scheme to deal with all surface water from the development and arrangements for future maintenance;

The explanatory text for the policy highlights that the floodplain aspect of the site need not be developed and instead used for green infrastructure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Drainage Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Town/Parish Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It would appear that no objections were raised in regards to flood risk.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Click here to sign this section
### ASC Planning Proforma 2 - Plan Making Process

**Report Date:** 28/02/2012

**Prepared By:** DG

**Interviewed:** LA: Middlesbrough

**E-mail Address:**

**Telephone:**

**Department:** SADPD

---

#### Local Authority Wide

Total amount of land allocated for development in the local authority by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>657.44</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>361.65</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>342.2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land in entire district outside of flood risk zones (ha)</th>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones, and national designations (ha) |                     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------                      |                     |

| Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones (ha) |                     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|                     |

| Amount of land inside flood risk zones (ha) |                     |
|--------------------------------------------|                     |

#### All Strategic allocations

Total amount of land allocated for strategic development by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>382.8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>181.35</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Amount of land allocated for strategic development within flood zones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Amount of Land</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood Risk</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>166.66</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Flood Zone 2 / minority Flood Zone 3</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>181.35</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What proportion of all allocated land in the authority falls within this definition of a strategic allocation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is the mean allocation size within the authority?

Amount of land (ha) Note:

Individual Strategic Allocations - Note only allocations in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to be included. This record will be completed for each individual allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>Greater Middlehaven REG 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Pluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A proportion of the land that makes up the Greater Middlehaven area is within the floodplain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flood Zone 1 (75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flood Zone 2 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flood Zone 3a (20%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation? No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

3. Ov er riding regeneration need

The Council policy response is to ensure that flood mitigation measures are included within development proposals, with planning applications to be accompanied by a flood risk assessment.

The Site Allocations DPD identifies Greater Middlehaven as a 'principal regeneration site'.

The Core Strategy identifies the regeneration of Middlehaven as a development priority and a flagship project.

The regeneration of Greater Middlehaven is considered to have beneficial impacts upon the achievement of wider objectives:
- establishing an environment that encourages and supports economic vitality and quality of life that attracts people and businesses to Middlesbrough;
- ensuring that the type, mix and range of new housing developments provides choice, quality and affordability, whilst meeting residents aspirations; and
- major cultural projects and flagships that act as economic drivers by contributing to the quality of the town’s image and environment.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed? Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?
From the information that is publicly available there were no objections to the allocation of this site on flood risk grounds.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

There is one specific reference to flooding in the Inspectors Report regarding the Greater Middlehaven allocation.

With an addition made to clarify that:

Use of the river frontage is maximised without affecting the hydrology of the River Tees and its floodplain and, where feasible opportunities to maintain and enhance biodiversity habitats are identified and taken.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

**Site Reference**

Abingdon REG 9

**Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable**

Pluvial

Brownfield site predominantly in Flood Zone 1 (75%).

Flood Zone 2 (3%)
Flood Zone 3a (14%)
Flood Zone 3b (8%)

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

3. Over riding regeneration need
This is an existing housing area. This site has been allocated in recognition of the need for housing market renewal activity to transform failing neighbourhoods in older housing areas to address challenging and inter-related economic, social and physical issues.

The regeneration of this area is supports the Core Strategy ‘Housing Strategy’ for Inner Middlesbrough Older Housing and Grove Hill areas.

The strategy for this neighbourhood/areas is specifically:
- new housing to meet aspirational needs and create a sustainable and balanced mix of housing;
- housing and environmental improvements; and
- where necessary, to support the creation of a balanced housing stock, the selected demolition of terraced properties.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- EA
- Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council

From the information that is publicly available there were no objections to the allocation of this site on flood risk grounds.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

The reason is not explicit in the Inspectors Report. However, this is an existing housing area for refurbishment, reconfiguration with new development on brownfield land.

The Site Allocations DPD states that:

Investment in the Abingdon Road area will mainly concentrate on the focused refurbishment of existing poorer quality housing stock in the area.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No

Site Reference  Riverside Park REG 13-16

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Fluvial
Brownfield site with 75% in Flood Zone 2 and 25% in Flood Zone 3a.

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?  
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?  
2. Over riding employment need (driven by targets)  
This is an existing employment location, recognised in the Core Strategy as the most significant employment location within Middlesbrough, outside of the town centre.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?  
No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?  
From the information that is publicly available there were no objections to the allocation of this site on flood risk grounds.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?  
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?  
Not Applicable
The Inspectors Report does not explicitly state why.

This is an existing employment location, recognised in the Core Strategy as the most significant employment location within Middlesbrough, outside of the town centre. Specifically to achieve Core Strategy spatial objective for high and sustainable levels of economic growth by supporting existing businesses and encouraging new ones to set up in Middlesbrough.

‘Flood Risk’ is included in the Site Allocations DPD as a general development consideration, specifically:

Use of the river frontage is maximised without affecting the hydrology of the River Tees and its floodplain and, where practicable seek to integrate habitats with the strategic green infrastructure network.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A
Local Authority Wide

Total amount of land allocated for development in the local authority by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>64.95</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>141.18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land in entire district outside of flood risk zones (ha)

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones, and national designations (ha)

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones (ha)

Amount of land inside flood risk zones (ha)

All Strategic allocations

Total amount of land allocated for strategic development by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>50.19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land allocated for strategic development within flood zones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood Risk</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood Risk</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What proportion of all allocated land in the authority falls within this definition of a strategic allocation?
Note:

2 out of 17 strategic allocations (within the threshold) are located in areas at risk of flooding.

What is the mean allocation size within the authority?

Individual Strategic Allocations - Note only allocations in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to be included. This record will be completed for each individual allocation

**Site Reference**

C14 Land west of Roughton Road

**Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable**

Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

1. Overriding housing need (driven by targets)

In paragraph 4.4.7 in the Allocations DPD the constraint posed by surface water flooding (and the need for attenuation measures) is set out:

"Anglian Water have advised that any surface water discharge would be subject to heavy attenuation and that there are sewers crossing the site and diversion would be at the developers expense."

Does the plan/evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [x] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council
It would appear that no objections were raised in regards to flood risk during the Examination of the Allocations DPD.

Anglian Water raised the points on surface water drainage during the consultation on the Publication Draft DPD.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Site Reference: F01 Land north of Rudham Stile Lane
Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable: Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)

Issues surrounding surface water (and sewerage) flooding are raised as constraints affecting the site, which would need to be resolved in order for development to be considered acceptable.

In the policy for this site it states that:

"f. prior approval of a scheme to prevent the input of hazardous substances to groundwater;

h. demonstration that there is adequate capacity in sewage treatment works and the foul sewerage network and that proposals have regard to Water Framework Directive objectives;"

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [X] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

It does not appear that any objections were raised in regards to flood risk during the Examination of the document.

Based on a review of the comments received during consultation on the Publication Draft Allocations DPD it would seem that the concerns set out in the DPD on surface water flooding were raised by the EA at this point.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

- Not applicable

The Inspector stated that they were satisfied that this allocation was sound and that they did not need to make additional comments on this Allocation.

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

- Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

- N/A

Click here to sign this section
Local Authority Wide

Total amount of land allocated for development in the local authority by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>148.43</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>195.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>100.48</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land in entire district outside of flood risk zones (ha)

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones, and national designations (ha)

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones (ha)

Amount of land inside flood risk zones (ha)

All Strategic allocations

Total amount of land allocated for strategic development by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>149.8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>139.4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land allocated for strategic development within flood zones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Amount of Land</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All in Zone 3</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>52.46</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All in Zone 3</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All in Zone 3</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All in Zone 2</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood Risk</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What proportion of all allocated land in the authority falls within this definition of a strategic allocation?

Amount of land (ha) Note: 26/33 strategic allocations (within the threshold) are in areas at risk of flooding.

What is the mean allocation size within the authority?

Amount of land (ha) Note:

Individual Strategic Allocations - Note only allocations in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to be included. This record will be completed for each individual allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>H7 Land at former Portishead Power Station</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Fluvial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation? No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

1. Ov er riding housing need (driven by targets)

The site is allocated for residential development as part of policy H/2 to meet local needs for housing growth in the Borough. As part of this policy a number of sites are allocated for residential development and specific reasons are not provided for individual allocations.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed? Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council
It does not appear that any objections were raised on flood risks grounds

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Site Reference
H9 Land at East Portishead

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Fluvial and Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
1. Ov er riding housing need (driven by targets)
The site is allocated for residential development as part of policy H/2 to meet local needs for housing growth in the Borough. As part of this policy a number of sites are allocated for residential development and specific reasons are not provided for individual allocations.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No
Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

It does not appear that any objections were raised on flood risks grounds.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

**Site Reference**
H60 Land at Albert Road, Portishead

**Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable**
Fluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)
The site is allocated for residential development as part of policy H/2 to meet local needs for housing growth in the Borough. As part of this policy a number of sites are allocated for residential development and specific reasons are not provided for individual allocations.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?  
**Yes**

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?  
- [ ] EA  
- [ ] Water Company  
- [ ] Drainage Board  
- [ ] ABI  
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?  
**Not applicable**

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?  
**Not Applicable**

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?  
**N/A**

**Site Reference**  
P65 Paper Mill, Portishead

**Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable**  
Fluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?  
**No**
What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)

The site is allocated for residential development as part of policy H/2 to meet local needs for housing growth in the Borough. As part of this policy a number of sites are allocated for residential development and specific reasons are not provided for individual allocations.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Site Reference
H17 East of Park and Ride, Summer Lane

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Fluvial and Pluvial
Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation? 
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation? 
1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)
The site is allocated for residential development as part of policy H/2 to meet local needs for housing growth in the Borough. As part of this policy a number of sites are allocated for residential development and specific reasons are not provided for individual allocations.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed? 
No
Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds? 
☐ EA
☐ Water Company
☐ Drainage Board
☐ ABI
☐ Town/Parish Council

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections? 
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation? 
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed? 

Site Reference
H18 Land at Moor Lane, Locking Castle

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Fluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)
The site is allocated for residential development as part of policy H/2 to meet local needs for housing growth in the Borough. As part of this policy a number of sites are allocated for residential development and specific reasons are not provided for individual allocations.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?
☐ EA
☐ Water Company
☐ Drainage Board
☐ ABI
☐ Town/Parish Council

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable
Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

**Site Reference**

H19 Land at Airport View Caravan Park

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Fluvial and Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)

The site is allocated for residential development as part of policy H/2 to meet local needs for housing growth in the Borough. As part of this policy a number of sites are allocated for residential development and specific reasons are not provided for individual allocations.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable
Why did the inspector retain the allocation? 
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed? 
N/A

Site Reference 
H40 WsM Football Club

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Fluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation? 
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation? 
1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)
   The site is allocated for residential development as part of policy H/2 to meet local needs for housing growth in the Borough. As part of this policy a number of sites are allocated for residential development and specific reasons are not provided for individual allocations.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed? 
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds? 

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council
Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Site Reference
H56 Beach road / Clarence road

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Fluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)
The site is allocated for residential development as part of policy H/2 to meet local needs for housing growth in the Borough. As part of this policy a number of sites are allocated for residential development and specific reasons are not provided for individual allocations.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Select...
Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- EA
- Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Site Reference
H61 Weston Gateway

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Fluvial and Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)
The site is allocated for residential development as part of policy H/2 to meet local needs for housing growth in the Borough. As part of this policy a number of sites are allocated for residential development and specific reasons are not provided for individual allocations.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Select...

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A

Site Reference

H63 Bridge Farm

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

Fluvial and Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

No
What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)

The site is allocated for residential development as part of policy H/2 to meet local needs for housing growth in the Borough. As part of this policy a number of sites are allocated for residential development and specific reasons are not provided for individual allocations.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Site Reference
H64 - Land to the rear of Wellsea Grove, WsM

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Fluvial and Pluvial
Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)

The site is allocated for residential development as part of policy H/2 to meet local needs for housing growth in the Borough. As part of this policy a number of sites are allocated for residential development and specific reasons are not provided for individual allocations.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Site Reference</strong></th>
<th>H78 - Knightstone Island, WsM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Fluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What reason was given for retaining the allocation?</strong></td>
<td>1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site is allocated for residential development as part of policy H/2 to meet local needs for housing growth in the Borough. As part of this policy a number of sites are allocated for residential development and specific reasons are not provided for individual allocations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Company</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Board</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABI</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town/Parish Council</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?</strong></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Why did the inspector retain the allocation?</strong></td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

**Site Reference**
H20a - West Wick, Locking Castle

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Fluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

1. Overiding housing need (driven by targets)
   
The site is allocated for residential development as part of policy H/2 to meet local needs for housing growth in the Borough. As part of this policy a number of sites are allocated for residential development and specific reasons are not provided for individual allocations.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why did the inspector retain the allocation?</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Reference</td>
<td>E/1C Western Regeneration Area - western airfield [east]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Fluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What reason was given for retaining the allocation?</td>
<td>3. Over riding regeneration need</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This site presents a strategic opportunity for growth within the local authority. Flood risk on the site is acknowledged within both policy E1 and the supporting text, which sets out how the risk of flooding on the development will need to / can be managed through the planning process. Text in the policy states that the development of the site will need to incorporate the early provision of:

"a sustainable flood management scheme incorporating creation of a new rhyne wetland and network of rhynes for the Airfield (and adjoining areas), including the re-instatement of a main rhyne to replace the culvert crossing Weston Airfield to control flows in the Cross Rhyne;"

Furthermore, paragraph 7.50 states in relation to water management and flooding:

"The Environment Agency mapping system indicates that part of the Weston Airfield is at risk to flooding. Surface water run-off from the new development will need to be controlled in order not to compound this risk. This will be achieved by a comprehensive and environmentally sensitive flood management scheme, which will control flows in the Cross Rhyne. The Environment Agency will require that adequate mitigation is provided so as to ensure that there is no unacceptable risk of flooding on the site and that development of the site will not exacerbate or displace the flood risk to adjoining and other areas. This will be achieved by developing a new network of Rhynes and a wetland area along the southern part of the site. The flood management scheme for the Weston Airfield will be designed to be compatible with any comprehensive flood management scheme prepared for the whole of the Weston Regeneration Area."

Did the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

☐ EA
☐ Water Company
☐ Drainage Board
☐ ABI
☐ Town/Parish Council

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Site Reference
E/1c Western Regeneration Area - western airfield [west]

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Fluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
3. Over riding regeneration need

This site presents a strategic opportunity for growth within the local authority. Flood risk on the site is acknowledged within both policy E1 and the supporting text, which sets out how the risk of flooding on the development will need to / can be managed through the planning process. Text in the policy states that the development of the site will need to incorporate the early provision of:

"a sustainable flood management scheme incorporating creation of a new rhyne wetland and network of rhynes for the Airfield (and adjoining areas), including the re-instatement of a main rhyne to replace the culvert crossing Weston Airfield to control flows in the Cross Rhyne;"

Furthermore, paragraph 7.50 states in relation to water management and flooding:

“The Environment Agency mapping system indicates that part of the Weston Airfield is at risk to flooding. Surface water run-off from the new development will need to be controlled in order not to compound this risk. This will be achieved by a comprehensive and environmentally sensitive flood management scheme, which will control flows in the Cross Rhyne. The Environment Agency will require that adequate mitigation is provided so as to ensure that there is no unacceptable risk of flooding on the site and that development of the site will not exacerbate or displace the flood risk to adjoining and other areas. This will be achieved by developing a new network of Rhynes and a wetland area along the southern part of the site. The flood management scheme for the Weston Airfield will be designed to be compatible with any comprehensive flood management scheme prepared for the whole of the Weston Regeneration Area."

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [x] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why did the inspector retain the allocation?</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Reference</strong></td>
<td>M6: Land adjoining Great Western Centre Aisecombe Way, Western Super Mare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Fluvial and Pluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What reason was given for retaining the allocation?</td>
<td>3. Over riding regeneration need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site is allocated for mixed used development, with parts of this highlighted as suitable for retail due to the town centre location (subject to meeting the requirements of the sequential test as set out in PPS6).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A

**Site Reference**

E/5 E7: Land at Portishead Quays, Portishead

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

Fluvial and Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

2. Ov er riding employment need (driven by targets)
Policy E/5 in the Local Plan allocates multiple sites as safeguarded employment areas to help maintain sustainable patterns of development through the provision of employment land to meet local needs. Multiple sites are allocated as part of this policy and specific reasons are not provided for each individual allocation.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?  
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?  
☐ EA  
☐ Water Company  
☐ Drainage Board  
☐ ABI  
☐ Town/Parish Council

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?  
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?  
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?  
N/A

Site Reference  
E/5: E12 - Land at Winterstoke Rd business park

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable  
Fluvial and Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?  
No
What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

2. Over riding employment need (driven by targets)

Policy E/5 in the Local Plan allocates multiple sites as safeguarded employment areas to help maintain sustainable patterns of development through the provision of employment land to meet local needs. Multiple sites are allocated as part of this policy and specific reasons are not provided for each individual allocation.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [X] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A

Site Reference

E/5: E15 Land off Winterstoke Road/old Junction Road

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

Fluvial and Pluvial
Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?  
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?  
2. Over riding employment need (driven by targets)

Policy E/5 in the Local Plan allocates multiple sites as safeguarded employment areas to help maintain sustainable patterns of development through the provision of employment land to meet local needs. Multiple sites are allocated as part of this policy and specific reasons are not provided for each individual allocation.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?  
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?  
☐ EA  
☐ Water Company  
☐ Drainage Board  
☐ ABI  
☐ Town/Parish Council

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?  
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?  
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Site Reference

E/5 E17 - Land at Aisecome Way, Great Western Centre

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Fluvial and Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

2. Over riding employment need (driven by targets)

Policy E/5 in the Local Plan allocates multiple sites as safeguarded employment areas to help maintain sustainable patterns of development through the provision of employment land to meet local needs. Multiple sites are allocated as part of this policy and specific reasons are not provided for each individual allocation.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable
Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Site Reference
E/5 E19 - land East of Park and Ride Site, Western-super-mare

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Fluvial and Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

2. Over riding employment need (driven by targets)

Policy E/5 in the Local Plan allocates multiple sites as safeguarded employment areas to help maintain sustainable patterns of development through the provision of employment land to meet local needs. Multiple sites are allocated as part of this policy and specific reasons are not provided for each individual allocation.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [x] Town/Parish Council

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why did the inspector retain the allocation?</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Reference</td>
<td>E/5: E22 - Land at Locking Castle Business Park, Western-super-mare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Pluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What reason was given for retaining the allocation?</td>
<td>Over riding employment need (driven by targets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy E/5 in the Local Plan allocates multiple sites as safeguarded employment areas to help maintain sustainable patterns of development through the provision of employment land to meet local needs. Multiple sites are allocated as part of this policy and specific reasons are not provided for each individual allocation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?</td>
<td>EA, Water Company, Drainage Board, ABI, Town/Parish Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
West Mendip Internal Drainage Board raised an issue in regards to provision being made for flood storage on the site.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Reject

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
2. Over riding employment need (driven by targets)
The Inspector stated that drainage issues could be dealt with through the extant master-plan and the implementation of a Section 106 Agreement for the site.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes

Site Reference
E/5 E38 - Western Business Park, Locking Moor Road, Western-super-mare

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Fluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
2. Over riding employment need (driven by targets)
Policy E/5 in the Local Plan allocates multiple sites as safeguarded employment areas to help maintain sustainable patterns of development through the provision of employment land to meet local needs. Multiple sites are allocated as part of this policy and specific reasons are not provided for each individual allocation.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes
Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

**Issue raised in to regards to whether the Proposals Map should show the site being located within the Flood Plain?**

**Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?**

**Accept**

The Inspector stated in regards to this that the Council state that the extent of the flood plain draws upon information provided by the Environment Agency and accepts that the diagrammatic representation on the Proposals Map may be unclear. The Inspector stated that a note on the key to the Proposals Map that the areas are an indication only and not definitive, should be added was recommended.

**Why did the inspector retain the allocation?**

1. **Over riding employment need (driven by targets)**

The Proposals Map is to be amended as set out in the previous question.

**Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?**

**Yes**

**Site Reference**

E/5 E39 - Land West of Kenn Road, Kenn

**Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable**

Fluvial

**Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?**

**No**

**What reason was given for retaining the allocation?**

1. **Over riding employment need (driven by targets)**
Policy E/5 in the Local Plan allocates multiple sites as safeguarded employment areas to help maintain sustainable patterns of development through the provision of employment land to meet local needs. Multiple sites are allocated as part of this policy and specific reasons are not provided for each individual allocation.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

Questions were raised on if this site should be allocated for development?

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Reject

The Inspector noted in relation to this site the site is within zone 3b where PPG25 advises against development save in exceptional circumstances. Should the allocation be supported, it would have to rely upon such circumstances being made out. A preliminary flood risk assessment has been carried out.

The Environment Agency has agreed that if a need for the development is established and in the absence of a sequentially preferable site, protective measures could render the allocation acceptable.

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
2. Over riding employment need (driven by targets)

The Environment Agency has agreed that if a need for the development is established and in the absence of a sequentially preferable site, protective measures could render the allocation acceptable.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes

Site Reference
E/5 E36 Land at Western Airfield (East)
Locking Moor Road, Western-super-mare

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Fluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

Policy E/5 in the Local Plan allocates multiple sites as safeguarded employment areas to help maintain sustainable patterns of development through the provision of employment land to meet local needs. Multiple sites are allocated as part of this policy and specific reasons are not provided for each individual allocation.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A
## Local Authority Wide

Total amount of land allocated for development in the local authority by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>1,293.18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>195.67</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>230.73</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land in entire district outside of flood risk zones (ha)</th>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones, and national designations (ha) | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Mixed Use                                                                         |                     |
| Housing                                                                           |                     |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones (ha)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land inside flood risk zones (ha)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## All Strategic allocations

Total amount of land allocated for strategic development by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>93.98</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>1,289.25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>135.03</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land allocated for strategic development within flood zones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone, Use</th>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood Risk, Housing</td>
<td>24.91</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood Risk, Mixed use</td>
<td>345.38</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Flood Zone 3/minority Flood Zone 2, Employment</td>
<td>44.43</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What proportion of all allocated land in the authority falls within this definition of a strategic allocation?

Amount of land (ha)  

Note:

7 out of 27 sites (within the threshold) fall within areas at risk of flooding.

What is the mean allocation size within the authority?

Amount of land (ha)  

Note:

Individual Strategic Allocations - Note only allocations in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to be included. This record will be completed for each individual allocation

Site Reference  

SA1.4: Great Haddon

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

1. Overriding housing need (driven by targets)

This site is delivering the largest single component of Peterborough's residential requirement, in numerical terms, to 2026. They want new residential development to take place on underused land in urban areas, such as this site.

The location for the proposed new urban extension (i.e. those not already committed) is based on the evidence and conclusions from the IGS, which examined all potential alternatives against a comprehensive range of constraints information and evaluation criteria.

Does the plan/evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council
Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

As the SA document is currently being examined before it is adopted, there is no inspector's report. I have looked at the Inspector's Report for the Core Strategy but there is no information with regard to flooding at the site/or the reason as to why the allocation was retained.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Site Reference
SA3.17: Land formerly part of Peterborough Regional College

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)

Site allocated for housing. No justification given as to why the site was chosen but it has been interpreted that it is to meet the identified housing target and need.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No
Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- EA
- Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council

No

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

As the SA document is currently being examined before it is adopted, there is no inspector's report. I have looked at the Inspector's Report for the Core Strategy but there is no information with regard to flooding at the site/or the reason as to why the allocation was retained.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Site Reference
SA3.43: Former Freemans Site, Ivatt Way

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)
Site allocated for housing. No justification given as to why the site was chosen but it has been interpreted that it is to meet the identified housing target and need.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- EA
- Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council

No

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

As the SA document is currently being examined before it is adopted, there is no inspector’s report. I have looked at the Inspector’s Report for the Core Strategy but there is no information with regard to flooding at the site/or the reason as to why the allocation was retained. I have therefore selected over-riding need as per above.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Site Reference
SA3.47: Triangle Land, West of Hampton Vale

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No
What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)

Site allocated for housing. In particular, the site will be expected to include a reasonable proportion of prestige homes in line with the requirements of Core Strategy policy CS8.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- EA
- Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council

No

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

NA

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

As the SA document is currently being examined before it is adopted, there is no inspector's report. I have looked at the Inspector's Report for the Core Strategy but there is no information with regard to flooding at the site/or the reason as to why the allocation was retained. I have therefore selected over-riding need as per above.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Site Reference
SA11.1 [Eastern (GEA3)]: Land off Third Drove and fronting Fengate

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Fluvial and Pluvial
Fluvial (flood zones 2 and 3) and pluvial.

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
2. Over riding employment need (driven by targets)
Site allocated for employment - it is a general employment area. No justification given as to why the site was chosen but it has been interpreted that this is due to employment needs.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

No

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable
As the SA document is currently being examined before it is adopted, there is no inspector's report. I have looked at the Inspector's Report for the Core Strategy but there is no information with regard to flooding at the site/or the reason as to why the allocation was retained. I have therefore selected over-riding need as per above.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Not applicable
**Site Reference**  
SA11.2 [Eastern (GEA3)]: Land between Second & Third Drive

**Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable**  
Fluvial and Pluvial

**Fluvial** (flood zone 2 and 3) and pluvial.

**Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?**  
No

**What reason was given for retaining the allocation?**  
2. Overriding employment need (driven by targets)  
Site allocated for employment - it is a general employment area. No justification given as to why the site was chosen but it has been interpreted that this is due to employment needs.

**Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?**  
No

**Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?**

- [ ] EA  
- [ ] Water Company  
- [ ] Drainage Board  
- [ ] ABI  
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

No

**Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?**  
Not applicable

NA

**Why did the inspector retain the allocation?**  
Not Applicable
As the SA document is currently being examined before it is adopted, there is no inspector's report. I have looked at the Inspector's Report for the Core Strategy but there is no information with regard to flooding at the site/or the reason as to why the allocation was retained. I have therefore selected over-riding need as per above.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>SA11.4 [Eastern (GEA3)]: Red Brick Farm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Fluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood zones 2 and 3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
2. Over riding employment need (driven by targets)
Over-riding need and flood risk deemed to be manageable when developed.

Site allocated for employment - it is a general employment area. No justification given as to why the site was chosen but it has been interpreted that this is due to employment needs.

Planning permission for the Red Brick Farm site will only be granted once appropriate solutions to the following issues are demonstrated and proved to be deliverable: Flood risk and flood safety issues, as demonstrated by a Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment and associated evidence.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

No

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable
NA

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

As the SA document is currently being examined before it is adopted, there is no inspector's report. I have looked at the Inspector's Report for the Core Strategy but there is no information with regard to flooding at the site/or the reason as to why the allocation was retained.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Click here to sign this section
Local Authority Wide

Total amount of land allocated for development in the local authority by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount of land in entire district outside of flood risk zones (ha)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones, and national designations (ha)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones (ha)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of land inside flood risk zones (ha)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All Strategic allocations

Total amount of land allocated for strategic development by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>126.4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>33.54</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land allocated for strategic development within flood zones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Amount of Land</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood Risk</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood Risk</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What proportion of all allocated land in the authority falls within this definition of a strategic allocation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Note:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 out of 23 strategic allocations are in areas at risk of flooding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is the mean allocation size within the authority?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Note:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Strategic Allocations - Note only allocations in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to be included. This record will be completed for each individual allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>SH05 Friary Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Pluvial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
3. **Ov er riding regeneration need**

This site was identified for the need to improve the types of uses currently located here in order to help maximise the potential of the area.

The issue of pluvial flooding on the site is not mentioned in the policy, however, paragraph 17 as part of policy SH 05 Friary Park states that:

“The preparation of a Climate Change and Sustainability Statement which will demonstrate how progress will be made towards achieving a zero carbon development. Any technical or financial impediments to such progress will need to be identified early by the developer, and they will be taken into account at the planning application stage.”

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?
- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council
Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?  
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?  
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?  
N/A

Site Reference  
NP03 Wakehams Quarry

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable  
Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?  
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?  
3. Over riding regeneration need  
The redevelopment of this site provides an opportunity to maximise this gateway location within the district, to significantly improve the quality of the urban environment found here. The need to manage flood risk on this development site is acknowledged as part of this policy. It states that development proposals for the site should provide for:

“The assessment of the risk of flooding. The development should be designed to avoid unnecessary development in areas of high risk and minimise the impact of development on flooding, or provide mitigation measures to reduce the impacts of potential flood.”

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes
Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- EA
- Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Site Reference
NP 05 Sherfood and Sports Club

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)
The objective of this allocation is to contribute to creating a neighbourhood a Sherfood that is effectively integrated with the existing wider Plymouth urban area. This new community will predominantly be for residential uses but will include wider community amenities/resources required to create sustainable patterns of development.

The policy for this allocation specifically highlights the need to consider the following factors in bringing forward development here:

“39. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) and any appropriate flood prevention measures.

40. Foul effluent drainage and treatment facilities either on site or piped to facilities in the Plym catchment area.

42. The provision of potable water supplies throughout the community in conjunction with water saving strategies and fittings (to Environment Agencies guidelines). Rainwater harvesting and grey-water recycling should be investigated and implemented wherever practical.”

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A
Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
3. Over riding regeneration need

The need to restore this yard so that it provides a mix of uses and makes the Peninsula area more vibrant can be seen to explain the rationale for this allocation of land.
Paragraph 8 of this policy states that:

"8. The preparation of a Climate Change and Sustainability Strategy which will demonstrate how progress will be made towards achieving zero carbon development, as defined by Level 6 of the Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM excellent standards. Any technical or financial impediments to such progress will need to be identified early by the developer, and they will be taken into account at the planning application stage."

Furthermore supporting text on the nature of the climate change sustainability statement states that this document should set out how the development will provide for sustainable urban drainage and waste systems.

Supporting text at paragraph 5.15 states that:

"Flood risk issues are identified in the Council’s Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for this area and appropriate mitigation measures should be identified as part of any development proposals."

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?
- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable
The Inspector set out in regards to this allocation in their report that the text on the climate change and sustainability statement should be included within the policy and supporting text for this allocation, to ensure that these issues were considered.

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
**Not Applicable**

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
**N/A**

[Click here to sign this section]
## Local Authority Wide

Total amount of land allocated for development in the local authority by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>17.64</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>33.65</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land in entire district outside of flood risk zones (ha)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones (ha)</th>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones, and national designations (ha)

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones (ha)

Amount of land inside flood risk zones (ha)

---

## All Strategic allocations

Total amount of land allocated for strategic development by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land allocated for strategic development within flood zones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood Risk</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What proportion of all allocated land in the authority falls within this definition of a strategic allocation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1 out of 5 strategic allocations are in areas at risk of flooding

What is the mean allocation size within the authority?
Amount of land (ha) Note:

Individual Strategic Allocations - Note only allocations in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to be included. This record will be completed for each individual allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>SSA 12 The Goods Yard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Pluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
3. Over riding regeneration need

The DPD identifies that the site has a critical role in connecting the railway station and any proposed development into Falkland Square, part of the primary shopping area in the town centre, as well as integrating with any possible future development opportunities that may arise on neighbouring sites currently occupied by Barclays and Poole Stadium. In this sense the location of the site means that there is a need to bring development forward here.

Policy in the DPD sets out the need for proposals to adopt the approach to flood risk assessment and adaptation/mitigation set out in Core Strategy policy PCS 34 – Flood Risk.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council
The Inspector's report indicates no objections were made to the allocation of this site on flood risk grounds.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A
Local Authority Wide

Total amount of land allocated for development in the local authority by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>207.2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land in entire district outside of flood risk zones (ha)

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones, and national designations (ha)

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones (ha)

Amount of land inside flood risk zones (ha)

All Strategic allocations

Total amount of land allocated for strategic development by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land allocated for strategic development within flood zones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Amount of Land</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All in Zone 2</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What proportion of all allocated land in the authority falls within this definition of a strategic allocation?

Note:

What is the mean allocation size within the authority?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Note:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Individual Strategic Allocations - Note only allocations in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to be included. This record will be completed for each individual allocation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>SA8g Part of Former Battle Hospital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Fluvial and Pluvial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?  
Yes  
The site passed the sequential test for inclusion as an allocation for residential development.

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?  
1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)  
The DPD identifies a need for further housing sites to be identified to continue to meet the needs of the Borough and in the Sequential and Exceptions test of sites the need for regeneration of the site is stressed, with a residential use identified as the best mechanism to achieve this regeneration.  
Mechanisms to minimise and manage the risk of flooding are included in the policy for this site.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?  
Yes  

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?  
- [ ] EA  
- [ ] Water Company  
- [ ] Drainage Board  
- [ ] ABI  
- [ ] Town/Parish Council  
The Plan is currently being examined and it is therefore unknown if any bodies have objected to the allocation on flood risk grounds.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?  
Not applicable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why did the inspector retain the allocation?</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Reference</td>
<td>SA8j Napier Court, Napier Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Fluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site passed the sequential test for inclusion as an allocation for residential development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What reason was given for retaining the allocation?</td>
<td>3. Over riding regeneration need</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The over-riding need for regeneration on the site was identified as the reason for it being retained as an allocation.

It should also be noted that the Council has, in the past, rejected the proposal to allocate this site for residential development, both in the Reading Central Area Action Plan and in the first version of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document, on solely flooding grounds (the Council has always contended that this site would otherwise have potential for residential development). However, since then, the Environment Agency flood zones have been changed, with two changes affecting the site in particular:

• The site is no longer wholly in Flood Zone 2, with the building footprints now in Flood Zone 1; and
• The site is no longer surrounded by Flood Zone 3, meaning that escape in the event of a flood will be significantly safer.

It is now therefore considered that the site can be safely and appropriately developed for residential use, and that there may even be an opportunity for such a use to actively reduce flood risk on site (see above). This would, however, be subject to development not significantly increasing the building footprint on site and therefore potentially increasing flood risk elsewhere.

Mechanisms to manage the risk of flooding are included within the policy for this allocation. Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [x] Town/Parish Council

The Plan is currently being examined and it is therefore unknown if any bodies have objected to the allocation on flood risk grounds.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A
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### Local Authority Wide

Total amount of land allocated for development in the local authority by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing</strong></td>
<td>34.26</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land in entire district outside of flood risk zones (ha)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Amount of land ‘available’ outside of flood risk zones, and national designations (ha)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Amount of land ‘available’ outside of flood risk zones (ha)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Amount of land inside flood risk zones (ha)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### All Strategic allocations

Total amount of land allocated for strategic development by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing</strong></td>
<td>21.98</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land allocated for strategic development within flood zones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Amount of Land</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Select...</td>
<td>Select...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What proportion of all allocated land in the authority falls within this definition of a strategic allocation?

Amount of land (ha) | Note: No strategic allocations were in areas at risk of flooding

What is the mean allocation size within the authority?

Amount of land (ha) | Note:
Individual Strategic Allocations - Note only allocations in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to be included. This record will be completed for each individual allocation

**Site Reference**

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

Select...

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

Select...

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

Select...

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

Select...

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Select...
Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Select...

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Select...

Click here to sign this section
## Local Authority Wide

Total amount of land allocated for development in the local authority by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>379.98</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>337.24</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land in entire district outside of flood risk zones (ha)

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones, and national designations (ha)

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones (ha)

Amount of land inside flood risk zones (ha)

## All Strategic allocations

Total amount of land allocated for strategic development by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land allocated for strategic development within flood zones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Amount of Land</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All in Zone 2</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All in Zone 2</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What proportion of all allocated land in the authority falls within this definition of a strategic allocation?

Amount of land (ha) Note:

Out of 15 strategic allocations 2 are in areas at risk of flooding.
What is the mean allocation size within the authority?
Amount of land (ha)  

Note:

Individual Strategic Allocations - Note only allocations in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to be included. This record will be completed for each individual allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>H8.1 Black Lake - Land to east of Black Lake (633)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)

Need to meet housing requirements in the district.

The explanatory text on allocations for residential development in the Black Lake areas sets out how this area is becoming increasingly attractive for residential uses and is less viable for commercial activities. Paragraph 12.6 states that:

"In the Black Lake area to the north of West Bromwich Town Centre, there has been recent residential development adjacent to the industrial area of Ridgacre Road. Within this area there have been expressions of interest by companies to relocate their business operations and for their sites to go for residential development. There are also a number of vacant and underused sites which are not economically viable for industrial use."

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council
This DPD was submitted to the Secretary of State on the 31st of October 2011 and the EIP of the document is scheduled to occur in 2012.

Consequently, based on a review of comments received from the Environment Agency on the Site Allocation Policies Consultation it would appear that no objections were raised on this allocation on flood risk grounds. Based on current information available it would appear that the water company did not submit a response to this consultation.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

**Site Reference**

E8.4 Bromwich Pikehelve St Bagnall St.

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
2. Over riding employment need (driven by targets)
To meet the needs of employment growth in the district.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No
Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- EA
- Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council

This DPD was submitted to the Secretary of State on the 31st of October 2011 and the EIP of the document is scheduled to occur in 2012.

Consequently, based on a review of comments received from the Environment Agency on the Site Allocation Policies Consultation it would appear that no objections were raised on this allocation on flood risk grounds. Based on current information available it would appear that the water company did not submit a response to this consultation.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A
Local Authority Wide

Total amount of land allocated for development in the local authority by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>54.26</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land inside flood risk zones (ha)

Amount of land allocated for strategic development by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>30.61</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land allocated for strategic development within flood zones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Amount of Land</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood Risk</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood Risk</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>24.12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What proportion of all allocated land in the authority falls within this definition of a strategic allocation?

Amount of land (ha)  

Note:
4 out of 13 strategic allocations are in areas at risk of flooding.

What is the mean allocation size within the authority?

**Amount of land (ha)**

**Note:**

Individual Strategic Allocations - Note only allocations in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to be included. This record will be completed for each individual allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>H3.7 503-509 Hawthorne Road, Bootle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Pluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What reason was given for retaining the allocation?</td>
<td>1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To meet housing demand in the Borough for the plan period.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No objections appear to have been raised to the allocation on flood risk grounds.
Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Site Reference: H4 Land at Town lane

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)

This represents the largest site in Sefton allocated for housing development and as such will make an important contribution to meeting housing need.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- EA
- Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council
It does not appear that any objections were raised on flood risk grounds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why did the inspector retain the allocation?</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site Reference**

EDT3.3 Senate Business park and Girobank

**Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable**

Pluvial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What reason was given for retaining the allocation?</td>
<td>2. Over riding employment need (driven by targets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The allocation is a large site for employment, of which there is an overall shortage in the Sefton area. As such the site represents an important opportunity to develop the economy of the area. Of the three sites allocated for employment in this policy this site is put forward for office uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- EA
- Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council

No objections were raised in flood risk grounds.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Site Reference

EDT6.4 Former Vestey Site, Bridle Rd

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
2. Over riding employment need (driven by targets)
Site allocated for business, industrial, storage and distribution development in the borough. The site is also within the south of the Borough, in the Dunnings Bridge Corridor and Netherton Industrial Areas (Policy EDT1), where regeneration funding is available through the Atlantic Gateway Strategic Investment Area programme.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?  
No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?  

- [ ] EA  
- [ ] Water Company  
- [ ] Drainage Board  
- [ ] ABI  
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

No objections were raised to the allocation on flood risk grounds.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?  
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?  
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?  
N/A
Local Authority Wide

Total amount of land allocated for development in the local authority by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>262.22</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land in entire district outside of flood risk zones (ha):

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones, and national designations (ha):

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones (ha):

Amount of land inside flood risk zones (ha):

All Strategic allocations

Total amount of land allocated for strategic development by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>198.2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land allocated for strategic development within flood zones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Amount of Land</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All in Zone 2</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What proportion of all allocated land in the authority falls within this definition of a strategic allocation?

Amount of land (ha) Note:

1 out of 6 strategic allocations are in areas at risk of flooding.
What is the mean allocation size within the authority?

Amount of land (ha)  Note:

---

Individual Strategic Allocations - Note only allocations in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to be included. This record will be completed for each individual allocation

**Site Reference**  SSA7 Cippenham Phase 4

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

**Pluvial**

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

1. Over-riding housing need (driven by targets)

The Allocations DPD states that the rationale for allocating the site for residential development was:

“To establish the principle of allowing this Greenfield site to be developed for housing and confirm the extent of this final phase of development. To ensure that a range of family house types and sizes and affordable family housing is provided. To ensure all necessary infrastructure is provided in full.”

Does the plan/evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

It would not appear that any objections were raised on flood risk grounds.

---

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

---
Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A
ASC Planning Proforma 2 - Plan Making Process

Report Date: 28/02/2012
Prepared By: DG

Interviewed: LA:
Solihull

E-mail Address: Department:

Telephone: Position:
UDPLP

Local Authority Wide
Total amount of land allocated for development in the local authority by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>185.1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>197.15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land in entire district outside of flood risk zones (ha): [Amount of Land (ha)]
Note:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones, and national designations (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land inside flood risk zones (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All Strategic allocations
Total amount of land allocated for strategic development by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>121.73</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land allocated for strategic development within flood zones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Amount of Land</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood Risk</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood Risk</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What proportion of all allocated land in the authority falls within this definition of a strategic allocation?
Amount of land (ha)
Note:
What is the mean allocation size within the authority?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Note:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Strategic Allocations - Note only allocations in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to be included. This record will be completed for each individual allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>Council Depot, Moat Lane POLICY H1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Pluvial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)
Brownfield site identified ensure that sufficient land is provided to meet the Regional Spatial Strategy target of 4,000 new homes during the Plan period of 2001 to 2011.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable
Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

**Site Reference**
Birmingham Business Park

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
2. Over riding employment need (driven by targets)
The Site is allocated as part of a larger group of employment sites identified to meet the target set out in the UDP for employment land provision in the city. A specific reason for the allocation of this individual site is not provided.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council
Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A
### Local Authority Wide

Total amount of land allocated for development in the local authority by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>40.76</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>52.28</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land in entire district outside of flood risk zones (ha)

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones, and national designations (ha)

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones (ha)

Amount of land inside flood risk zones (ha)

### All Strategic allocations

Total amount of land allocated for strategic development by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land allocated for strategic development within flood zones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Amount of Land</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood Risk</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood Risk</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood Risk</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What proportion of all allocated land in the authority falls within this definition of a strategic allocation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Note:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

What is the mean allocation size within the authority?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Note:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Individual Strategic Allocations - Note only allocations in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to be included. This record will be completed for each individual allocation.

**Site Reference**: Cambridge Northern Fringe West (Orchard Park)

**Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable**: Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
1. Overiding housing need (driven by targets)

The Council’s preferred sites for the allocation of additional housing land includes 3 plots of land at Cambridge Northern Fringe West.

Previously allocated in the Local Plan.

Completion of development in accordance with the CNF West Masterplan.

Does the plan/evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?
- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why did the inspector retain the allocation?</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Reference</td>
<td>North West Cambridge Huntingdon Road to Histon Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Pluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What reason was given for retaining the allocation?</td>
<td>1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To meet housing over-riding housing need and targets Land at North West Cambridge between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road, is to be developed as part of a sustainable housing-led urban extension of Cambridge, with the Cambridge Green Belt subsequently revised to provide for this development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- EA
- Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Site Reference
Longstanton: North of Hattons Road up to the proposed bypass

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
2. Over riding employment need (driven by targets)
Over-riding employment need.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable
NA

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Click here to sign this section
Local Authority Wide
Total amount of land allocated for development in the local authority by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>349.58</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>152.61</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land in entire district outside of flood risk zones (ha)

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones, and national designations (ha)

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones (ha)

Amount of land inside flood risk zones (ha)

All Strategic allocations
Total amount of land allocated for strategic development by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>194.3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land allocated for strategic development within flood zones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Amount of Land</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood Risk</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What proportion of all allocated land in the authority falls within this definition of a strategic allocation?

Note:
**What is the mean allocation size within the authority?**

Amount of land (ha)  
Note:  

---

**Individual Strategic Allocations - Note only allocations in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to be included. This record will be completed for each individual allocation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>Cloverdale Drive &amp; Cottonwood Drive, Longwell Green</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Pluvial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?**

No

**What reason was given for retaining the allocation?**

1. **Over riding housing need (driven by targets)**

   This site is allocated with a large group of sites for residential development to meet housing provision in the plan period 1996 - 2011.

   The site was previously allocated for a Primary School but has now been declared surplus to Education requirements. Residential development should help to meet housing needs particularly for affordable housing (33.3% of units).

   **Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?**

   No

**Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?**

- [ ] EA  
- [ ] Water Company  
- [ ] Drainage Board  
- [ ] ABI  
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

No objections were raised on flood risk grounds.

**Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?**
Why did the inspector retain the allocation? 

Not Applicable

The Inspectors Report states:

This site has been declared surplus to requirements and I understand that the council is not seeking additional sites for schools in this area. I have no evidence to refute this view.

In Inspectors Report goes further to state:

The site lies within an established residential area and I see no reason why the council should not aim at the higher end of the density range.

Risk of flooding is not mentioned.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A

Site Reference

Old Costonians Playing Fields, New Road, Filton

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)

This site is allocated with a large group of sites for residential development to meet housing provision in the plan period 1996 - 2011.

This site was previously a degraded and disused section, of the former Old Colstonians Sports Ground.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?
Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

The Inspectors Report supported all the housing allocations put forward by the plan.

The Inspector had some misgivings about the extent to which the sites allocated could be built-out in the plan period.

To make up the shortfall, the Inspector recommended this site be included as a mainstream allocation, rather than as a reserve site as originally intended.

Risk of flooding is not mentioned.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A
### Local Authority Wide

Total amount of land allocated for development in the local authority by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land in entire district outside of flood risk zones (ha)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones, and national designations (ha)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones (ha)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Amount of land inside flood risk zones (ha)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### All Strategic allocations

Total amount of land allocated for strategic development by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land allocated for strategic development within flood zones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All in Zone 2</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>27.45</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Flood Zone 2</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 3</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All in Zone 2</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Majority Flood Zone 2 /minority Flood Zone 3

All in Zone 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>106</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What proportion of all allocated land in the authority falls within this definition of a strategic allocation?

Amount of land (ha) | Note:

What is the mean allocation size within the authority?

Amount of land (ha) | Note:

Individual Strategic Allocations - Note only allocations in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to be included. This record will be completed for each individual allocation

Site Reference: Spalding 2011, Holland Park

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

Fluvial and Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)

This site has been allocated within a long list of new housing allocations to ensure that the housing requirement for the South Holland District can be met.

In the case of Holland Park, Spalding the figures given are those for the number of dwellings expected to be completed during the plan period as part of an urban extension (1450).

The Plan’s strategy seeks to allocate housing land, to accommodate most of the District’s needs within or adjoining the existing urban areas, primarily in Spalding and Holbeach.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

Select...

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?
The Environment Agency expressed concern about the differing flood risk on the southern part of the site and land earmarked ‘post-2021’, and the desirability of adopting a sequential approach to site selection.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Reject

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

3. Over riding regeneration need

The Inspector’s Report cites the benefits of the scheme, namely - the provision of the link road would, in this particular instance, be a matter of greater weight.

The Inspector considered that it is capable of being taken into account the EA’s concerns as part of a planning brief for the site.

The benefits of the scheme were attributed greater weight, namely:
- The provision of the western link road,
- 33% affordable housing; and
- A range of community facilities; including: village/neighbourhood centre, healthcare facilities, a primary school, a religious centre, leisure facilities and open space.
- Walking/cycling routes and would be served by an extended bus service.
- The possibility of a rail halt is to be safeguarded.

The Inspector concludes that Holland Park should be retained in the Plan as an allocated urban extension, stating that there is no evidence of preferable alternative proposals which would accord with the Plan's strategy.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes

Site Reference
Holbeach 2021 - Adjacent A51

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Fluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No
What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)

   This site has been allocated within a long list of new housing allocations to ensure that the housing requirement for the South Holland District can be met.

   In the case of the land adjacent to the A151 at Holbeach the figures given are those for the number of dwellings expected to be completed during the plan period as part of an urban extension (150).

   The Plan's strategy seeks to allocate housing land, to accommodate most of the District's needs within or adjoining the existing urban areas, primarily in Spalding and Holbeach.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

[ ] EA
[ ] Water Company
[ ] Drainage Board
[ ] ABI
[ ] Town/Parish Council

No objections have been made on flood risk grounds.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

NA

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

As at Spalding, the Inspector supports the allocation of housing, regarding the urban extension as a desirable approach to meeting the housing, employment and community infrastructure needs of Holbeach.

The Inspector considers the intended development brief for this site, will provide the appropriate vehicle for consideration of the disposition of the various land uses in relation, amongst other things, to the A151.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A

Site Reference

Holbeach to 2021 - Off Foxes Lowe Road
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This site has been allocated within a long list of new housing allocations to ensure that the housing requirement for the South Holland District can be met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the case of the land at Foxes Low Road, Holbeach the figures given are those for the number of dwellings expected to be completed during the plan period as part of an urban extension (150).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Plan's strategy seeks to allocate housing land, to accommodate most of the District’s needs within or adjoining the existing urban areas, primarily in Spalding and Holbeach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No objection to this allocation on flood risk grounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why did the inspector retain the allocation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

**Site Reference**  
Long Sutton to 2021 - Off Lime Walk

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable  
Fluvial and Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)

   This site has been allocated within a long list of new housing allocations to ensure that the housing requirement for the South Holland District can be met.

   In the case of the land off Lime Walk, Sutton, the figures given are those for the number of dwellings expected to be completed during the plan period as part of an urban extension (80).

   The Plan's strategy seeks to allocate housing land, to accommodate most of the District's needs within or adjoining the existing urban areas.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA  
- [ ] Water Company  
- [ ] Drainage Board  
- [ ] ABI  
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

No objections on flood risk grounds.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

The Inspectors Report regards this site as effectively comprising the final phase of the recent development to the south. It is contained on 3 sides by existing housing and to the Inspector it appears to be readily developable.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A

Site Reference: Spalding - land of Wardentree Lane and Spalding Road (Pinchbeck)

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

Fluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

2. Over riding employment need (driven by targets)

In line with the spatial strategy of the Plan, new employment allocations have been focussed in, or close to, the towns in the District. The Local Plan identifies those areas within which land is allocated for employment to meet the development needs within the District.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council
No objections on flood risk grounds.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

The Inspector's Report refers to this site as: Spalding Major Employment Area. It is an existing Employment area and it is retained as an allocation due to the importance of this area for the maintenance and enhancement of the economic prosperity of the District.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

**Site Reference**

| Sutton Bridge (Wingland) |

**Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable**

| Fluvial and Pluvial |

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

2. Over riding employment need (driven by targets)
In line with the spatial strategy of the Plan, new employment allocations have been focussed in, or close to, the towns in the District. The Local Plan identifies those areas within which land is allocated for employment to meet the development needs within the District.

The employment allocation at the port has been carried forward from the 1998 Adopted Local Plan.

The Local Plan and the Inspectors Report cite the locational imperative, and as the lack of sequentially preferable sites.

The Inspectors Report states:

I see no reason for any change. Indeed, it is my understanding the Environment Agency does not object to the principle of the allocation of this land.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

No objections on grounds of flood risk.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A

Site Reference

Long Sutton/Little Sutton

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

Fluvial
Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?  
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?  
2. Over riding employment need (driven by targets)

The employment allocation has been carried forward from the 1998 Adopted Local Plan.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?  
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?  

☐ EA  
☐ Water Company  
☐ Drainage Board  
☐ ABI  
☐ Town/Parish Council

No objections on grounds of flood risk.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?  
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?  
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Site Reference

Holbeach - land on the west side of Holbeach adjacent to A151

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

Fluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)

At Holbeach, the allocation (10.1 ha) is part of an urban extension, along with residential, community infrastructure and open space.

The Council is to prepare a development brief for the whole of the urban extension to guide the disposition of the various uses, the phasing and other relevant matters.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

No objections on grounds of flood risk.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

NA

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable
Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?  
N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>Crowland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable | Fluvial |

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?  
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?  
2. Over riding employment need (driven by targets)

Site allocated in the 1998 Adopted Local Plan.

The Council proposes to keep the allocation under review, which the Inspector considers to be a reasonable approach at this stage in the absence of any competing site.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?  
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?  

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

No objections on grounds of flood risk.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?  
Not applicable
Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes

Site Reference  
Northern Expansion Area, Spalding

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Fluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
3. Overiding regeneration need

Retail Capacity Study Update undertaken on the Council’s behalf indicates a quantitative need for additional floorspace for comparison goods in the District.

Policy EC13 promotes proposals for mixed use development on the Northern Expansion Area appropriate to its location close to the town centre and with a significant number of dwellings nearby, with a significant proportion of development on the site to comprise retail but may also include residential.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- EA
- Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council
No objections on grounds of flood risk.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Site Reference
Land to the Rear of the White Hart, Spalding

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Fluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
3. Over riding regeneration need

This site is located close to the heart of Spalding's traditional shopping centre.

It has planning permission for retail development, part of which has been implemented. There has also been some residential development.

The site has constraints including access and its relationship to nearby buildings, many of which are listed, and uses which appear to be making it unattractive commercially for an entirely retail development.

The site has been allocated for a mixed use development, including retail.
Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

No objections on grounds of flood risk.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A
Local Authority Wide

Total amount of land allocated for development in the local authority by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>102.78</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>38.75</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land in entire district outside of flood risk zones (ha) | Amount of Land (ha) | Note

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones , and national designations (ha)

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones (ha)

Amount of land inside flood risk zones (ha)

All Strategic allocations

Total amount of land allocated for strategic development by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land allocated for strategic development within flood zones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Amount of Land</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood Risk</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>15.02</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What proportion of all allocated land in the authority falls within this definition of a strategic allocation?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>Westfield Orwell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk</td>
<td>Pluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What reason was given for retaining the allocation?</td>
<td>Over-riding housing need (driven by targets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?</td>
<td>Town/Parish Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No objections raised on flood risk grounds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why did the inspector retain the allocation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedewell Industrial Estate, Adair Way, Hebburn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What reason was given for retaining the allocation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-riding housing need (driven by targets).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?
- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

No objections raised on flood risk grounds.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
- Not applicable
  - NA

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
- Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
- N/A

**Site Reference**  
Land at Monkton Fell (north)

**Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable**
- Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
- No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
1. Overriding housing need (driven by targets)
Over-riding housing need (driven by targets).

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?
- EA
- Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council

No objections raised on flood risk grounds.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Site Reference
Land at Monkton Fell (central)

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No
What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
1. Overriding housing need (driven by targets)

Over-riding housing need (driven by targets).

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

No objections raised on flood risk grounds.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

NA

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

**Site Reference**
Ashworth Frazer Industrial Estate, Station Road, Hebburn

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Pluvial
Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
1. Over-riding housing need (driven by targets)
   Over-riding housing need (driven by targets).

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- EA
- Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council

No objections raised on flood risk grounds.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

NA

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Click here to sign this section
Local Authority Wide

Total amount of land allocated for development in the local authority by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land in entire district outside of flood risk zones (ha)

Amount of land ‘available’ outside of flood risk zones, and national designations (ha)

Amount of land ‘available’ outside of flood risk zones (ha)

Amount of land inside flood risk zones (ha)

All Strategic allocations

Total amount of land allocated for strategic development by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land allocated for strategic development within flood zones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Amount of Land</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All in Zone 3</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All in Zone 3</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All in Zone 2</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What proportion of all allocated land in the authority falls within this definition of a strategic allocation?

Amount of land (ha) Note:
What is the mean allocation size within the authority?
Amount of land (ha) 

Note:

Individual Strategic Allocations - Note only allocations in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to be included. This record will be completed for each individual allocation

Site Reference

A8: Riverside Works, Fordbridge Road, Sunbury

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Fluvial
96% in Flood Zone 2
4% in Flood Zone 3

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
Yes

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)

The owners, the Environment Agency, are promoting the site for residential use. In line with the Core Strategy Housing Strategy policies:

- To meet the Borough’s housing requirement in the for the South East.
- To ensure provision for housing incorporates a mix of tenure, size and type to meet local needs, including affordable housing.
- To encourage redevelopment of poorly located employment land for housing or to meet other development needs.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

No objections on flood risk grounds.
Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

The reason given within the Site Allocations DPD is that residential development would be more in keeping with the location and provides the opportunity to improve the setting of the River Thames.

The Inspectors Report states that any proposal for housing here to be supported by an appropriate FRA and incorporate an appropriate sustainable drainage scheme.

The Council state that, the EA has carried out an FRA which has indicated the acceptability of a residential development on this site. The site is already extensively developed with hard surfacing or buildings, and a redevelopment of the site would have the potential to reduce surface water run-off, and so even to a small extent reduce the risk of flooding from that source.

Any development on the site to provide adequate sewerage infrastructure, and the text of the DPD identifies the need to assess whether any improvements to sewerage infrastructure would be needed and to implement them before occupation of the site.

The Inspectors Report concludes that taking all these matters into account, that the site could be redeveloped for housing without leading to increased flood risk for nearby dwellings.

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A

**Site Reference**  
A9: Bridge Street Car Park, Staines

**Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable**  
Fluvial

58% in Flood Zone 2  
42% in Flood Zone 3

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

Yes

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)

Redevelopment would provide an opportunity to create a high quality development that
makes the most of this visually important site, offering the potential to enhance both the town centre and the setting of the river.

Housing is considered the most appropriate use for the site in view of the need for housing, reflected in Core Strategy priorities, and other housing development along the river frontage.

The Site Allocations DPD states that a flood risk assessment has been carried out which indicates that housing with parking beneath is acceptable in flood risk terms. Any development proposal will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.

Any development proposal would also require an assessment in conjunction with Thames Water to determine the need for local improvements to the sewerage network, to be implemented prior to the occupation of the site.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- EA
- Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council

No objections based on flood risk grounds.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Site Reference
A10: The Elmsleigh Centre and adjoining land, Staines

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Fluvial

3% in Flood Risk 1
Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
Yes

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
3. Over riding regeneration need

The 2004 Spelthorne Retail Study and the 2007 update shows there is scope for further retail development in Staines to meet forecast growth in retail expenditure on non food items.

The scale of the Allocation is consistent with the findings of the 2007 study update, which shows there is scope for a development of approximately 18,000 sq m up to 2016 and up to a further 32,000 sq m by 2026, subject to future monitoring. In the context of growing retail expenditure and consequent demand for extra floorspace a development of the scale proposed enables Staines to maintain its role as the principal town centre for north Surrey in accordance with Strategic Policy in the Core Strategy.

The inclusion of housing widens the mix of town centre uses and contributes to meeting housing needs.

A flood risk assessment has been carried out by consultants Black and Veatch which demonstrates that, in principle, a development could be acceptable in flooding terms. However, any development proposal will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.

There is no known major network capacity issue in the vicinity of the site but one of the nearby sewage pumping stations is close to capacity.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

No objections based on flood risk grounds.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable
Why did the inspector retain the allocation?  
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?  
N/A
Local Authority Wide

Total amount of land allocated for development in the local authority by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>45.42</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>124.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>159.4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land in entire district outside of flood risk zones (ha):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones, and national designations (ha):

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones (ha):

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land inside flood risk zones (ha):

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All Strategic allocations

Total amount of land allocated for strategic development by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>124.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>154.6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land allocated for strategic development within flood zones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Amount of Land</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majority Flood Zone 3/minority Flood Zone 2</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>107.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Flood Zone 3/minority Flood Zone 2</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood Risk</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pluvial Flood Risk | Employment | 16.9 | 1
--- | --- | --- | ---
Pluvial Flood Risk | Mixed use | 31.2 | 3

What proportion of all allocated land in the authority falls within this definition of a strategic allocation?

Amount of land (ha) | Note:
--- | ---

What is the mean allocation size within the authority?

Amount of land (ha) | Note:
--- | ---

Individual Strategic Allocations - Note only allocations in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to be included. This record will be completed for each individual allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>Groves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Pluvial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)

Over-riding housing need (driven by targets).

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?
| No objections on flood risk grounds - * to be checked against Inspectors Report when available. |

| Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections? |
| Not applicable |
| NA |

| Why did the inspector retain the allocation? |
| Not Applicable |

| Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed? |
| N/A |

| Site Reference | Farringdon Row |

| Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable |
| Pluvial |

| Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation? |
| No |

| What reason was given for retaining the allocation? |
| 1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets) |
| Over-riding housing need (driven by targets). |
Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?  
**Yes**

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds? 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory Body</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town/Parish Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No objections on flood risk grounds - * to be checked against Inspectors Report when made available.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections? 

**Not applicable**

NA

Why did the inspector retain the allocation? 

**Not Applicable**

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed? 

**N/A**

**Site Reference**  
Low Street

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable 

**Fluvial**

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation? 

**Yes**
What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

3. Over-riding regeneration need

Over-riding housing need (driven by targets) and over-riding regeneration need - regeneration of Central Sunderland is the main objective of the UDP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No objections on flood risk grounds - * to be checked against Inspectors Report when made available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why did the inspector retain the allocation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site Reference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fluvial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?  
Yes

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?  
2. Over riding employment need (driven by targets)  
Over-riding employment need (driven by targets) and over-riding regeneration need.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?  
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory Body</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town/Parish Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No objections on flood risk grounds - * to be checked against Inspectors Report when made available.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?  
Not applicable  
NA

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?  
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?  
N/A

Site Reference  
Pallion Yard
Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
2. Over riding employment need (driven by targets)

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Select...

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?
EA
Water Company
Drainage Board
ABI
Town/Parish Council

No objections on flood risk grounds - * to be checked against Inspectors Report when made available.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable
NA

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable
**Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?**  
N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Site Reference</strong></th>
<th>Pallion Retail Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</strong></td>
<td>Pluvial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?**  
No

**What reason was given for retaining the allocation?**  
3. Over riding regeneration need  
Mix of uses to meet over-riding employment need and over-riding regeneration need.

**Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?**  
Yes

**Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?**  
- [ ] EA  
- [ ] Water Company  
- [ ] Drainage Board  
- [ ] ABI  
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

No objections on flood risk grounds - * to be checked against Inspectors Report when made available.

**Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?**  
Not applicable  
NA
Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Site Reference: City Centre West

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
3. Over riding regeneration need

Over-riding regeneration need. The regeneration of Central Sunderland is the main objective of the UDP.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?
- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

No objections on flood risk grounds - * to be checked against Inspectors Report when made available.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why did the inspector retain the allocation?</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Reference</td>
<td>Stadium Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Pluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What reason was given for retaining the allocation?</td>
<td>Over-riding regeneration need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No objections on flood risk grounds - * to be checked against Inspectors Report when made available.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable
NA

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A
Local Authority Wide
Total amount of land allocated for development in the local authority by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land in entire district outside of flood risk zones (ha)

Amount of land ‘available’ outside of flood risk zones, and national designations (ha)

Amount of land ‘available’ outside of flood risk zones (ha)

Amount of land inside flood risk zones (ha)

All Strategic allocations
Total amount of land allocated for strategic development by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land allocated for strategic development within flood zones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Amount of Land</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood Risk</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Flood Zone 2</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What proportion of all allocated land in the authority falls within this definition of a strategic allocation?

Amount of land (ha)  

Note:
What is the mean allocation size within the authority?

Amount of land (ha)  

Note:

Individual Strategic Allocations - Note only allocations in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to be included. This record will be completed for each individual allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>A20: Felnex Trading Estate, London Road, Hackbridge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

3. Over riding regeneration need

Three employment sites in the Hackbridge area are identified for mixed use development. Felnex Trading Estate (A20) will retain some 25% of its 7.7ha site area for employment purposes.

This allocation is in accordance with the Core Strategy’s proposals for the growth and regeneration of Hackbridge.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council
No objections on flood risk grounds.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable
NA

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

**Site Reference**
A23: Land adjoining Hackbridge Station, London Road

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
3. Over riding regeneration need

Three employment sites in the Hackbridge area are identified for mixed use development. Hackbridge Station (A23) (1.2ha) will retain some 30% of the sites for employment purposes.

This allocations is in accordance with the Core Strategy's proposals for the growth and regeneration of Hackbridge.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes
Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

No objections on flood risk grounds.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A

**Site Reference**

A28: Kelvin House, London Road, Hackbridge

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

2. Over riding employment need (driven by targets)
The re-use of land and premises within an established industrial areas.

There are also vacant and underused sites and premises immediately adjoining the Hackbridge local centre, notably the former Kelvin House site providing opportunities for growth and regeneration in a prominent location within the local centre.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?  
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town/Parish Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No objections on flood risk grounds.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?  
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?  
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?  
N/A

**Site Reference**  
A32: Wandle Valley Trading Estate, Mill Green Road, Hackbridge

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fluvial and Pluvial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?  
No
What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

3. Over riding regeneration need

Three employment sites in the Hackbridge area are identified for mixed use development.

Wandle Valley Trading Estate (A32) (2.3ha) will retain some 40% of the site for employment purposes.

This allocation is in accordance with the Core Strategy’s proposals for the growth and regeneration of Hackbridge.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- EA
- Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council

No objections on flood risk grounds.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A

Click here to sign this section
### Local Authority Wide

Total amount of land allocated for development in the local authority by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>127.5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>62.57</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land in entire district outside of flood risk zones (ha)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones, and national designations (ha)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones (ha)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Amount of land inside flood risk zones (ha)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### All Strategic allocations

Total amount of land allocated for strategic development by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>37.56</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land allocated for strategic development within flood zones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majority Flood Zone 3/Minority Flood Zone 2</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All in Zone 3</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What proportion of all allocated land in the authority falls within this definition of a strategic allocation?

Amount of land (ha) | Note: |
What is the mean allocation size within the authority?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Note:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Strategic Allocations - Note only allocations in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to be included. This record will be completed for each individual allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>(d) Castledene Transport and Pickfords Removals, Mill Hall, Aylesford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fluvial and Pluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluvial and Pluvial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?  
Yes

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?  
1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)

   This is one of a number of sites allocated land for housing which contributes towards meeting the housing requirement identified.

   The sites allocated for housing and should be developed in accordance with the criteria identified in respect of each site and developed at the highest density compatible with the character and amenity of the surrounding area but not normally at a density of less than 30 dwellings per hectare.

   Specific reasons are not provided for individual sites

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?  
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?  

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town/Parish Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No objections based on flood risk grounds.
Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

NA

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A

Site Reference

(f) Kings Hill - remainder

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

Fluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

Yes

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)

This is one of a number of sites allocated land for housing which contributes towards meeting the housing requirement identified.

The sites allocated for housing and should be developed in accordance with the criteria identified in respect of each site and developed at the highest density compatible with the character and amenity of the surrounding area but not normally at a density of less than 30 dwellings per hectare.

Specific reasons are not provided for individual sites.

This site is regarded as the small part of the Local Plan housing allocation at Kings Hill which does not yet benefit from planning permission.

The Urban Capacity Study provides clear and convincing evidence that these sites are appropriately designated for housing, to ensure that sites are developed at the highest density compatible with the surrounding area. The Inspectors Report notes that they are
satisfied that this design-led approach will achieve the efficient use of land.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

**No**

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

No objections to this allocation on flood risk grounds.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

**Not applicable**

NA

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

**Not Applicable**

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

**N/A**

**Site Reference**

(f) West of Woodgate Way, Tonbridge

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

**Fluvial and Pluvial**

**Fluvial and Pluvial**

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

**Yes**
What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

2. Over riding employment need (driven by targets)

Land at Woodgate Way, Tonbridge is shown as an area to be safeguarded for employment purposes on the Core Strategy (CS) Key Diagram.

The strategy for employment land, set out in the CS is, in summary, to protect the highest quality employment sites, whilst allowing a more flexible approach to development proposals on other sites.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

EA
Water Company
Drainage Board
ABI
Town/Parish Council

No objections to this allocation based on flood risk grounds.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A

Click here to sign this section
Local Authority Wide

Total amount of land allocated for development in the local authority by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>445.52</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of land in entire district outside of flood risk zones (ha)</td>
<td>Amount of Land (ha)</td>
<td>Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones, and national designations (ha)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones (ha)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of land inside flood risk zones (ha)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All Strategic allocations

Total amount of land allocated for strategic development by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>298.5</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land allocated for strategic development within flood zones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Amount of Land</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majority Flood Zone 3/minority Flood Zone 2</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>100.36</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood Risk</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Flood Zone 2 /minority Flood Zone 3</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>162.62</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood Risk</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What proportion of all allocated land in the authority falls within this definition of a strategic...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the mean allocation size within the authority?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of land (ha)</td>
<td>Note:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Strategic Allocations - Note only allocations in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to be included. This record will be completed for each individual allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Reference</td>
<td>Sirdar, Flanshaw Lane, Wakefield Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Pluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What reason was given for retaining the allocation?</td>
<td>Over-riding residential need (driven by targets). The site is previously developed land within the settlement of Wakefield. There is a key policy objective to provide employment and skills development opportunities for local residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town/Parish Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A public examination is currently being held to allow an independent Inspector to assess the soundness of Wakefield's Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document - the Inspectors Report has not been published yet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Site Reference
Castleford Riverside

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Fluvial and Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
Yes

The Exception Test has been carried out for this site.

N9 – Castleford Riverside
a) The development will provide wider sustainability benefits to the community, it will contribute to the objectives of the Core Strategy’s and Sites document’s Sustainability Appraisals.

b) The development is on developable previously–developed land.

c) A flood risk assessment has been carried out that demonstrates that the development will be safe, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and will marginally reduce the risk to adjacent land.

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
3. Over riding regeneration need

Over-riding regeneration need.

Castleford Riverside is a Special Policy Area to promote the regeneration of the north eastern parts of Castleford.

The Special Policy Area incorporates housing development sites and employment sites. The site is located within the Housing Growth Point area, and helps to address the districts housing requirement.
Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

**Yes**

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory Body</th>
<th>Checkmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town/Parish Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A public examination is currently being held to allow an independent Inspector to assess the soundness of Wakefield’s Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document - the Inspector’s Report has not been published yet.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

**Not applicable**

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

**Not Applicable**

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

**N/A**

**Site Reference**

N42 Land North of St Andrew's Road, Fryston

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

**Fluvial and Pluvial**

Fluvial and Pluvial.

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

**No**
What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

3. **Over riding regeneration need**

Over-riding regeneration need.

This site is located within Castleford Riverside, a Special Policy Area to promote the regeneration of the north eastern parts of Castleford.

The Special Policy Area incorporates housing development sites and employment sites. The site is located within the Housing Growth Point area, and helps to address the districts housing requirement.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

**No**

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

A public examination is currently being held to allow an independent Inspector to assess the soundness of Wakefield's Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document - the Inspectors Report has not been published yet.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

**Not applicable**

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

**Not Applicable**

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

**N/A**

**Site Reference**

N101 Castleford Tigers Ground, Wheldon Road

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

- Fluvial and Pluvial
Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?  
Yes

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?  
3. Over riding regeneration need  
Over-riding regeneration need.

This site is located within Castleford Riverside, a Special Policy Area to promote the regeneration of the north eastern parts of Castleford.

The Special Policy Area incorporates housing development sites and employment sites. The site is located within the Housing Growth Point area, and helps to address the districts housing requirement.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?  
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?  

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

A public examination is currently being held to allow an independent Inspector to assess the soundness of Wakefield's Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document - the Inspectors Report has not been published yet.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?  
Not applicable

NA

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?  
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?  
N/A
**Site Reference**

N115 Land at Pemberton Drive

**Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable**

Fluvial and Pluvial

Fluvial and Pluvial.

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

3. Over-riding regeneration need

Over-riding regeneration need.

This site is located within Castleford Riverside, a Special Policy Area to promote the regeneration of the north eastern parts of Castleford.

The Special Policy Area incorporates housing development sites and employment sites. The site is located within the Housing Growth Point area, and helps to address the districts housing requirement.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

Select...

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

A public examination is currently being held to allow an independent Inspector to assess the soundness of Wakefield’s Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document - the Inspectors Report has not been published yet.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

NA

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable
Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A

Site Reference  
N143 Land at Saxon Way

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable  
Fluvial and Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

3. Over riding regeneration need

Over-riding regeneration need.

This site is located within Castleford Riverside, a Special Policy Area to promote the regeneration of the north eastern parts of Castleford.

The Special Policy Area incorporates housing development sites and employment sites. The site is located within the Housing Growth Point area, and helps to address the district’s housing requirement.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

A public examination is currently being held to allow an independent Inspector to assess the soundness of Wakefield's Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document - the Inspectors Report has not been published yet.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

NA
Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A

Site Reference

N151 Former C6 Solutions Centre

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

Fluvial and Pluvial

Fluvial and Pluvial.

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

Yes

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

3. Over-riding regeneration need

Over-riding regeneration need.

This site is located within Castleford Riverside, a Special Policy Area to promote the regeneration of the north eastern parts of Castleford.

The Special Policy Area incorporates housing development sites and employment sites. The site is located within the Housing Growth Point area, and helps to address the districts housing requirement.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

☐ EA
☐ Water Company
☐ Drainage Board
☐ ABI
☐ Town/Parish Council

A public examination is currently being held to allow an independent Inspector to assess the soundness of Wakefield’s Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document - the
Inspectors Report has not been published yet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

| Not Applicable |

| Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed? | N/A |

**Site Reference**  
N152 Former Fryston Colliery (Part)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</th>
<th>Fluvial and Pluvial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fluvial and Pluvial.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

| Yes |

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Over riding regeneration need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over-riding regeneration need.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This site is located within Castleford Riverside, a Special Policy Area to promote the regeneration of the north eastern parts of Castleford.

The Special Policy Area incorporates housing development sites and employment sites. The site is located within the Housing Growth Point area, and helps to address the districts housing requirement.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

| Yes |

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

|                     |
A public examination is currently being held to allow an independent Inspector to assess the soundness of Wakefield’s Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document - the Inspectors Report has not been published yet.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable
NA

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

**Site Reference**

N175 Land at Park Dale, Castleford

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Fluvial and Pluvial.

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
3. Over riding regeneration need

Over-riding regeneration need.

This site is located within Castleford Riverside, a Special Policy Area to promote the
regeneration of the north eastern parts of Castleford.

The Special Policy Area incorporates housing development sites and employment sites. The site is located within the Housing Growth Point area, and helps to address the districts housing requirement.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

A public examination is currently being held to allow an independent Inspector to assess the soundness of Wakefield's Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document - the Inspectors Report has not been published yet.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

NA

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Site Reference
N177 Wheldale Farm, Wheldon Road, Castleford

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Fluvial and Pluvial

Fluvial and Pluvial.

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No
What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

3. Over-riding regeneration need

Over-riding regeneration need.

This site is located within Castleford Riverside, a Special Policy Area to promote the regeneration of the north eastern parts of Castleford.

The Special Policy Area incorporates housing development sites and employment sites. The site is located within the Housing Growth Point area, and helps to address the districts housing requirement.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- EA
- Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council

A public examination is currently being held to allow an independent Inspector to assess the soundness of Wakefield's Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document - the Inspectors Report has not been published yet.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

NA

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A

Site Reference  
N178 Stansfield Road, Castleford

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

Fluvial and Pluvial

Fluvial and Pluvial.
Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
3. Over riding regeneration need
Over-riding regeneration need.

This site is located within Castleford Riverside, a Special Policy Area to promote the regeneration of the north eastern parts of Castleford.

The Special Policy Area incorporates housing development sites and employment sites. The site is located within the Housing Growth Point area, and helps to address the districts housing requirement.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

A public examination is currently being held to allow an independent Inspector to assess the soundness of Wakefield's Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document - the Inspectors Report has not been published yet.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

NA

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was
Developed?  
N/A

**Site Reference**  
N217i Nestle Site, Wheldon Road, Castleford

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable  
**Fluvial and Pluvial**

Fluvial and Pluvial.

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?  
**No**

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?  
**3. Over-riding regeneration need**

Over-riding regeneration need.

This site is located within Castleford Riverside, a Special Policy Area to promote the regeneration of the north eastern parts of Castleford.

The Special Policy Area incorporates housing development sites and employment sites. The site is located within the Housing Growth Point area, and helps to address the districts housing requirement.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?  
**Yes**

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?  

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

A public examination is currently being held to allow an independent Inspector to assess the soundness of Wakefield’s Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document - the Inspectors Report has not been published yet.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?  
**Not applicable**

NA
Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Site Reference

N230i Bus Depot

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Fluvial and Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
3. Over riding regeneration need

Over-riding regeneration need.

This site is located within Castleford Riverside, a Special Policy Area to promote the regeneration of the north eastern parts of Castleford.

The Special Policy Area incorporates housing development sites and employment sites. The site is located within the Housing Growth Point area, and helps to address the districts housing requirement.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

EA
Water Company
Drainage Board
ABI
Town/Parish Council

A public examination is currently being held to allow an independent Inspector to assess the soundness of Wakefield's Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document - the Inspectors Report has not been published yet.
Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable
NA

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Site Reference
North of Pontefract Road, Featherstone

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)
Over-riding housing need (driven by targets).
This is a greenfield urban extension site, the site’s development also forms part of regeneration proposals.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes
Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?
A public examination is currently being held to allow an independent Inspector to assess the soundness of Wakefield's Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document - the Inspectors Report has not been published yet.

**Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?**

Not applicable

**Why did the inspector retain the allocation?**

Not Applicable

**Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?**

N/A

**Site Reference**

Sports Ground, Kirkby Road

**Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable**

Pluvial

**Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?**

No

**What reason was given for retaining the allocation?**

1. Over-riding housing need (driven by targets)

Over-riding housing need (driven by targets).
Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- EA
- Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council

A public examination is currently being held to allow an independent Inspector to assess the soundness of Wakefield's Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document - the Inspectors Report has not been published yet.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Site Reference
Oxiris Chemical Works and adjoining land
Common Lane

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Fluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
Yes

The Exception Test has been carried out for this site.

N160E - Oxiris Chemical Works and adjoining land Common Lane, Knottingley
a) The development will provide wider sustainability benefits to the community, it will contribute to the objectives of the Core Strategy’s and Sites document’s Sustainability Appraisals.

b) The development is on developable previously–developed land.

c) A flood risk assessment has been carried out that demonstrates that the development will be safe, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and will marginally reduce the risk to adjacent land.

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)

Over-riding residential need (driven by targets).

This proposal is greenfield and brownfield development and it is partly within and partly an extension to the urban area.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- EA
- Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council

A public examination is currently being held to allow an independent Inspector to assess the soundness of Wakefield's Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document - the Inspectors Report has not been published yet.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

NA

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A

Site Reference
Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

1. Over-riding housing need (driven by targets)

Over-riding residential need (driven by targets).

Infill site within the existing urban area.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

[ ] EA
[ ] Water Company
[ ] Drainage Board
[ ] ABI
[ ] Town/Parish Council

A public examination is currently being held to allow an independent Inspector to assess the soundness of Wakefield’s Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document - the Inspectors Report has not been published yet.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable
Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A

Site Reference: Brackenhill Ackworth

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

1. Over-riding housing need (driven by targets)

Over-riding residential need (driven by targets).

Previously developed land within the settlement.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

A public examination is currently being held to allow an independent Inspector to assess the soundness of Wakefield’s Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document - the Inspectors Report has not been published yet.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why did the inspector retain the allocation?</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Reference</td>
<td>Land at Ferrybridge Power Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Fluvial and Pluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What reason was given for retaining the allocation?</td>
<td>Over-riding employment need (driven by targets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To protect employment provision and encourage the renewal of the major power station infrastructure investment. The area which is almost entirely existing power station operational land is to become a special Employment Zone - to be restricted to employment development directly associated with power generation and related infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?</td>
<td>EA, Water Company, Drainage Board, ABI, Town/Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A public examination is currently being held to allow an independent Inspector to assess the soundness of Wakefield's Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document - the Inspectors Report has not been published yet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why did the inspector retain the allocation?</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Reference</td>
<td>Silkwood Park, Ossett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Pluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What reason was given for retaining the allocation?</td>
<td>Over-riding employment need (driven by targets).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over-riding employment need (driven by targets). This is an existing employment site with land which can still be developed to the employment land supply. Retention of this site to contribute towards the 'prime' employment land identified in the core strategy. Allocation of the site for employment to safeguard an adequate supply and variety of land, particularly in areas of deprivation, to improve the economic performance of the local area. This site is located in an area where there is a key policy objective to provide employment and skills development opportunities for local residents. Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A public examination is currently being held to allow an independent Inspector to assess the soundness of Wakefield’s Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document - the Inspector’s Report has not been published yet.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A
### ASC Planning Proforma 2 - Plan Making Process

**Report Date:** 28/02/2012  
**Prepared By:** DG  
**Interviewed:** LA: Wakefield  
**E-mail Address:**  
**Telephone:**  
**Department:**  
**Position:** SAE

**Local Authority Wide**

**Total amount of land allocated for development in the local authority by type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>445.52</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land in entire district outside of flood risk zones (ha)</th>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount of land ‘available’ outside of flood risk zones, and national designations (ha)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of land ‘available’ outside of flood risk zones (ha)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of land inside flood risk zones (ha)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**All Strategic allocations**

**Total amount of land allocated for strategic development by type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>298.5</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land allocated for strategic development within flood zones?</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Amount of Land</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majority Flood Zone 3/majority Flood Zone 2</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>100.36</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood Risk</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Flood Zone 2 /minority Flood Zone 3</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>162.62</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood Risk</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What proportion of all allocated land in the authority falls within this definition of a strategic allocation?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**What is the mean allocation size within the authority?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Individual Strategic Allocations - Note only allocations in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to be included. This record will be completed for each individual allocation**

**Site Reference** Sirdar, Flanshaw Lane, Wakefield Lane  
**Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable** Pluvial
Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

1. Over-riding housing need (driven by targets)

Over-riding residential need (driven by targets).

The site is previously developed land within the settlement of Wakefield. There is a key policy objective to provide employment and skills development opportunities for local residents.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- EA
- Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council

A public examination is currently being held to allow an independent Inspector to assess the soundness of Wakefield's Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document - the Inspector's Report has not been published yet.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

NA

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>Castleford Riverside</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Fluvial and Pluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial and Fluvial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Exception Test has been carried out for this site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NB – Castleford Riverside</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) The development will provide wider sustainability benefits to the community, it will contribute to the objectives of the Core Strategy’s and Sites document’s Sustainability Appraisals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) The development is on developable previously-developed land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) A flood risk assessment has been carried out that demonstrates that the development will be safe, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and will marginally reduce the risk to adjacent land.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What reason was given for retaining the allocation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over-riding regeneration need.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Castleford Riverside is a Special Policy Area to promote the regeneration of the north-eastern parts of Castleford.

The Special Policy Area incorporates housing development sites and employment sites. The site is located within the Housing Growth Point area, and helps to address the district’s housing requirement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds? |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| EA |
| Water Company |
| Drainage Board |
| ABI |
| Town/Parish Council |

A public examination is currently being held to allow an independent Inspector to assess the soundness of Wakefield’s Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document - the Inspector’s Report has not been published yet.

| Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections? |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Not applicable |

| Why did the inspector retain the allocation? |
|---------------------------------------------|-----|
| Not Applicable |

| Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed? |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| N/A |


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>N42 Land North of St Andrew's Road, Fryston</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Fluvial and Pluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What reason was given for retaining the allocation?</td>
<td>3. Over riding regeneration need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-riding regeneration need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This site is located within Castleford Riverside, a Special Policy Area to promote the regeneration of the north eastern parts of Castleford.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Special Policy Area incorporates housing development sites and employment sites. The site is located within the Housing Growth Point area, and helps to address the districts housing requirement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?</td>
<td>EA, Water Company, Drainage Board, ABI, Town/Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A public examination is currently being held to allow an independent Inspector to assess the soundness of Wakefield's Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document - the Inspectors Report has not been published yet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site Reference: N01 Castleford Tigers Ground, Wheldon Road

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable:
- Fluvial
- Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
- Yes

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
- Overriding regeneration need

This site is located within Castleford Riverside, a Special Policy Area to promote the regeneration of the north eastern parts of Castleford.

The Special Policy Area incorporates housing development sites and employment sites. The site is located within the Housing Growth Point area, and helps to address the districts housing requirement.

Does the plan/evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
- Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?
- EA Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council

A public examination is currently being held to allow an independent Inspector to assess the soundness of Wakefield’s Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document - the Inspector’s Report has not been published yet.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject] these objections?
- Not applicable

Why did the Inspector retain the allocation?
- Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
- N/A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>N15 Land at Pemberton Drive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Fluvial and Pluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluvial and Pluvial.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What reason was given for retaining the allocation?</td>
<td>Over-riding regeneration need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-riding regeneration need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This site is located within Castleford Riverside, a Special Policy Area to promote the regeneration of the north eastern parts of Castleford.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Special Policy Area incorporates housing development sites and employment sites. The site is located within the Housing Growth Point area, and helps to address the districts housing requirement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td>Select...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?</td>
<td>□ EA  □ Water Company  □ Drainage Board  □ ABI  □ Town/Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A public examination is currently being held to allow an independent Inspector to assess the soundness of Wakefield's Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document - the Inspectors Report has not been published yet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why did the Inspector retain the allocation?</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site Reference
N143 Land at Saxon Way

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Fluvial and Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
Over-riding regeneration need.

This site is located within Castleford Riverside, a Special Policy Area to promote the regeneration of the north eastern parts of Castleford.

The Special Policy Area incorporates housing development sites and employment sites. The site is located within the Housing Growth Point area, and helps to address the districts housing requirement.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- EA
- Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council

A public examination is currently being held to allow an independent Inspector to assess the soundness of Wakefield’s Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document - the Inspectors Report has not been published yet.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

NA

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>N151 Former C6 Solutions Centre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Fluvial and Pluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What reason was given for retaining the allocation?</td>
<td>3. Over riding regeneration need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This site is located within Castleford Riverside, a Special Policy Area to promote the regeneration of the north eastern parts of Castleford.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Special Policy Area incorporates housing development sites and employment sites. The site is located within the Housing Growth Point area, and helps to address the districts housing requirement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?</td>
<td>EA, Water Company, Drainage Board, ABI, Town/Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A public examination is currently being held to allow an independent Inspector to assess the soundness of Wakefield's Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document - the Inspector's Report has not been published yet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why did the Inspector retain the allocation?</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site Reference: N152 Former Fryston Colliery (Part)

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable:
- Fluvial and Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
- Yes

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
- Over-riding regeneration need

This site is located within Castleford Riverside, a Special Policy Area to promote the regeneration of the north eastern parts of Castleford.

The Special Policy Area incorporates housing development sites and employment sites. The site is located within the Housing Growth Point area, and helps to address the district's housing requirement.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
- Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- EA
- Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council

A public examination is currently being held to allow an independent Inspector to assess the soundness of Wakefield's Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document - the Inspector's Report has not been published yet.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
- Not applicable

NA

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
- Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
- N/A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>N175 Land at Park Dale, Castleford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluvial and Pluvial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluvial and Pluvial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What reason was given for retaining the allocation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-riding regeneration need</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This site is located within Castleford Riverside, a Special Policy Area to promote the regeneration of the north eastern parts of Castleford.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Special Policy Area incorporates housing development sites and employment sites. The site is located within the Housing Growth Point area, and helps to address the districts housing requirement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] EA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Water Company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Drainage Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] ABI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Town/Parish Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A public examination is currently being held to allow an independent Inspector to assess the soundness of Wakefield’s Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document - the Inspectors Report has not been published yet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why did the inspector retain the allocation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site Reference: N177 Wheldale Farm, Wheldon Road, Castleford

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable:
- Fluvial
- Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
3 Over riding regeneration need

Over-riding regeneration need.

This site is located within Castleford Riverside, a Special Policy Area to promote the regeneration of the north eastern parts of Castleford.

The Special Policy Area incorporates housing development sites and employment sites. The site is located within the Housing Growth Point area, and helps to address the districts housing requirement.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

A public examination is currently being held to allow an independent Inspector to assess the soundness of Wakefield's Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document - the Inspector's Report has not been published yet.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable
NA

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A
Site Reference

N178 Stansfield Road, Castleford

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Fluvial and Pluvial

Fluvial and Pluvial.

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
3. Over riding regeneration need

Over-riding regeneration need.

This site is located within Castleford Riverside, a Special Policy Area to promote the regeneration of the north eastern parts of Castleford.

The Special Policy Area incorporates housing development sites and employment sites. The site is located within the Housing Growth Point area, and helps to address the district’s housing requirement.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- EA
- Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council

A public examination is currently being held to allow an independent Inspector to assess the soundness of Wakefield's Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document - the Inspector’s Report has not been published yet.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable
NA

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>N2171 Nestle Site, Wheldon Road, Castleford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</th>
<th>Fluvial and Pluvial, Fluvial and Pluvial.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What reason was given for retaining the allocation?</th>
<th>Over-riding regeneration need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

This site is located within Castleford Riverside, a Special Policy Area to promote the regeneration of the north eastern parts of Castleford.

The Special Policy Area incorporates housing development sites and employment sites. The site is located within the Housing Growth Point area, and helps to address the district's housing requirement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A public examination is currently being held to allow an independent Inspector to assess the soundness of Wakefield's Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document - the Inspector's Report has not been published yet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why did the inspector retain the allocation?</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Reference</td>
<td>N230i Bus Depot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Fluvial and Pluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluvial and Pluvial.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What reason was given for retaining the allocation?</td>
<td>Over riding regeneration need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-riding regeneration need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This site is located within Castleford Riverside, a Special Policy Area to promote the regeneration of the north eastern parts of Castleford.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Special Policy Area incorporates housing development sites and employment sites. The site is located within the Housing Growth Point area, and helps to address the district’s housing requirement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?</td>
<td>EA Water Company Drainage Board ABI Town/Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A public examination is currently being held to allow an independent Inspector to assess the soundness of Wakefield’s Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document - the Inspector’s Report has not been published yet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why did the inspector retain the allocation?</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Reference</strong></td>
<td>North of Pontefract Road, Featherstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</strong></td>
<td>Pluvial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?** | No |

| **What reason was given for retaining the allocation?** | Over-riding housing need (driven by targets) |

| **This is a greenfield urban extension site, the site's development also forms part of regeneration proposals.** |

| **Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?** | Yes |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Water Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Drainage Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ABI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Town/Parish Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **A public examination is currently being held to allow an independent Inspector to assess the soundness of Wakefield's Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document - the Inspector's Report has not been published yet.** |

| **Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?** | Not applicable |

| **Not Applicable** |

| **Why did the inspector retain the allocation?** | Not Applicable |

<p>| <strong>Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</strong> | N/A |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>Sports Ground, Kirkby Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Pluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What reason was given for retaining the allocation?</td>
<td>Over-riding housing need (driven by targets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?</td>
<td>EA, Water Company, Drainage Board, ABI, Town/Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A public examination is currently being held to allow an independent Inspector to assess the soundness of Wakefield's Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document - the Inspectors Report has not been published yet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why did the inspector retain the allocation?</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site Reference: Oxiris Chemical Works and adjoining Common Lane

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable: Fluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation? Yes

The Exception Test has been carried out for this site.

N160E - Oxiris Chemical Works and adjoining land Common Lane, Knottingley

a) The development will provide wider sustainability benefits to the community, it will contribute to the objectives of the Core Strategy’s and Sites document’s Sustainability Appraisals.

b) The development is on developable previously-developed land.

c) A flood risk assessment has been carried out that demonstrates that the development will be safe, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and will marginally reduce the risk to adjacent land.

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

1. Overriding housing need (driven by targets)

Over-riding residential need (driven by targets).

This proposal is greenfield and brownfield development and it is partly within and partly an extension to the urban area.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed? Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- EA
- Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council

A public examination is currently being held to allow an independent Inspector to assess the soundness of Wakefield’s Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document – the Inspectors’ Report has not been published yet.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections? Not applicable

NA

Why did the inspector retain the allocation? Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed? N/A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>Victoria Way, Outwood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable**
Pluvial

**Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?**
No

**What reason was given for retaining the allocation?**
1. Over-riding housing need (driven by targets)
   Over-riding residential need (driven by targets).
   Infill site within the existing urban area.

**Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?**
Yes

**Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?**
- EA
- Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council

A public examination is currently being held to allow an independent Inspector to assess the soundness of Wakefield’s Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document - the Inspectors Report has not been published yet.

**Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?**
Not applicable

**Why did the inspector retain the allocation?**
Not Applicable

**Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?**
N/A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>Brackenhill Ackworth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Pluvial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?  
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?  
1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)  
Over-riding residential need (driven by targets).  
Previously developed land within the settlement.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?  
Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?  
- EA  
- Water Company  
- Drainage Board  
- ABI  
- Town/Parish Council

A public examination is currently being held to allow an independent Inspector to assess the soundness of Wakefield's Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document - the Inspector's Report has not been published yet.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?  
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?  
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?  
N/A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>Land at Ferrybridge Power Station</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Fluvial and Pluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What reason was given for retaining the allocation?</td>
<td>Over riding employment need (driven by targets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To protect employment provision and encourage the renewal of the major power station infrastructure investment. The area which is almost entirely existing power station operational land is to become a special Employment Zone - to be restricted to employment development directly associated with power generation and related infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town/Parish Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A public examination is currently being held to allow an independent Inspector to assess the soundness of Wakefield’s Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document - the Inspector’s Report has not been published yet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why did the inspector retain the allocation?</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Reference</td>
<td>Silkwood Park, Ossett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Pluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason given for retaining the allocation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Over-riding employment need (driven by targets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-riding employment need (driven by targets).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

  This is an existing employment site with land which can still be developed to the employment land supply. Retention of this site to contribute towards the ‘prime’ employment land identified in the core strategy.

  Allocation of the site for employment to safeguard an adequate supply and variety of land, particularly in areas of deprivation, to improve the economic performance of the local area.

  This site is located in an area where there is a key policy objective to provide employment and skills development opportunities for local residents.

  Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?  
  Yes

  Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

  - EA
  - Water Company
  - Drainage Board
  - ABI
  - Town/Parish Council

  A public examination is currently being held to allow an independent Inspector to assess the soundness of Wakefield’s Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document - the Inspectors Report has not been published yet.

  Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
  Not applicable

  Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
  Not Applicable

  Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
  N/A

[Click here to sign this section]
## ASC Planning Proforma 2 - Plan Making Process

**Report Date:** 28/02/2012  
**Prepared By:** DG  
**Interviewed:** LA: Wandsworth London Boro  
**E-mail Address:** Department:  
**Telephone:** Position: SAE

### Local Authority Wide
Total amount of land allocated for development in the local authority by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing</strong></td>
<td>149</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment</strong></td>
<td>23.91</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed Use</strong></td>
<td>124.45</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land in entire district outside of flood risk zones (ha)  

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones, and national designations (ha)  

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones (ha)  

Amount of land inside flood risk zones (ha)  

### All Strategic allocations
Total amount of land allocated for strategic development by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed use</strong></td>
<td>44.42</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land allocated for strategic development within flood zones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone, Use</th>
<th>Amount of Land</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majority Flood Zone 3/minority Mixed use</td>
<td>11.13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What proportion of all allocated land in the authority falls within this definition of a strategic allocation?

Amount of land (ha)  

Note:
What is the mean allocation size within the authority?

Amount of land (ha)  

Note:

Individual Strategic Allocations - Note only allocations in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to be included. This record will be completed for each individual allocation

**Site Reference**: 2.1.16 Main Site, Ballymore, Ponton Road, SW8

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

**Fluvial and Pluvial**

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

**No**

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

3. Overriding regeneration need

Justification given within the Site Allocations DPD:

The site lies within an Opportunity Area which has been identified for mixed use development within the London Plan and the Core Strategy. Development for a mix of uses will contribute to the targets set out in the Core Strategy for employment and housing. The scale of growth and change achievable in the Nine Elms area is also dependent on the proportionate provision of physical and social infrastructure.

With regards to Flood Risk the Site Allocation DPD states:

The site is located within Flood Zone 3a. Refer to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) for specific details. A Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment should utilise SFRA breach model results to confirm residual risks. Proposed mitigation measures are likely to include the provision of a safe access and egress route onto Nine Elms Lane. A flood warning and evacuation plan will be required.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

**Yes**

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council
No objections on flood risk grounds.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable
NA

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

**Site Reference**

2.1.18 Royal Mail Group Site, Ponton Road, SW8

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Fluvial

Fluvial and tidal.

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
Yes

Site located in Flood Zone 3a

Site specific FRA likely to utilise SFRA breach model results to confirm residual risks. Proposed mitigation measures likely to include locating all residential development at first floor level and above i.e. above peak tidal flood levels. Provision of safe access & egress route onto Nine Elms Lane will be challenging therefore internal refuge areas should be provided. Flood warning and appropriate refuge/evacuation plan required.

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
3. Over riding regeneration need
The justification given in the Site Allocations DPD is:

The site lies within an Opportunity Area which has been identified for mixed use development within the London Plan and the Core Strategy. Development for a mix of uses will contribute to the targets set out in the Core Strategy for employment and housing. The scale of growth and change achievable in the Nine Elms area is also dependent on the proportionate provision of physical and social infrastructure.

With regards to Flood Risk the Site Allocations DPD states:

The site is located within Flood Zone 3a. Refer to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) for specific details. A Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment should utilise SFRA breach model results to confirm residual risks. Proposed mitigation measures are likely to include the provision of a safe access and egress route onto Nine Elms Lane. A flood warning and appropriate refuge/evacuation plan will be required.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

Yes

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

☐ EA
☐ Water Company
☐ Drainage Board
☐ ABI
☐ Town/Parish Council

No objections on flood risk grounds.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

NA

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A
### Local Authority Wide

Total amount of land allocated for development in the local authority by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>106.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land in entire district outside of flood risk zones (ha) | Amount of Land (ha) | Note

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones, and national designations (ha)

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones (ha)

Amount of land inside flood risk zones (ha)

### All Strategic allocations

Total amount of land allocated for strategic development by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>89.57</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land allocated for strategic development within flood zones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Amount of Land</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood Risk</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What proportion of all allocated land in the authority falls within this definition of a strategic allocation?

Amount of land (ha) | Note:

What is the mean allocation size within the authority?
### Individual Strategic Allocations - Note only allocations in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to be included. This record will be completed for each individual allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>Land at Omega North</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Pluvial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?  
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?  
2. Over riding employment need (driven by targets)  
Site identified to deliver employment land during the UDP Plan period.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?  
No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?  

- [ ] EA  
- [ ] Water Company  
- [ ] Drainage Board  
- [ ] ABI  
- [ ] Town/Parish Council  

No objections on flood risk grounds.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject] these objections?  
Not applicable
Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A
Local Authority Wide

Total amount of land allocated for development in the local authority by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>21.85</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>43.38</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land in entire district outside of flood risk zones (ha)

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones, and national designations (ha)

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones (ha)

Amount of land inside flood risk zones (ha)

All Strategic allocations

Total amount of land allocated for strategic development by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__Select…</td>
<td>40.06</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land allocated for strategic development within flood zones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Amount of Land</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>__Select…</td>
<td>__Select…</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What proportion of all allocated land in the authority falls within this definition of a strategic allocation?

Amount of land (ha)  

Note:
What is the mean allocation size within the authority?

Amount of land (ha)  

Note:

Individual Strategic Allocations - Note only allocations in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to be included. This record will be completed for each individual allocation.

Click here to sign this section
Local Authority Wide

Total amount of land allocated for development in the local authority by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>77.82</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land in entire district outside of flood risk zones (ha)

| Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones, and national designations (ha) |

Amount of land 'available' outside of flood risk zones (ha)

| Amount of land inside flood risk zones (ha) |

All Strategic allocations

Total amount of land allocated for strategic development by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Development</th>
<th>Amount of Land (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of land allocated for strategic development within flood zones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Amount of Land</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All in Zone 3</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All in Zone 2</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood Risk</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood Risk</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What proportion of all allocated land in the authority falls within this definition of a strategic allocation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Note:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 out of 21 strategic allocations are in areas at risk of flooding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is the mean allocation size within the authority?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of land (ha)</th>
<th>Note:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Strategic Allocations - Note only allocations in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to be included. This record will be completed for each individual allocation

- **Site Reference**: H1.12 Hungate
- **Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable**: Fluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

- **No**

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

1. **Over riding housing need (driven by targets)**

The Site is allocated for development in the Local Plan as part of policy H1 where a larger number of sites are allocated for residential development. Reasons for the allocation of individual sites are not provided in the Plan.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

- **No**

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council
As a result of changes to the planning system that require local authorities to produce a new type of city-side plan (the Local Development Framework), the public inquiry on York’s Local Plan was not be reconvened.

As such the Local Plan for the area is that of the City of York Local Plan Incorporating the 4th Set Of Changes – Development Control Local Plan and therefore there is not an Inspector’s Report available to review. Information is not available on objections raised by stakeholders to the Plan.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Site Reference
H1.24 Germany Beck Fulford

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)

The Site is allocated for development in the Local Plan as part of policy H1 where a larger number of sites are allocated for residential development. Reasons for the allocation of individual sites are not provided in the Plan.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

As a result of changes to the planning system that require local authorities to produce a new type of city-side plan (the Local Development Framework), the public inquiry on York’s Local Plan was not be reconvened. As such the Local Plan for the area is that of the City of York Local Plan Incorporating the 4th Set Of Changes – Development Control Local Plan and therefore there is not an Inspector’s Report available to review. Information is not available on objections raised by stakeholders to the Plan.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A

Site Reference

H1.35 Heworth Green

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable

Fluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)
The Site is allocated for development in the Local Plan as part of policy H1 where a larger number of sites are allocated for residential development. Reasons for the allocation of individual sites are not provided in the Plan.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

As a result of changes to the planning system that require local authorities to produce a new type of city-side plan (the Local Development Framework), the public inquiry on York’s Local Plan was not reconvened. As such the Local Plan for the area is that of the City of York Local Plan Incorporating the 4th Set Of Changes – Development Control Local Plan and therefore there is not an Inspector’s Report available to review. Information is not available on objections raised by stakeholders to the Plan.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Site Reference  
H1.36 Hospital Fields Road

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No
What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

1. **Over riding housing need (driven by targets)**

The Site is allocated for development in the Local Plan as part of policy H1 where a larger number of sites are allocated for residential development. Reasons for the allocation of individual sites are not provided in the Plan.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

Select...

**Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?**

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

As a result of changes to the planning system that require local authorities to produce a new type of city-side plan (the Local Development Framework), the public inquiry on York's Local Plan was not be reconvened. As such the Local Plan for the area is that of the City of York Local Plan Incorporating the 4th Set Of Changes – Development Control Local Plan and therefore there is not an Inspector's Report available to review. Information is not available on objections raised by stakeholders to the Plan.

**Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?**

Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

**Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?**

N/A

**Site Reference**

H1.37 MOD Land, Fulford

**Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable**

Pluvial
Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?

No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)

The Site is allocated for development in the Local Plan as part of policy H1 where a larger number of sites are allocated for residential development. Reasons for the allocation of individual sites are not provided in the Plan.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

Select...

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- EA
- Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council

As a result of changes to the planning system that require local authorities to produce a new type of city-side plan (the Local Development Framework), the public inquiry on York's Local Plan was not be reconvened. As such the Local Plan for the area is that of the City of York Local Plan Incorporating the 4th Set Of Changes – Development Control Local Plan and therefore there is not an Inspector's Report available to review. Information is not available on objections raised by stakeholders to the Plan.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Site Reference</strong></th>
<th>H1.39 Former Bus Depot, Navigation Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</strong></td>
<td>Fluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What reason was given for retaining the allocation?</strong></td>
<td>1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Site is allocated for development in the Local Plan as part of policy H1 where a larger number of sites are allocated for residential development. Reasons for the allocation of individual sites are not provided in the Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drainage Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ABI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town/Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of changes to the planning system that require local authorities to produce a new type of city-side plan (the Local Development Framework), the public inquiry on York's Local Plan was not reconvened. As such the Local Plan for the area is that of the City of York Local Plan Incorporating the 4th Set Of Changes – Development Control Local Plan and therefore there is not an Inspector's Report available to review. Information is not available on objections raised by stakeholders to the Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?</strong></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Why did the inspector retain the allocation?</strong></td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
N/A

Site Reference
H1.43 Tenneco

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
Fluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?
1. Over riding housing need (driven by targets)

The Site is allocated for development in the Local Plan as part of policy H1 where a larger number of sites are allocated for residential development. Reasons for the allocation of individual sites are not provided in the Plan.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council

As a result of changes to the planning system that require local authorities to produce a new type of city-side plan (the Local Development Framework), the public inquiry on York’s Local Plan was not be reconvened. As such the Local Plan for the area is that of the City of York Local Plan Incorporating the 4th Set Of Changes – Development Control Local Plan and therefore there is not an Inspector's Report available to review. Information is not available on objections raised by stakeholders to the Plan.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?
Not applicable
Why did the inspector retain the allocation?
- Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
- N/A

**Site Reference**
- E3a.1 York Business Park

Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable
- Pluvial

Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?
- No

What reason was given for retaining the allocation?

2. Over riding employment need (driven by targets)

The Site is allocated for development in the Local Plan as part of policy E3 Standard Employment Allocations where a larger number of sites are allocated for employment. Reasons for the allocation of individual sites are not provided in the Plan.

Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?
- No

Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- [ ] EA
- [ ] Water Company
- [ ] Drainage Board
- [ ] ABI
- [ ] Town/Parish Council
As a result of changes to the planning system that require local authorities to produce a new type of city-side plan (the Local Development Framework), the public inquiry on York’s Local Plan was not reconvened. As such the Local Plan for the area is that of the City of York Local Plan Incorporating the 4th Set Of Changes – Development Control Local Plan and therefore there is not an Inspector’s Report available to review. Information is not available on objections raised by stakeholders to the Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why did the inspector retain the allocation?</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Reference</td>
<td>E3a.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of flood risk to which the allocation is vulnerable</td>
<td>Pluvial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the Exception test used to justify the allocation?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What reason was given for retaining the allocation?</td>
<td>2. Over riding employment need (driven by targets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Site is allocated for development in the Local Plan as part of policy E3 Standard Employment Allocations where a larger number of sites are allocated for employment. Reasons for the allocation of individual sites are not provided in the Plan.</td>
<td>Does the plan / evidence state that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Did any statutory bodies object to the allocation on flood risk grounds?

- EA
- Water Company
- Drainage Board
- ABI
- Town/Parish Council

As a result of changes to the planning system that require local authorities to produce a new type of city-side plan (the Local Development Framework), the public inquiry on York's Local Plan was not reconvened. As such the Local Plan for the area is that of the City of York Local Plan Incorporating the 4th Set Of Changes – Development Control Local Plan and therefore there is not an Inspector's Report available to review. Information is not available on objections raised by stakeholders to the Plan.

Did the Inspector consider [accept/reject?] these objections?

Not applicable

Why did the inspector retain the allocation?

Not Applicable

Did the Inspector consider that flood risk could be managed when the allocation was developed?

N/A
Appendix D

Task 3: Multi Criteria Analysis
Framework Worksheets
### Typologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More / less area at flood risk</th>
<th>More/less dense population</th>
<th>More/Less deprived</th>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>Abr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More area at flood risk</td>
<td>More dense</td>
<td>More deprived</td>
<td>More Flood Risk, More Dense, More Deprived</td>
<td>MMM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less deprived</td>
<td>More Flood Risk, More Dense, Less Deprived</td>
<td>MML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less dense</td>
<td>More deprived</td>
<td>More Flood Risk, Less Dense, More Deprived</td>
<td>MLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less deprived</td>
<td>More Flood Risk, Less Dense, Less Deprived</td>
<td>MLL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less area at flood risk</td>
<td>More dense</td>
<td>More deprived</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk, More Dense, More Deprived</td>
<td>LMM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less deprived</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk, More Dense, Less Deprived</td>
<td>LML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less dense</td>
<td>More deprived</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk, Less Dense, More Deprived</td>
<td>LLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less deprived</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk, Less Dense, Less Deprived</td>
<td>LLL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Typology datasets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More / less area at flood risk</td>
<td>OS British Coastline, % of land at flood risk</td>
<td>include coastal, tidal and fluvial flood risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More/less dense population</td>
<td>Urban Area Boundaries</td>
<td>Can calculate % of LA land (not population) that is 'urbanised', we need to define % over which a LA is urban / rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less/More deprived</td>
<td>Indices of multiple deprivation</td>
<td>Index includes income; employment; health and disability; education, skills and training; barriers to housing and services; living environment; crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMM 1</td>
<td>Barking and Dagenham London Boro</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMM 2</td>
<td>Wakefield District (B)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMM 3</td>
<td>Havant District (B)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMM 4</td>
<td>Slough (B)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMM 5</td>
<td>Redbridge London Boro</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table includes various data points related to the development of developments in flood zones, employment, housing, and population density. The objectives judged to be most valuable to the local authority (LA) are also mentioned.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LA Name</th>
<th>Total area in LA at level 2 flood risk (sqm)</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Core Strategy and Typology classification using Median (if greater, &quot;Less deprived&quot;; if smaller/equal to, &quot;More deprived&quot;)</th>
<th>Resultant Typology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barking and Dagenham London Boro</td>
<td>37778900</td>
<td>10978100</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>More Yes</td>
<td>More Flood Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrow-in-Furness District (B)</td>
<td>13206391</td>
<td>30752500</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>More Yes</td>
<td>More Flood Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basildon District</td>
<td>11044543</td>
<td>11984600</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>More Yes</td>
<td>More Flood Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath and North East Somerset</td>
<td>35112290</td>
<td>22668400</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Less Less Flood Risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolsover District</td>
<td>10938491</td>
<td>4836240</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Less Less Flood Risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromley London Boro</td>
<td>15014514</td>
<td>9333140</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Less Less Flood Risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bury District (B)</td>
<td>9948382</td>
<td>5998830</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Less Less Flood Risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlisle District (B)</td>
<td>10556007</td>
<td>11697400</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>More Yes</td>
<td>More Flood Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Bedfordshire</td>
<td>71566454</td>
<td>49055240</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Less Less Flood Risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelmsford District</td>
<td>34299759</td>
<td>27697600</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Less Yes</td>
<td>More Flood Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire West and Chester</td>
<td>2 Housing</td>
<td>34343772</td>
<td>14840100</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>More Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Bristol (B)</td>
<td>34343772</td>
<td>14840100</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>More Yes</td>
<td>More Flood Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Peterborough (B)</td>
<td>34343772</td>
<td>14840100</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>More Yes</td>
<td>More Flood Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Plymouth (B)</td>
<td>84242475</td>
<td>3898740</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Less Yes</td>
<td>More Flood Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Herefordshire</td>
<td>21797327</td>
<td>21672800</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>More More Flood Risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derbyshire Dales District</td>
<td>79535585</td>
<td>42646000</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Less Less Flood Risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Devon District</td>
<td>82373254</td>
<td>73124100</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>Less Yes</td>
<td>More Flood Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Hertfordshire District</td>
<td>47568704</td>
<td>33980300</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Less Less Flood Risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmbridge District (B)</td>
<td>96342734</td>
<td>23475600</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>More More Flood Risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erewash District (B)</td>
<td>10962809</td>
<td>24141200</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>More More Flood Risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeter District (B)</td>
<td>47877855</td>
<td>9419010</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>More Yes</td>
<td>More Flood Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Riding of Yorkshire</td>
<td>30665947</td>
<td>24093300</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Less Yes</td>
<td>More Flood Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fradley (B)</td>
<td>1608400</td>
<td>928500</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Less Less Flood Risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frimley (B)</td>
<td>2888000</td>
<td>1587500</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Less Less Flood Risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLLUDS</td>
<td>Exemplar Typology 2 2 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Manchester</td>
<td>3 Employment</td>
<td>3 3 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds City Region</td>
<td>2 Employment</td>
<td>2 2 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
<td>3 Employment</td>
<td>3 3 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luton</td>
<td>3 Employment</td>
<td>3 3 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>3 Employment</td>
<td>3 3 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medway (B)</td>
<td>2 Employment</td>
<td>2 2 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Core Strategy with Housing Allocation DPDs</td>
<td>More Flood Risk</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>More Dense</td>
<td>Less Dense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenland District</td>
<td>83% More Yes</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>More Dense</td>
<td>Less Dense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrow London Boro</td>
<td>15% More Yes</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>More Dense</td>
<td>Less Dense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hart District</td>
<td>7% Less</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>More Dense</td>
<td>Less Dense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havering London Boro</td>
<td>15% More Yes</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>More Dense</td>
<td>Less Dense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Peak District</td>
<td>3% Less</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>More Dense</td>
<td>Less Dense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds District (B)</td>
<td>8% Less</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>More Dense</td>
<td>Less Dense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool District (B)</td>
<td>3% Less</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>More Dense</td>
<td>Less Dense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medway (B)</td>
<td>9% Less</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>More Dense</td>
<td>Less Dense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merton London Boro</td>
<td>9% Less</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>More Dense</td>
<td>Less Dense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Sussex District</td>
<td>3% Less</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>More Dense</td>
<td>Less Dense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mole Valley District</td>
<td>6% Less</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>More Dense</td>
<td>Less Dense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East Derbyshire District</td>
<td>3% Less</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>More Dense</td>
<td>Less Dense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East Lincolnshire (B)</td>
<td>24% More Yes</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>More Dense</td>
<td>Less Dense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton District (B)</td>
<td>16% More</td>
<td>More Flood Risk</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>More Dense</td>
<td>Less Dense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich District (B)</td>
<td>16% More</td>
<td>More Flood Risk</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>More Dense</td>
<td>Less Dense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oadby and Wigston District (B)</td>
<td>6% Less</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>More Dense</td>
<td>Less Dense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poole (B)</td>
<td>6% Less</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>More Dense</td>
<td>Less Dense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redditch District (B)</td>
<td>8% Less</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>More Dense</td>
<td>Less Dense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reigate and Banstead District (B)</td>
<td>9% Less</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>More Dense</td>
<td>Less Dense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmondshire District</td>
<td>5% Less</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>More Dense</td>
<td>Less Dense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochford District</td>
<td>31% More Yes</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>More Dense</td>
<td>Less Dense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runnymede District (B)</td>
<td>3% Less</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>More Dense</td>
<td>Less Dense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutland</td>
<td>3% Less</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
<td>More Dense</td>
<td>Less Dense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopted Site</td>
<td>Ryedale District</td>
<td>1506593921</td>
<td>121613000</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk, Less Deprived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sedgemoor District</td>
<td>606177210</td>
<td>285158000</td>
<td>More</td>
<td>More Flood Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sefton District (B)</td>
<td>204774963</td>
<td>717674000</td>
<td>More</td>
<td>More Flood Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shepway District</td>
<td>365246272</td>
<td>182641000</td>
<td>More</td>
<td>More Flood Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slough (B)</td>
<td>32536353</td>
<td>6854770</td>
<td>More</td>
<td>More Flood Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solihull District (B)</td>
<td>178289805</td>
<td>11599200</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Cambridgeshire District</td>
<td>901687483</td>
<td>107906000</td>
<td>More</td>
<td>More Flood Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Holland District</td>
<td>821045017</td>
<td>622949000</td>
<td>More</td>
<td>More Flood Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Staffordshire District</td>
<td>407315264</td>
<td>21261400</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spelthorne District (B)</td>
<td>51156542</td>
<td>22653400</td>
<td>More</td>
<td>More Flood Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surrey Heath District (B)</td>
<td>95093321</td>
<td>9482670</td>
<td>More</td>
<td>More Flood Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Swindon (B)</td>
<td>119454549</td>
<td>2468940</td>
<td>More</td>
<td>More Flood Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Torridge District</td>
<td>995912037</td>
<td>45087700</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>More Flood Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells District (B)</td>
<td>331328483</td>
<td>26213000</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uttlesford District</td>
<td>641182874</td>
<td>21247900</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walsall District (B)</td>
<td>407315264</td>
<td>21261400</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waveney District</td>
<td>1164707437</td>
<td>49472800</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waverley District (B)</td>
<td>331328483</td>
<td>26213000</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wellingborough District (B)</td>
<td>163039191</td>
<td>19054900</td>
<td>More</td>
<td>More Flood Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Devon District</td>
<td>1164707437</td>
<td>49472800</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Oxfordshire District</td>
<td>407315264</td>
<td>21261400</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winchester District (B)</td>
<td>661071109</td>
<td>24938000</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Less Flood Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worthing District (B)</td>
<td>34965773</td>
<td>4122460</td>
<td>More</td>
<td>More Flood Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>York (B)</td>
<td>272014174</td>
<td>50183800</td>
<td>More</td>
<td>More Flood Risk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Summary of Core Strategy Policies**

**Key Information**
- More Flood Risk, More Dense, More Deprived
- Barking and Dagenham London Borough

**LA Name:**

**No of allocations in floodplain:**

**Managing Growth (CM)**
- Sustainable Resources and the Environment (CR)
- Creating a Sense of Community (CC)
- Ensuring a Vibrant Economy and Attractive Town Centres (CE)
- Creating a Sense of Place (CP)

**Core Strategy, Policy CR4: Flood Management**
- All development proposals put forward on land that is at risk of flooding will comply with the proposals and will not aggravate the flood risk.

**Climate Change objectives and understanding of mitigation and adaptation within core strategy and SAs**
- None other than flooding
- Policy CR1 'Climate Change and environmental management', Policy CR4 'Flood Management'

**Multi Criteria Analysis Framework**
- Inferred weighting of Sustainability Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred option:</th>
<th>To be considered acceptable, the location of new development should comply with the following five principles -</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option A:</td>
<td>This option protects the green belt and encourages the majority of development to take place on the key regeneration sites. Principles 1-5 and 7 would be the same as in the preferred policy option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option B:</td>
<td>This option guides residential development to key regeneration sites and areas with high PTAL levels. However, it rules out further housing development in residential areas. Principles 1 and 7 would be the same as in the preferred policy option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option C:</td>
<td>This option guides new residential development to key regeneration sites, areas with high PTAL levels and existing residential areas but rules out housing development in the green belt. Principles 1 and 7 would be the same as in the preferred policy option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option D:</td>
<td>This option is similar to the Preferred Policy Option in that it protects the green belt and guides residential development to key regeneration sites and areas with high PTAL levels. However, it rules out further housing development in existing residential areas. Principles 1 and 7 would be the same as in the preferred policy option.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SuSDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred option:</th>
<th>To be considered acceptable, the location of new development should comply with the following five principles -</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option A:</td>
<td>This option protects the green belt and encourages the majority of development to take place on the key regeneration sites. Principles 1-5 and 7 would be the same as in the preferred policy option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option B:</td>
<td>This option guides residential development to key regeneration sites and areas with high PTAL levels. However, it rules out further housing development in residential areas. Principles 1 and 7 would be the same as in the preferred policy option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option C:</td>
<td>This option guides new residential development to key regeneration sites, areas with high PTAL levels and existing residential areas but rules out housing development in the green belt. Principles 1 and 7 would be the same as in the preferred policy option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option D:</td>
<td>This option is similar to the Preferred Policy Option in that it protects the green belt and guides residential development to key regeneration sites and areas with high PTAL levels. However, it rules out further housing development in existing residential areas. Principles 1 and 7 would be the same as in the preferred policy option.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observations**

From looking at the transfer of objectives from the LA’s sustainability appraisal into the policy of the core strategy, the following sustainability objectives appear to have been given the most value:

- Improving Housing Choice
- Enhancing community participation and civic pride
- Protecting and improving cultural Assets
- Mitigation of climate change
- Mitigate against/adapt for the impacts of flooding

**Notes**

* B&D split their analysis for A-E by geography (Regeneration sites, Green Belt, Stations and shopping centres, Existing residential areas) Above is an 'average' of those scores

**Preferred option, decision notes**

**SO 11: Emission of substances contributing to climate change**

Taking account of the risk of flooding, SUDS will reduce storm water run off. This mitigation measure will help reduce the risk of flooding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MCA Objective</th>
<th>LA Value</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Improving Health</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Improving Housing Choice</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Improving access to services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Enhancing community participation and civic pride</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Protecting and improving natural Assets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No obvious importance given (no clear link with CS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Protecting and improving cultural Assets</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Some importance (inferred/minor reference through CS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Re-using sequentially preferable land (PDL/ Urban Area)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Important (clearly appears in CS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Minimise loss of productive agricultural land</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Very important (clearly appears and further heavy emphasis given throughout CS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Mitigation of climate change</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Adaptation to the effects of climate change (excluding flooding)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Mitigate against/adapt for the impacts of flooding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Improving amount and range of employment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Improving resident skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Encouraging growth and economic prosperity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy used for SA:

**Reference document:**

- **MCA Objective**
  - S
  - L

**Notes**

- **A Improving Health**
  - SO 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MCA Objective</th>
<th>LA Value</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B Improving Housing Choice</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Improving access to services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Enhancing community participation and civic pride</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Protecting and improving natural Assets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No obvious importance given (no clear link with CS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Protecting and improving cultural Assets</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Some importance (inferred/minor reference through CS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Re-using sequentially preferable land (PDL/ Urban Area)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Important (clearly appears in CS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Minimise loss of productive agricultural land</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Very important (clearly appears and further heavy emphasis given throughout CS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Mitigation of climate change</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Adaptation to the effects of climate change (excluding flooding)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Mitigate against/adapt for the impacts of flooding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Improving amount and range of employment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Improving resident skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Encouraging growth and economic prosperity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Information Summary**

- **LA Name:**
- **No of allocations in floodplain:**

**Objective of the framework:**

- **Creating Mixed and Balanced Communities**
  - **Supporting Dynamic and Efficient Local Economy**
  - **Valuing and Protecting the Environment**

**Summary of all Core Strategy Policies**

- **More Flood Risk, More Dense, More Deprived**
  - Wakefield 13

**Policy used for SA:**

- **Multi Criteria Analysis Framework:**
  - Sustainability Assessment of alternative options

**Preferred Option:**

- **Policy Statement 1:**
  - "The District Plan should identify areas where new development could be located, and which are consistent with national planning policy and the spatial strategy for the Wakefield District. There will be no new development in areas of high environmental value, in accordance with national planning policy and the spatial strategy for the Wakefield District."

**Alternative Options:**

- **Policy Statement 2:**
  - "The District Plan should identify areas where new development could be located, and which are consistent with national planning policy and the spatial strategy for the Wakefield District. There will be no new development in areas of high environmental value, in accordance with national planning policy and the spatial strategy for the Wakefield District."

**Information Summary:**

- **Summary of all Core Strategy Policies**
  - **More Flood Risk, More Dense, More Deprived**
    - Wakefield 13
### Core Strategy, Policy CC1

**Renewable energy, energy conservation and sustainable construction** specifically, 'at least 10% of demand from on-site renewables'.

### Multi Criteria Analysis Framework - Inferred weighting of Sustainability Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA objective</th>
<th>LA value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Refered to in Policy EN4 'Provision of open space and sport and recreation facilities'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Policy SP2 'Housing Provision' Policy HO2 'Contingency for Meeting Housing Provision' Policy HO3 'Affordable Housing' Policy HO4 'Housing type and size'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Policy CO1 'Providing community facilities'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Refered to in Policy SP6 'Maintaining and improving the environment Policy EN7 'Tree Protection' Policy EN8 'Protecting and improving the landscape and biodiversity' Policy EN9 'River Thames and its tributaries'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Policy EN5 'Buildings of Architectural and Historic Interest'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No obvious reference other than for flood risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Refered to in SP1 'Location of Development' Policy LO1 'Floodin'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Policy SP3 'Economy and Employment Land Provision' Policy EM1 'Employment Development' Policy EM2 'Employment development on other land'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Refered to in SP5 'Meeting Community needs' Policy EM1 'Employment Development'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Refered to in EM1 'Employment Development'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Refered to in SP6 'Maintaining and improving the environment Policy EN7 'Tree Protection' Policy EN8 'Protecting and improving the landscape and biodiversity' Policy EN9 'River Thames and its tributaries'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Refered to in EM1 'Employment Development'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Refered to in EM1 'Employment Development'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Policy used for SA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy used for SA</th>
<th>Decision notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy: CS1SA preferred options appendices' pg 10 onwards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Observations from Sustainability Appraisal of alternative options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Major Positive Effect</th>
<th>Minor Positive Effect</th>
<th>Neutral Effect</th>
<th>Minor Negative Effect</th>
<th>Major Negative Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SO 5</td>
<td>Minimise the harm from flooding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO 11</td>
<td>Mitigation of climate change (excluding flooding)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO 6</td>
<td>Minimise the harm from flooding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO 18</td>
<td>Adaptation to the effects of climate change (excluding flooding)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO 14</td>
<td>Improving amount and range of employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO 12</td>
<td>Encouraging growth and economic prosperity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### How the LA dealt with I, J and K in decision making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred option</th>
<th>Decision notes (SA Preferred options appendices, p10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1A (preferred)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Information Summary

**Strategies:**
- Area Flood Risk Main Demand Less Dependent
- Area Flood Risk Main Demand More Dependent
- Floodplain

**Summary of All Core Strategy Policies:**
- Realising Poole’s Economic Potential
- Meeting Poole’s Housing Need
- Revitalising the Town Centre
- Accessibility and the Prime Transport Corridors
- Priority Areas in Need of Investment and Improvement
- Locally Distinctive and Self-Reliant Places
- Areas where change will be carefully managed
- Preparing Poole for Climate Change

### Multi Criteria Analysis and Inferred Weighting of Sustainability Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MCA Objective</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving Health</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(revised list of health issues, referenced frequently throughout PCS 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving Housing Choice</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(revised list of housing issues, referenced frequently throughout PCS 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving access to services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(referred to in Policy PCS 6, Areas and Movements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing community participation and civic pride</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(referred to in Policy PCS 11, Areas and Movements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving and enhancing natural Assets</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(no obvious importance given (no clear link with CS))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving and enhancing cultural Assets</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(minor negative effect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-using sequentially preferable land (PDL/ Urban Area)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(minor negative effect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise loss of productive agricultural land</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(clearly appears in CS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation of climate change</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(very important - clearly appears and further heavy emphasis given throughout CS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation to the effects of climate change (excluding flooding)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving amount and range of employment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(clearly appears in CS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving resident skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging growth and economic prosperity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Observations from Sustainability Appraisal of alternative options

- **Social:** Improving Health and Improving Housing Choice.
  - Greater importance is given to the skills and infrastructure aspects of the appraisal.
  - Social and economic impacts are discussed in terms of the different methods of appraisal.

- **Environmental:** Improving and enhancing natural Assets.
  - Greater importance is given to the health of the environment and the natural assets, with a focus on sustainability.

- **Economic:** Improving amount and range of employment
  - Greater importance is given to the economic development and the range of employment opportunities.

### Key

- 0: no obvious importance given (no clear link with CS)
- 1: some importance (inferred/minor reference through CS)
- 2: important (clearly appears in CS)
- 3: very important (clearly appears and further heavy emphasis given throughout CS)

### Core Strategy, Strategic Objective 8 ‘To Address Climate Change’, specifically ‘overarching principle...future will need...will need to adapt to the effects of climate change...and other environmental performance improvements, including sustainable drainage, on site renewables, carbon reductions.

---

**Information Summary**

**Strategies:**
- Area Flood Risk Main Demand Less Dependent
- Area Flood Risk Main Demand More Dependent
- Floodplain

**Summary of All Core Strategy Policies:**
- Realising Poole’s Economic Potential
- Meeting Poole’s Housing Need
- Revitalising the Town Centre
- Accessibility and the Prime Transport Corridors
- Priority Areas in Need of Investment and Improvement
- Locally Distinctive and Self-Reliant Places
- Areas where change will be carefully managed
- Preparing Poole for Climate Change

### Multi Criteria Analysis and Inferred Weighting of Sustainability Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MCA Objective</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Audification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving Health</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Health BS4 Health, referenced frequently throughout PCS 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving Housing Choice</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Health BS4 Housing, referenced frequently throughout PCS 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving access to services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Health BS4 Services, referenced frequently throughout PCS 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing community participation and civic pride</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Health BS4 Participation, referenced frequently throughout PCS 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving and enhancing natural Assets</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Health BS4 Natural Assets, referenced frequently throughout PCS 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving and enhancing cultural Assets</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Health BS4 Cultural Assets, referenced frequently throughout PCS 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-using sequentially preferable land (PDL/ Urban Area)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Health BS4 Urban Renewal, referenced frequently throughout PCS 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise loss of productive agricultural land</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Health BS4 Agriculture, referenced frequently throughout PCS 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation of climate change</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Health BS4 Climate Change, referenced frequently throughout PCS 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation to the effects of climate change (excluding flooding)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Health BS4 Climate Change, referenced frequently throughout PCS 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving amount and range of employment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Health BS4 Employment, referenced frequently throughout PCS 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving resident skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging growth and economic prosperity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Observations from Sustainability Appraisal of alternative options

- **Social:** Improving Health and Improving Housing Choice.
  - Greater importance is given to the skills and infrastructure aspects of the appraisal.
  - Social and economic impacts are discussed in terms of the different methods of appraisal.

- **Environmental:** Improving and enhancing natural Assets.
  - Greater importance is given to the health of the environment and the natural assets, with a focus on sustainability.

- **Economic:** Improving amount and range of employment
  - Greater importance is given to the economic development and the range of employment opportunities.

### Key

- 0: no obvious importance given (no clear link with CS)
- 1: some importance (inferred/minor reference through CS)
- 2: important (clearly appears in CS)
- 3: very important (clearly appears and further heavy emphasis given throughout CS)
### Summary of All Core Strategy Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key

- A: Moderate importance (may be due to lack of clear link with core strategy)
- B: High importance (clear link with core strategy)
- C: Very high importance (clear link with core strategy)

### MCA Objective LA Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MCA Objective</th>
<th>LA Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving Health</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving Housing Choice</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving access to services</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing community participation and civic pride</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting and improving natural Assets</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting and improving cultural Assets</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-using sequentially preferable land (PDL/ Urban Area)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise loss of productive agricultural land</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation of climate change</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation to the effects of climate change (excluding flooding)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigate against/adapt for the impacts of flooding</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving amount and range of employment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving resident skills</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging growth and economic prosperity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Policy Used for SA:

Reference Document:

- Notes

### Preferences for SA

**Key**

- **Low Importance (0):** No obvious importance given.
- **Some Importance (1):** Inferred through references.
- **High Importance (2):** Clearly appears in references.
- **Very High Importance (3):** Clearly appears throughout references.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MCA Objective</th>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving Health</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving Housing Choice</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving access to services</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing community participation and civic pride</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting and improving natural Assets</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting and improving cultural Assets</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-using sequentially preferable land (PDL/Urban Area)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise loss of productive agricultural land</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation of climate change</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation to the effects of climate change (excluding flooding)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigate against/adapt for the impacts of flooding</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving amount and range of employment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving resident skills</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging growth and economic prosperity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### From looking at the transfer of objectives from the LA’s sustainability appraisal into the policy of the core strategy, the following sustainability objectives appear to have been given the most value:

- **Public Health**
- **Housing Choice**
- **Cultural Assets**
- **Natural Assets**
- **Economic Development**

### How the LA dealt with I, J and K in decision making

**Preferred option:** Alternative Approach: A wider distribution of development through identifying a larger number of Selected Villages.

**Prefer option: B:** Alternative approach: A greater concentration of new development by reducing the number of Selected Villages.

### Observations from Sustainability Appraisal of alternative options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Economic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary of all Core Strategy Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key

- A: Moderate importance (may be due to lack of clear link with core strategy)
- B: High importance (clear link with core strategy)
- C: Very high importance (clear link with core strategy)

### MCA Objective LA Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MCA Objective</th>
<th>LA Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving Health</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving Housing Choice</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving access to services</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing community participation and civic pride</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting and improving natural Assets</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting and improving cultural Assets</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-using sequentially preferable land (PDL/ Urban Area)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise loss of productive agricultural land</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation of climate change</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation to the effects of climate change (excluding flooding)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigate against/adapt for the impacts of flooding</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving amount and range of employment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving resident skills</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging growth and economic prosperity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Policy Used for SA:

Reference Document:

- Notes

### Preferences for SA

**Key**

- **Low Importance (0):** No obvious importance given.
- **Some Importance (1):** Inferred through references.
- **High Importance (2):** Clearly appears in references.
- **Very High Importance (3):** Clearly appears throughout references.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MCA Objective</th>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving Health</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving Housing Choice</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving access to services</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing community participation and civic pride</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting and improving natural Assets</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting and improving cultural Assets</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-using sequentially preferable land (PDL/Urban Area)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise loss of productive agricultural land</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation of climate change</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation to the effects of climate change (excluding flooding)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigate against/adapt for the impacts of flooding</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving amount and range of employment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving resident skills</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging growth and economic prosperity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### From looking at the transfer of objectives from the LA’s sustainability appraisal into the policy of the core strategy, the following sustainability objectives appear to have been given the most value:

- **Public Health**
- **Housing Choice**
- **Cultural Assets**
- **Natural Assets**
- **Economic Development**

### How the LA dealt with I, J and K in decision making

**Preferred option:** Alternative Approach: A wider distribution of development through identifying a larger number of Selected Villages.

**Prefer option: B:** Alternative approach: A greater concentration of new development by reducing the number of Selected Villages.

### Observations from Sustainability Appraisal of alternative options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Economic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary of all Core Strategy Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary of Core Strategy Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS1</td>
<td>Improving Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS2</td>
<td>Improving Housing Choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS3</td>
<td>Improving access to services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS4</td>
<td>Enhancing community participation and civic pride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS5</td>
<td>Protecting and improving natural Assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS6</td>
<td>Protecting and improving cultural Assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS7</td>
<td>Re-using sequentially preferable land (PDL/Urban Area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS8</td>
<td>Minimise loss of productive agricultural land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS9</td>
<td>Mitigation of climate change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS10</td>
<td>Adaptation to the effects of climate change (excluding flooding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS11</td>
<td>Mitigate against/adapt for the impacts of flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS12</td>
<td>Improving amount and range of employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS13</td>
<td>Improving resident skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS14</td>
<td>Encouraging growth and economic prosperity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary of Sustainability Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MCA Objective</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving Health</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving Housing Choice</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving access to services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing community participation and civic pride</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting and improving natural Assets</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting and improving cultural Assets</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-using sequentially preferable land (PDL/Urban Area)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise loss of productive agricultural land</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation of climate change</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation to the effects of climate change (excluding flooding)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigate against/adapt for the impacts of flooding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving amount and range of employment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving resident skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging growth and economic prosperity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Observations from Sustainability Appraisal of alternative options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>CS1</th>
<th>CS2</th>
<th>CS3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key

- **S**: Major Positive Effect
- **M**: Minor Positive Effect
- **L**: Neutral Effect
- **H**: Minor Negative Effect
- **I**: Major Negative Effect

### Notes

- Social: Policy CS8 'Meeting Housing Needs', referred to throughout the document.
- Environmental: Policy CS10 'Environmental Capital', Policy CS19 'Open space and green infrastructure', Policy CS21 'Biodiversity and geological conservation', Policy CS22 'Flood risk'.

### Justification

- Social: CS10 'Environmental Capital', specifically, "The development of a natural capital strategy to support the delivery of new development in the area, including opportunities for renewable energy and green infrastructure.
- Environmental: CS10 'Environmental Capital', specifically, "The development of a natural capital strategy to support the delivery of new development in the area, including opportunities for renewable energy and green infrastructure.
- Economic: CS10 'Environmental Capital', specifically, "The development of a natural capital strategy to support the delivery of new development in the area, including opportunities for renewable energy and green infrastructure."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>0: no obvious importance given (can often link with (E))</th>
<th>1: some importance (often linked to within SO)</th>
<th>2: important (clearly appears in CS)</th>
<th>3: major importance (so significant that CS raises it as an objective)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Summary of all Core Strategy Policies

**Sustainable Development Centres and Employment Policies**

- **Housing**
- **Infrastructure**
- **Public Realm**
- **Transport and Accessibility**
- **Environment and Rural Communities**
- **Energy, Resources, Waste, Water and Recycling Policy**

### Information Summary

**Typology:**

- More Flood Risk
- Less Dense
- Less Deprived

**Colchester**

### LA Name:

**No of allocations in Core Strategy, Policy ER1 'Energy, Resources, Waste, Water and Recycling' specifically 'commitment to carbon emission reduction' and the objective to reduce flooding?**

9. To make efficient use of energy and resources, and reduce waste and our contribution to climate change.

### Multi Criteria Analysis Framework - Inferred weighting of Sustainability Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MCA Objective LA Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Improving Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Improving Housing Choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Improving access to services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Enhancing community participation and civic pride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Protecting and improving natural assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Protecting and improving cultural assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Re-using sequentially preferable land (PDL/Urban Area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Minimise loss of productive agricultural land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Mitigation of climate change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Adaptation to the effects of climate change (excluding flooding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Mitigate against/adapt for the impacts of flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Improving amount and range of employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Improving resident skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Encouraging growth and economic prosperity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Preparing a site for development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred option, revised notes (CB022 CS SOPs Appendix B, Policy 100: Sustainable Development)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To ensure that the development is located sustainably and makes efficient use of land to reduce the risk of flooding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sustainability Appraisal of alternative options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy used for SA:</th>
<th>Reference document:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy: SD1 Sustainable Development Locations. The preferred policy option seeks to direct development towards sustainable, accessible and attractive development locations, and therefore helps to develop a prestigious regional centre.</td>
<td>EB022 CS APO SA appendices, Appendix B, Policy SD1: Sustainable Development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### How the LA dealt with I, J and K in decision making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observations from Sustainability Appraisal of alternative options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From looking at the transfer of objectives from the LA’s sustainability appraisal into the policy of the core strategy, the following sustainability objectives appear to have been given the most value:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving Housing Choice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Preferred option:

- Policy ER1: 'Energy, Resources, Waste, Water and Recycling' which specifically ‘commitment to carbon emission reduction’ and the objective to reduce flooding.

- Policy ER2: ‘Transport and Accessibility’ which specifically ‘commitment to carbon emission reduction’ and the objective to reduce flooding.
Information Summary

More Flood Risk, Less Dense, Less Deprived

Hambleton

LA Name: Hambleton

No of allocations in floodplain: 5

Meeting local development needs sustainably
Developing a balanced housing market
Supporting prosperous communities
Maintaining quality environments
Creating healthy and safe communities

Core Strategy, Strategic Objective 10.

To reduce the adverse impact of society on the environment, and respond to the challenge of climate change, leading to reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, to prevent and control pollution, noise or hazardous activities.

SA: SO F: To minimise climate change and its effects on the population

Multi Criteria Analysis Framework

Inferred weighting of Sustainability Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MCA Objective</th>
<th>LA Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Improving Health</td>
<td>N/A N/A N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Improving Housing Choice</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Improving access to services</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Enhancing community participation and civic pride</td>
<td>N/A N/A N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Protecting and improving natural Assets</td>
<td>SO B Major Positive Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Protecting and improving cultural Assets</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Re-using sequentially preferable land (PDL/ Urban Area)</td>
<td>No obvious objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Minimise loss of productive agricultural land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Mitigation of climate change</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Adaptation to the effects of climate change (excluding flooding)</td>
<td>No obvious objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Including greywater and rainwater harvesting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Improving amount and range of employment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Improving resident skills</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Encouraging growth and economic prosperity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations from Sustainability Appraisal of alternative options

5.43. The Core Strategy should provide a more specific requirement for new development to incorporate sustainable design features. For example, water and energy efficiency is not specifically required, although reducing the use of natural resources is an objective of Policy CP18.74

5.44. The Core Strategy should provide a more specific requirement for new developments to incorporate a limited range of sustainable design features. For example, water and energy efficiency is not specifically required, although reducing the use of natural resources is an objective of Policy CP18.74

5.42. The Core Strategy only requires new employment development to incorporate a limited range of sustainable design features. For example, water and energy efficiency is not specifically required, although reducing the use of natural resources is an objective of Policy CP18.74

5.45. CP4 could specifically mention support for appropriate scale renewable energy proposals in rural areas.

Recommendations

5.41. Additional development will inevitably generate some additional greenhouse gas emissions. The key to success is whether the spatial priorities for other policies in the LTP, e.g. Policy CP1, include reducing the amount of development, all of which reduces net emissions. More importantly, the District must reduce its own greenhouse gas emissions to some degree, as does the County Council. Policies to reduce emissions within the District must ensure that the new development is reduced, but the impact of new development should be minimised by the introduction of new technologies and the maintenance of existing levels of new service provision, and ‘Secondary Villages’ (location-based development may be acceptable where it clearly supports a local need and is located in the sustainability of the community)

Policy used for SA: SP1

Reference document: SP1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MCA Objective</th>
<th>SP1</th>
<th>SP2</th>
<th>SP3</th>
<th>Alt 1</th>
<th>Alt 2</th>
<th>Alt 3</th>
<th>Alt 4</th>
<th>Alt 5</th>
<th>Alt 6</th>
<th>Alt 7</th>
<th>Alt 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Improving Health</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>SO P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Improving Housing Choice</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Improving access to services</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td></td>
<td>SO T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Enhancing community participation and civic pride</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Protecting and improving natural Assets</td>
<td>SO B Major Positive Effect</td>
<td>SO C Minor Positive Effect</td>
<td>No obvious objective</td>
<td>Neutral Effect</td>
<td>No obvious objective</td>
<td>Minor Negative Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Protecting and improving cultural Assets</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1: some importance (inferred/minor reference through CS)</td>
<td>1 2: important (clearly appears in CS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Re-using sequentially preferable land (PDL/ Urban Area)</td>
<td>No obvious objective</td>
<td>Neutral Effect</td>
<td>No obvious objective</td>
<td>Minor Negative Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Minimise loss of productive agricultural land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Mitigation of climate change</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>SO F Major Negative Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Adaptation to the effects of climate change (excluding flooding)</td>
<td>No obvious objective</td>
<td>No obvious objective</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Including greywater and rainwater harvesting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Improving amount and range of employment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Improving resident skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Encouraging growth and economic prosperity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How the LA dealt with I, J and K in decision making

Improving Housing Choice

Improving access to services

Alternative 3:

No Service Villages would be designated but instead a share of development in a wider range of villages permitted

Alternative 4:

No development in villages not designated as Service Villages, and delete category of Secondary Villages

Alternative 5:

Matching levels of new housing and new employment development

Alternative 6:

Greater proportion of employment at strategic sites (e.g. Dalton Airfield)

Alternative 7:

Promoting development where it would maximise the re-use of brownfield sites

Alternative 8:

Greater proportion of employment at strategic sites (e.g. Dalton Airfield)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MCA Objective</th>
<th>LA Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Improving Health</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Improving Housing Choice</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Improving access to services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Enhancing community participation and civic pride</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Protecting and improving natural Assets</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Protecting and improving cultural Assets</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Re-using sequentially preferable land (PDL/ Urban Area)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Minimise loss of productive agricultural land</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Mitigation of climate change</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Adaptation to the effects of climate change (excluding flooding)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Mitigate against/adapt to the impacts of flooding</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Improving amount and range of employment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Improving resident skills</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Encouraging growth and economic prosperity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Information Summary

**Less Flood Risk, More Dense, More Deprived (LMM) Brent**

- **Climate Change objectives and understanding of mitigation and adaptation within core strategy and SA**

  - Summary of all Core Strategy Policies
    - Tackling Climate Change and Achieving Sustainable Development
      - Protecting Community and Cultural Facilities
      - Maintaining Employment outside of Growth Areas
      - Planning for More and Better Housing
    - Protecting Open Space, Sports and Biodiversity
    - Achieving Sustainable Development through Waste Management
    
  - **Core Strategy Core Policy: CP 19 Brent Strategic Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation Measures**
    - All development should provide a net gain in open space and green infrastructure, and significant contribution towards meeting the net carbon balance.
    - New and existing communities, public and private, are encouraged to develop innovative sustainable development strategies to provide for new open space and green infrastructure to be promoted as part of the measures needed to mitigate climate change.

- **Sustainability Appraisal Objective 14. To reduce contributions to climate change and reduce vulnerability to climate change**
  - Numerous references across a number of policies
  - Justification
    - **Policy CPSS1 - Key Principles for Development**
      - The key principles which underpin the spatial strategy for Brent are:
        - Focusing higher density development in key growth areas, especially in the main growth area of Brentbridge.
        - Ensuring a balanced mix of housing, employment and services in key growth areas.
        - Encouraging high quality and sustainable development in key growth areas.
        - Encouraging high quality design that is sensitive to context and maximises opportunities for wildlife and biodiversity.
        - Encouraging high quality mixed-use developments.
        - Developing key growth areas into mixed-use developments.
        - Encouraging higher density development in key growth areas.
        - Encouraging high quality design that is sensitive to context and maximises opportunities for wildlife and biodiversity.
        - Encouraging high quality mixed-use developments.
        - Developing key growth areas into mixed-use developments.
        - Encouraging higher density development in key growth areas.

- **Preferred option: Policy CPSS1 - Key Principles for Development**
  - The key principles which underpin the spatial strategy for Brent are:
    - Focusing higher density development in key growth areas, especially in the main growth area of Brentbridge.
    - Ensuring a balanced mix of housing, employment and services in key growth areas.
    - Encouraging high quality and sustainable development in key growth areas.
    - Encouraging high quality design that is sensitive to context and maximises opportunities for wildlife and biodiversity.
    - Encouraging high quality mixed-use developments.
    - Developing key growth areas into mixed-use developments.
    - Encouraging higher density development in key growth areas.
    - Encouraging high quality design that is sensitive to context and maximises opportunities for wildlife and biodiversity.
    - Encouraging high quality mixed-use developments.
    - Developing key growth areas into mixed-use developments.
    - Encouraging higher density development in key growth areas.

### Notes on the MCA

- **Multi Criteria Analysis Framework - Inferred weighting of Sustainability Objectives**
  - **Key**
    - 0: no obvious importance given (no clear link with CS)
    - 1: some importance (inferred/minor reference through CS)
    - 2: important (clearly appears in CS)
    - 3: very important (clearly appears and further heavy emphasis given throughout CS)

- **How the LA dealt with I, J and K in decision making**
  - Where transport modal shift is achieved and the number of car journeys reduced, transport emissions are likely to be less.
  - Sustainable construction methods and materials on climate change mitigation also likely to reduce energy consumption in the long term.
  - Improving transport for freight should ensure freight risk management, energy use etc is accounted for.
  - Recycling and replacement of materials on climate change mitigation also likely to reduce energy consumption in the long term.

- **For the Early Years Development: Consultation on Core Strategy and Sustainability Appraisal**
  - Development proposals that are considered to comply with the Core Strategy and Sustainability Appraisal include SOL, SSI, SDC, PUP, RPB, TRH and SS.
  - If there are developments that are considered not to comply with the Core Strategy and Sustainability Appraisal, including altering or adding to land, to reduce CO2 emissions.
  - The Draft Sustainability Appraisal and Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal and Sustainability Appraisal: two policies for the Brent will support this.
**Sandwell's Core Strategy is a joint 'Black Country' Document**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>LA Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less Flood Risk, More Dense, More Deprived (LMM)</td>
<td>Sandwell0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No of allocations in Core Strategy, ENV5 'Flood Risk, Sustainable Drainage Systems and Urban Heat Island', specifically, The Black Country Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and its planning and development management recommendations as well as PPS25 clarifying on what flood risk the site falls into and design considerations that are important (PPS25, p.4). Sandwell Town Plan in respect to flood risk and also planning potential other than that direct flood risk, all development should:

- Consider Sustainable Drainage Systems (SDSs), sites must be infilled to be used in order to significantly reduce surface water run off and improve water quality. The type of SDS used will be dependent upon geographical conditions.

- Ensure proposed water courses above floodplain and maintenance dredging does not occur nor new existing watercourses where there is deliberate strategies in plans to implement this.

- Make sure the suitability of flood risk management, flood risk management, as well as the flood risk management, to flooding and flood water channeling and flood alleviation, for example, in the central, inner urban core and and area are in flood FRP.

- On sites requiring a flood Risk Assessment, reduce surface water flow back to equivalent groundwater levels.

- Deep greenspaces, trees from new areas provide green rectify, no development will be permitted within a year of 1997 when water physically affects an elevation, and no permission will be granted without a risk assessment demonstrating there will be no adverse affects on building.

---

**Multi Criteria Analysis Framework - Sustainability Appraisal of alternative options**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MCA Objective</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Improving Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Improving Housing Choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Improving access to services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Enhancing community participation and civic pride</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Protecting and improving natural Assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Protecting and improving cultural Assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Re-using sequentially preferable land (PDL/ Urban Area)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Minimise loss of productive agricultural land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Mitigation of climate change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Adaptation to the effects of climate change (excluding flooding)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Mitigate against/adapt for the impacts of flooding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Improving amount and range of employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Improving resident skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Encouraging growth and economic prosperity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Option 1: Concentrated Development within the Centres and Regeneration Corridors - Safeguarding Local Employment Opportunities**

- Protection of 1500 ha up to 2026 for local employment use - including a reservoir of 550 ha.
- Measure of the remaining 1500 ha for local employment use: 3 centres, 3 workshops.
- New housing would be concentrated at high densities in the most sustainable locations. Local authorities, public transport nodes, existing and emerging nodes, and centres.
- Development for shopping, leisure, offices and homes, will be focused towards centres within and adjusting Regeneration Corridors that have significant concentrations or improving transport links.
- Existing employment will be focused to strengthen the existing network.

**Option 2: Dispersed Development within the Centres and Regeneration Corridors - Providing Greater Housing Choice**

- Protection of 1300 ha up to 2026 for local employment use - including a reservoir of 350 ha.
- Measure of the remaining 1500 ha for local employment use: 1000 ha, 500 ha.
- New residential development would be focused towards existing local employment nodes, with the exception of flood zones, in areas of local employment use.
- Developments for shopping, leisure, offices and homes, will be focused towards centres within and adjusting Regeneration Corridors that have significant concentrations or improving transport links.
- Existing employment will be focused to strengthen the existing network.

---

**How the LA dealt with I, J and K in decision making**

**SO4: Plan for the anticipated different levels of climate change**

From looking at the transfer of objectives from the LA's sustainability appraisal into the policy of the core strategy, the following sustainability objectives appear to have been given the most value:

- Improving Housing Choice
- Adaptation to the effects of climate change (excluding flooding)
- Improving amount and range of employment
### MCA Objective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Policy used for SA</th>
<th>Reference document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Improving Health</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>(SO 12.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Improving Housing Choice</td>
<td>(SO 10.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Improving access to services</td>
<td>(SO 11.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Enhancing community participation and civic pride</td>
<td>(SO 12.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Protecting and improving natural Assets</td>
<td>(SO 3.4) Major Positive Effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Protecting and improving cultural Assets</td>
<td>(SO 2.3) Minor Positive Effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Re-using sequentially preferable land (PDL/ Urban Area)</td>
<td>Neutral Effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Minimise loss of productive agricultural land</td>
<td>Minor Negative Effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Mitigation of climate change</td>
<td>(SO 4.1) Major Negative Effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Adaptation to the effects of climate change (excluding flooding)</td>
<td>(SO 6.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Mitigate against/adapt for the impacts of flooding</td>
<td>(SO 6.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Improving amount and range of employment</td>
<td>(SO 9.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Improving resident skills</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>(SO 9.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Encouraging growth and economic prosperity</td>
<td>(SO 7.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key

- n/a: no obvious importance given (no clear link with CS)
- 1: some importance (inferred/minor reference through CS)
- 2: important (clearly appears in CS)
- 3: very important (clearly appears and further heavy emphasis given throughout CS)

### Summary of Benefits

- Place making policies (Housing Areas, Employment Areas, Town Centres, The Open Spaces Network)
- Borough Policies (Developing Active, Healthy and Inclusive Communities, Achieving Environmental Sustainability, Promoting Sustainable Transport and Accessibility, Improving the Street Scene and Living Environment)

### Multi Criteria Analysis Framework - Inferred weighting of Sustainability Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active, Healthy and Inclusive Communities</td>
<td>Linked to cultural assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Environmental Economic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Multi Criteria Analysis Framework - Sustainability Appraisal of alternative options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Preferred Option</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Improving Health</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Improving Housing Choice</td>
<td>(SO 10.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Improving access to services</td>
<td>(SO 11.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Enhancing community participation and civic pride</td>
<td>(SO 12.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Protecting and improving natural Assets</td>
<td>(SO 3.4) Major Positive Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Protecting and improving cultural Assets</td>
<td>(SO 2.3) Minor Positive Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Re-using sequentially preferable land (PDL/ Urban Area)</td>
<td>Neutral Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Minimise loss of productive agricultural land</td>
<td>Minor Negative Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Mitigation of climate change</td>
<td>(SO 4.1) Major Negative Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Adaptation to the effects of climate change (excluding flooding)</td>
<td>(SO 6.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Mitigate against/adapt for the impacts of flooding</td>
<td>(SO 6.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Improving amount and range of employment</td>
<td>(SO 9.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Improving resident skills</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Encouraging growth and economic prosperity</td>
<td>(SO 7.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proposed submission

From looking at the transfer of objectives from the LA's sustainability appraisal into the policy of the core strategy, the following sustainability objectives appear to have been given the most value:

- Improved Health
- Improved Housing Choice
- Improved access to services
- Enhanced community participation and civic pride
- Protecting and improving natural assets
- Protecting and improving cultural assets
- Re-using sequentially preferable land (PDL/Urban Area)
- Minimising loss of productive agricultural land
- Mitigation of climate change
- Adaptation to the effects of climate change

### Spatial Strategy: Balanced Sustainable Growth

- Core Policy BP8 - One Planet Living
  - The Council will address the causes and impacts of climate change, contribute to reducing carbon dioxide emissions in accordance with the Carbon Plan and the government’s carbon plan, and promote the sustainable use of land and energy through policies which promote energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy conservation.
  - How the LA dealt with I, J and K in decision making
    - SO 4.1 Energy Efficiency - To reduce energy consumption, Option 1 would have strongly beneficial impacts on reducing energy consumption, promoting best practice in Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) and climate change adaptation in all new developments.
    - Promoting the use of renewable energy sources, promoting best practice in Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) and climate change adaptation in new developments.
  - Multi Criteria Analysis Framework - Sustainability Appraisal of alternative options
    - Option 1: environmental protection
    - Option 2: Neighbourhood renewal
    - Option 3: Economic regeneration
  - Summary of all Core Strategy Policies

### Climate Change objectives and understanding of mitigation and adaptation within core strategy and SA

- Core Policy BP7 - Flood Risk and Climate Change Adaptation
  - The Council will seek to avoid, manage and reduce all sources of flood risk and all impacts of climate change by:
    - Reviewing and where necessary updating action plan(s) for flood risk management, energy policy, and climate change adaptation
    - Engaging with other local authorities to ensure consistency
    - Integrating flood risk assessment into all new development
    - Promoting the use of renewable energy sources, promoting best practice in Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) and climate change adaptation in new developments.
  - Multi Criteria Analysis Framework - Inferred weighting of Sustainability Objectives
    - Linked to civic pride

### Information Summary

- Less Flood Risk, More Dense, Less Deprived
- Sutton1

### Data and Observation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Preferred Option</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Improving Health</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Improving Housing Choice</td>
<td>(SO 10.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Improving access to services</td>
<td>(SO 11.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Enhancing community participation and civic pride</td>
<td>(SO 12.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Protecting and improving natural Assets</td>
<td>(SO 3.4) Major Positive Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Protecting and improving cultural Assets</td>
<td>(SO 2.3) Minor Positive Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Re-using sequentially preferable land (PDL/ Urban Area)</td>
<td>Neutral Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Minimise loss of productive agricultural land</td>
<td>Minor Negative Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Mitigation of climate change</td>
<td>(SO 4.1) Major Negative Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Adaptation to the effects of climate change (excluding flooding)</td>
<td>(SO 6.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Mitigate against/adapt for the impacts of flooding</td>
<td>(SO 6.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Improving amount and range of employment</td>
<td>(SO 9.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Improving resident skills</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Encouraging growth and economic prosperity</td>
<td>(SO 7.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Multi-Criteria Analysis Framework - Inferred weighting of Sustainability Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Economic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving Health</td>
<td>ECO A Major Positive Effect</td>
<td>ECO A Major Positive Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving Housing Choice</td>
<td>ECO L</td>
<td>ECO L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving access to services</td>
<td>ECO K</td>
<td>ECO K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing community participation and civic pride</td>
<td>ECO M</td>
<td>ECO M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting and improving natural Assets</td>
<td>ECO A Major Positive Effect</td>
<td>ECO A Major Positive Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting and improving cultural Assets</td>
<td>ECO</td>
<td>ECO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-using sequentially preferable land (PDL/Urban Area)</td>
<td>No obvious objective Neutral Effect</td>
<td>No obvious objective Neutral Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise loss of productive agricultural land</td>
<td>No obvious objective Minor Negative Effect</td>
<td>No obvious objective Minor Negative Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation of climate change</td>
<td>ECO I Major Negative Effect</td>
<td>ECO I Major Negative Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation to the effects of climate change (excluding flooding)</td>
<td>No obvious objective</td>
<td>No obvious objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigate against/adapt for the impacts of flooding</td>
<td>ECO I</td>
<td>ECO I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving amount and range of employment</td>
<td>ECO P</td>
<td>ECO P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving resident skills</td>
<td>No obvious objective</td>
<td>No obvious objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging growth and economic prosperity</td>
<td>ECO N</td>
<td>ECO N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Core Strategy

**Main Core Strategy Policies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Communities</td>
<td>Policies to encourage sustainable development and protect the environment</td>
<td>Refered to in COR 2 ‘Local Distinctiveness’; Mentioned throughout document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Distinctiveness</td>
<td>Policies to promote and protect the unique character of the area</td>
<td>COR 4 ‘Meeting Employment Needs’; Refered to in COR 1 ‘Sustainable Communities’; Mentioned throughout document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Housing Needs</td>
<td>Policies to meet local housing needs and improve the quality of life</td>
<td>Refered to in COR 3 ‘Meeting Housing Needs’; Refered to in COR 1 ‘Sustainable Communities’; No obvious reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Employment Needs</td>
<td>Policies to meet local employment needs and support economic growth</td>
<td>Refered to in COR 4 ‘Meeting Employment Needs’; Refered to in COR 1 ‘Sustainable Communities’; Mentioned throughout document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change</td>
<td>Policies to address the impacts of climate change</td>
<td>COR 5 ‘Climate Change’; Measures will be sought which minimise the impact of development on climate change, and work towards reducing and adapting to the impacts of climate change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Protection</td>
<td>Policies to protect and improve the environment</td>
<td>Refered to in COR 6 ‘Previously Developed Land’; More interested in preserving and improving the environment rather than enhancing it for economic gain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Centres</td>
<td>Policies to improve the functionality and attractiveness of town centres</td>
<td>Refered to in COR 7 ‘Town Centre’; Mentioned throughout document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Strategic Transport Networks</td>
<td>Policies to improve access to strategic transport networks</td>
<td>Refered to in COR 8 ‘Transport’; Mentioned throughout document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooding Development Focus</td>
<td>Policies to reduce the risk of flooding and the impact of climate change on development</td>
<td>Core Strategy, COR 5 ‘Climate Change’, Measures will be sought which minimise the impact of development on climate change, and work towards reducing and adapting to the impacts of climate change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Core Strategy Framework - Sustained Approach for Achieving Policy Objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Policies</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Climate Change Objectives and Understanding of Mitigation and Adaptation within Core Strategy

- **Climate Change Objectives**
  - Improve air quality and reduce emissions
  - Enhance green spaces
  - Reduce flood risk
  - Protect and enhance biodiversity

- **Understanding of Mitigation and Adaptation**
  - Mitigation measures include planting trees, improving insulation, and using renewable energy sources.
  - Adaptation measures include designing buildings that are resilient to climate change impacts, and preparing for sea-level rise and increased rainfall.

### Observations from Sustainability Appraisal of Alternative Options

- **Multi-Criteria Analysis Framework**
  - Balanced growth (MCA Objective LA Value 2)
  - Economic growth (MCA Objective LA Value 2)
  - Social growth (MCA Objective LA Value 2)
  - Environmental protection (MCA Objective LA Value 2)

- **Balanced Growth**
  - Improved air quality and reduced emissions
  - Enhanced green spaces
  - Reduced flood risk
  - Protected and enhanced biodiversity

- **Economic Growth**
  - Improved air quality and reduced emissions
  - Enhanced green spaces
  - Reduced flood risk
  - Protected and enhanced biodiversity

- **Social Growth**
  - Improved air quality and reduced emissions
  - Enhanced green spaces
  - Reduced flood risk
  - Protected and enhanced biodiversity

- **Environmental Protection**
  - Improved air quality and reduced emissions
  - Enhanced green spaces
  - Reduced flood risk
  - Protected and enhanced biodiversity
### Core Strategy, Development Control Policy DC 13 'Flood Risk'
New development should be located in areas at least risk of flooding. New development will be expected to minimise flood risk to people, property and places. Proposals which increase the risk of flooding to people, property or places, either directly or indirectly, will not be permitted in accordance with a risk-based approach.

New development will only be permitted in Environment Agency flood zones 2 & 3 and those areas deemed at risk from flooding by the District’s Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, where subject to the successful application of the sequential test:

- In Zone 2 - Uses are water compatible, less vulnerable, more vulnerable and essential infrastructures
- In Zone 3a - Uses are water compatible, or less vulnerable
- In Zone 3b - Uses are water compatible only.

**All development proposals in areas at risk of flooding will be expected to provide a Flood Risk Assessment commensurate with the scale of the flood risk and recognising all likely sources of flooding.** Proposals for flood management or other infrastructure offering improvements that lower the risk of flooding will be supported, subject to the proposal having no other adverse effects on amenities, or the use of buildings or land which ought to be preserved within the public interest. Suitable measures to deal with surface water arising from development proposals will be required to minimise the impact to and from new development. The preference is to manage surface water through the incorporation of SUDS unless this is not technically feasible, or where it can be demonstrated that ground conditions are unsuitable for such measures.

**As defined in Area B of PPS25 - Table D.1**

**GPG**: To stimulate renewable energy to reduce carbon emissions.

### Mitigation of change objectives and understanding of mitigation and adaptation within core strategy and SA

Core Strategy, Development Control Policy DC 13 ‘Flood Risk’

The following sustainability objectives appear to have been given the most value:

- Protecting and improving natural Assets
- Multi Criteria Analysis Framework - Sustainability Appraisal of alternative options

### Observations from Sustainability Appraisal of alternative options

- From looking at the transfer of objectives from the LA’s sustainability appraisal into the policy of the core strategy, the following sustainability objectives appear to have been given the most value:
  - Protecting and improving natural Assets
  - Multi Criteria Analysis Framework - Inferred weighting of Sustainability Objectives

### Information Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Summary</th>
<th>LA Name</th>
<th>No. of allocations in floodplain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Typology</td>
<td>Lee Flood Risk Area - East Devizes - Harvestfield</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary of all Core Strategy Policies

- Housing
- Employment and Regeneration
- Natural Resources
- Environment
- Accessibility

### Multi Criteria Analysis Framework - Inferred weighting of Sustainability Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MCA Objective</th>
<th>LA Value</th>
<th>LA Value</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving Health</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ref to DPF Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving Housing Choice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>LA Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving access to services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ref to CP12 Accessibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing community participation and civic pride</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No obvious reference in document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting and improving natural Assets</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ref to DC 17 Wildlife Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting and improving cultural Assets</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reusing sequentially preferable land (PCL, Urban Areas)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No obvious reference in document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing loss of productive agricultural land</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ref to CP8 Natural Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation to the impacts of climate change (excluding flooding)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation of the impacts of flooding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DC 13 Flood Risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving health and range of employment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>LA Employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving resident skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ref to DPF Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging growth and economic prosperity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Multi Criteria Analysis Framework - Sustainability Appraisal of alternative options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy used for SA</th>
<th>Policy Strategy</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving Housing Choice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving access to services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing community participation and civic pride</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting and improving natural Assets</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting and improving cultural Assets</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reusing sequentially preferable land (PCL, Urban Areas)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing loss of productive agricultural land</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ref to CP8 Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation to the impacts of climate change (excluding flooding)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation of the impacts of flooding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DC 13 Flood Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving health and range of employment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>LA Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving resident skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ref to DPF Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging growth and economic prosperity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Observations from Sustainability Appraisal of alternative options

- From looking at the transfer of objectives from the LA’s sustainability appraisal into the policy of the core strategy, the following sustainability objectives appear to have been given the most value:
  - Protecting and improving natural Assets
  - Multi Criteria Analysis Framework - Inferred weighting of Sustainability Objectives

---

**Key**

- 0: no obvious importance given (no clear link with CS)
- 1: some importance (inferred reference through CS)
- 2: important (clearly appears in CS)
- 3: very important (clearly appears and further heavy emphasis given throughout CS)
Typology: Less Fixed Risk, Less Dense, Less Deprieved
LA Name: Central Bedfordshire

No of allocations in Floodplain:

Summary of all Core Strategy Policies:
- Infrastructure
- Providing homes
- Providing jobs
- Climate Change
- Natural and Built Environment

Climate Change objectives and understanding of mitigation and adaptation within core strategy and SA:
Core Strategy, CS13 ‘Climate Change’, specifically ‘secure new development including new housing, new commercial development and new community and leisure facilities, which incorporate measures to take account of climate change…including renewable energy options, sustainable design, tree planting and carbon offsetting, minimising the risk of flooding’.

Multi Criteria Analysis Framework - Inferred weighting of Sustainability Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social</th>
<th>MCA Objective</th>
<th>LA Value</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Improving Health</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CS2 ‘Healthy and sustainable communities’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Improving Housing Choice</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>CS5 ‘Providing Homes’, CS7 ‘Delivery and timing of housing’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Enhancing community participation and civic pride</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inferred to in CS5 ‘Development Strategy’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Improving access to services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>CS1 ‘Healthy and sustainable communities’, CS2 ‘Healthy and sustainable communities’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Protecting and improving natural Assets</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>CS12 ‘Landscape and Woodland’, CS17 ‘Green Infrastructure’, CS18 ‘Climate Change’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Protecting and improving cultural Assets</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CS15 ‘Heritage’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Re-using sequentially preferable land (PDL/ Urban Area)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No obvious reference in document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Minimise loss of productive agricultural land</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CS16 ‘Agricultural Land’, CS17 ‘Green Infrastructure’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Mitigation of climate change</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CS13 ‘Climate Change’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Adaptation to the effects of climate change (excluding flooding)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No obvious reference in document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>MCA Objective</th>
<th>LA Value</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Mitigate against/adapt for the impacts of flooding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inferred to in CS13 ‘Climate Change’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Improving amount and range of employment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CS10 ‘Location of Employment sites’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Encouraging growth and economic prosperity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No obvious reference in document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi Criteria Analysis Framework - Sustainability Appraisal of alternative options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social</th>
<th>MCA Objective</th>
<th>Preferred Option</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Improving Health</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CS2 ‘Healthy and sustainable communities’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Improving Housing Choice</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>CS5 ‘Providing Homes’, CS7 ‘Delivery and timing of housing’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Enhancing community participation and civic pride</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inferred to in CS5 ‘Development Strategy’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Improving access to services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>CS1 ‘Healthy and sustainable communities’, CS2 ‘Healthy and sustainable communities’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Protecting and improving natural Assets</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>CS12 ‘Landscape and Woodland’, CS17 ‘Green Infrastructure’, CS18 ‘Climate Change’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Protecting and improving cultural Assets</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CS15 ‘Heritage’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Re-using sequentially preferable land (PDL/ Urban Area)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No obvious reference in document</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Minimise loss of productive agricultural land</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CS16 ‘Agricultural Land’, CS17 ‘Green Infrastructure’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Mitigation of climate change</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CS13 ‘Climate Change’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Adaptation to the effects of climate change (excluding flooding)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No obvious reference in document</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>MCA Objective</th>
<th>Preferred Option</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Mitigate against/adapt for the impacts of flooding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inferred to in CS13 ‘Climate Change’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Improving amount and range of employment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CS10 ‘Location of Employment sites’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Encouraging growth and economic prosperity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No obvious reference in document</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alternative options assessed:
Could not find evidence of SA of preferred and alternative options.

Multi Criteria Analysis Framework - Sustainability Appraisal of alternative options

Policy used for SA:
- Reference document: CS9 ‘Providing Jobs’, CS10 ‘Location of Employment sites’
- Refered to throughout document
- CS16 ‘Landscape and Woodland’, CS17 ‘Green Infrastructure’, CS18 ‘Heritage’
- CS13 ‘Climate Change’
- Referee to CS13 ‘Climate Change’
- DM12 ‘Redundant Agricultural sites’

Information Summary:
- Less Flood Risk, Less Dense, Less Deprieved
- Central Bedfordshire

Summary of all Core Strategy Policies:
- Infrastructure
- Providing homes
- Providing jobs
- Climate Change
- Natural and Built Environment

From looking at the transfer of objectives from the LA’s sustainability appraisal into the policy of the core strategy, the following sustainability objectives appear to have been given the most value:
- Improving Housing Choice
- Protecting and improving natural Assets

How the LA dealt with I, J and K in decision making:

Observations from Sustainability Appraisal of alternative options:
From looking at the transfer of objectives from the LA’s sustainability appraisal into the policy of the core strategy, the following sustainability objectives appear to have been given the most value:
- Improving Housing Choice
- Protecting and improving natural Assets

General Observations:
- The MCA weighting of the social, environmental and economic objectives is evident in the core strategy policies.
- The objectives are prioritised based on their importance and impact on the environment and community.
- The core strategy aims to balance economic growth with environmental sustainability.
- The strategy includes measures to protect and improve natural assets and cultural heritage.
- The core strategy is designed to mitigate the effects of climate change and promote sustainable development.
- The core strategy aims to provide jobs and improve the quality of life for residents in the area.
- The core strategy includes measures to protect and improve agricultural land and promote the use of renewable energy sources.

Overall, the core strategy aims to create a balanced and sustainable development plan for the area, taking into account the needs of the community and the environment.
Appendix E

Task 3: Cost Analysis
## Development Quantums - Local Authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resultant Typology</th>
<th>Abbr.</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>Plan Type</th>
<th>Development Quantums</th>
<th>Development Quantums per</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Housing (no of dwellings)</td>
<td>Employment (area in hectares)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Flood Risk, More Dense, More Deprived</td>
<td>MMM</td>
<td>Wakefield</td>
<td>Adopted Site Allocation DPDs</td>
<td>11000</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Flood Risk, More Dense, More Deprived</td>
<td>MMM</td>
<td>Barking and Dagenham London Boro</td>
<td>Adopted Site Allocation DPDs</td>
<td>11900</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Flood Risk, More Dense, Less Deprived</td>
<td>MML</td>
<td>Spelthorne District (B)</td>
<td>Adopted Site Allocation DPDs</td>
<td>3320</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Flood Risk, More Dense, Less Deprived</td>
<td>MML</td>
<td>Poole (B)</td>
<td>SADPD Under Examination</td>
<td>3460 - 5600 per annum</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Flood Risk, Less Dense, More Deprived</td>
<td>MLM</td>
<td>City of Peterborough (B)</td>
<td>SADPD Under Examination</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Flood Risk, Less Dense, More Deprived</td>
<td>MLM</td>
<td>North Norfolk District</td>
<td>Adopted Site Allocation DPDs</td>
<td>3250</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Flood Risk, Less Dense, Less Deprived</td>
<td>MLL</td>
<td>Colchester District (B)</td>
<td>Adopted Site Allocation DPDs</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Flood Risk, Less Dense, Less Deprived</td>
<td>MLL</td>
<td>Harlow District</td>
<td>Adopted Site Allocation DPDs</td>
<td>2980</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Flood Risk, More Dense, More Deprived</td>
<td>LMM</td>
<td>Brent London Boro</td>
<td>Adopted Site Allocation DPDs</td>
<td>11200</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Flood Risk, More Dense, More Deprived</td>
<td>LMM</td>
<td>Harlow District (B)</td>
<td>SADPD Under Examination</td>
<td>15040</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Flood Risk, More Dense, Less Deprived</td>
<td>LML</td>
<td>St Albans District</td>
<td>Adopted Site Allocation DPDs</td>
<td>3450</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Flood Risk, Less Dense, More Deprived</td>
<td>LLM</td>
<td>Mid Devon District</td>
<td>Adopted Site Allocation DPDs</td>
<td>6400</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Flood Risk, Less Dense, Less Deprived</td>
<td>LLL</td>
<td>Central Bedfordshire District</td>
<td>Adopted Site Allocation DPDs</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Flood Risk, Less Dense, Less Deprived</td>
<td>LLL</td>
<td>Breckland District</td>
<td>SADPD Under Examination</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Existing level of structural flood protection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>SFRA level</th>
<th>Flood Defence Information</th>
<th>Assumed level of protection (years protection)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The level of protection offered by the fluvial defences varies throughout the region although in general is to the 1 in 100 year return period standard. This standard is typically exceeded within tidal extents where tidal flooding presents a greater flood risk. As such, total protection typically offers protection against a level of water not realistically reached following fluvial events.</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poole</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The level of protection offered by the fluvial defences varies throughout the region although in general is to the 1 in 100 year return period standard. A section of the Report states 'No allowance has been made for protection afforded by flood defences, since none of the allocations lie within the high-risk Flood Zone 3a across the eastern part of the study area and further sea level rise due to climate change will primarily constrain new development opportunities predominantly within the urban parts to area where fluvial flood risk is low and the existing ground levels are relatively high. It should be noted however that these much of the higher flood risk areas are currently protected by existing main river flood defences on the River Roding and the Loxford Water. The likelihood of these informal defences failing is very low. The consequence of the failure of the informal defences would also be low, as the Flood Zones associated with the River Roding and the River Thames do not extend north-east of the railway line.</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hambleton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hambleton is divided into three areas within the SFRA. One area: After a series of flooding events in Stokesley during the 1960’s a flood defence channel (FDC) was installed in 1978, such that high flows in the river could by-pass the town. The FDC provides protection against a 1 in 40 year flood event. The two other areas: 2. Some of the flood defences provide protection to the land however do not impact on flood risk to particular areas (i.e. flood risk remains unchanged).</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>There are no figures in the report in relation to the extent to which flood defences are protecting properties and areas. What the Report does say is ‘the SFRA modelling and mapping takes account of the existence of flood defences’.</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterborough</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Determined areas of high risk Flood Zone 3a across the eastern part of the study area and further sea level rise due to climate change will primarily constrain new development opportunities predominantly within the urban parts to area where fluvial flood risk is low and the existing ground levels are relatively high. It should be noted however that these much of the higher flood risk areas are currently protected by existing main river flood defences on the River Roding and the Loxford Water. The likelihood of these informal defences failing is very low.</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poole</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>At the current time, existing defences are protecting 200 properties within the Poole Town (Quay scheme at a 1:200 year standard), 72 properties protected by the Hamworthy scheme (1:100 standard), together with Environment Agency Floodline and public warnings. The Resilience Group regard that the existing defences still leave 501 properties in a 1:200 year standard and 954 properties in a 1:1000 standard level of protection in flood risk, which is based on the existence of flood defences in Poole.</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandwell</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Formal flood defences within the Black Country have been identified in consultation with the Environment Agency and through site walkovers. The defences identified are located mainly on the River Tame (including the Oldbury and Wolverhampton Arms), as indicated on the adjoining maps. These defences are mainly regarded as ‘maintained river channel’, although at some locations there do exist some raised banks and/or floodwalls. These defences are generally less than 1m in height and therefore provide only a limited increase in the standard of protection to adjoining properties and do not pose a risk to life.</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southend-on-Sea</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Flood defences appear to protect parts of the Borough (see para 35); however no figure is given.</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakefield</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wakefield: scheme is designed to deliver a 100 year standard protection to Wakefield. Becks Scheme: designed to provide a 75 year standard of protection.</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## GVA and Employment

**2009 Headline GVA at current basic prices**

Source: ONS Regional GVA


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LA</th>
<th>NUTS Level 3</th>
<th>2009 (£ million)</th>
<th>Total employment (BRES) - MSA LA</th>
<th>Total employment (BRES) - NUTS3</th>
<th>GVA per employee NUTS3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barking and Dagenham London Boro</td>
<td>East and North East Outer London</td>
<td>22,089</td>
<td>46,530</td>
<td>454,449</td>
<td>£48,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakefield District</td>
<td>Calderdale, Kirklees and Wakefield</td>
<td>13,827</td>
<td>135,150</td>
<td>364,423</td>
<td>£37,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swindon District (B)</td>
<td>Swindon</td>
<td>28,208</td>
<td>54,746</td>
<td>509,349</td>
<td>£53,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poole (B)</td>
<td>Dorset</td>
<td>6,473</td>
<td>78,960</td>
<td>152,398</td>
<td>£42,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Peterborough (B)</td>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>13,111</td>
<td>95,117</td>
<td>271,474</td>
<td>£48,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Norfolk District</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>13,393</td>
<td>28,445</td>
<td>318,332</td>
<td>£42,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldeyar (B)</td>
<td>Gosport</td>
<td>23,372</td>
<td>71,332</td>
<td>504,423</td>
<td>£48,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harborough District</td>
<td>North Yorkshire CC</td>
<td>9,619</td>
<td>37,561</td>
<td>241,736</td>
<td>£39,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brent London Boro</td>
<td>West and North West Outer London</td>
<td>40,981</td>
<td>93,790</td>
<td>738,206</td>
<td>£55,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandwell District (B)</td>
<td>Dudley and Sandwell</td>
<td>8,738</td>
<td>119,500</td>
<td>234,340</td>
<td>£37,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton London Boro</td>
<td>South Outer London</td>
<td>20,348</td>
<td>63,613</td>
<td>416,357</td>
<td>£48,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Devon District</td>
<td>Devon CC</td>
<td>12,167</td>
<td>22,473</td>
<td>301,459</td>
<td>£40,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Bedfordshire District</td>
<td>Bedfordshire CC</td>
<td>6,527</td>
<td>87,939</td>
<td>87,941</td>
<td>£74,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breckland District</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>13,393</td>
<td>37,780</td>
<td>318,332</td>
<td>£42,072</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Costs Analysis - Existing level of Structural Protection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Cost</th>
<th>Flood Mitigation Costs</th>
<th>Maintenance and Replacement Costs</th>
<th>Total Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030s</td>
<td>£3,027</td>
<td>£74</td>
<td>£3,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040s</td>
<td>£3,027</td>
<td>£74</td>
<td>£3,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050s</td>
<td>£3,027</td>
<td>£74</td>
<td>£3,101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### NO CC Scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Cost</th>
<th>Flood Mitigation Costs</th>
<th>Maintenance and Replacement Costs</th>
<th>Total Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030s</td>
<td>£3,027</td>
<td>£74</td>
<td>£3,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040s</td>
<td>£3,027</td>
<td>£74</td>
<td>£3,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050s</td>
<td>£3,027</td>
<td>£74</td>
<td>£3,101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### MEDIUM CC Scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Cost</th>
<th>Flood Mitigation Costs</th>
<th>Maintenance and Replacement Costs</th>
<th>Total Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030s</td>
<td>£3,027</td>
<td>£74</td>
<td>£3,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040s</td>
<td>£3,027</td>
<td>£74</td>
<td>£3,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050s</td>
<td>£3,027</td>
<td>£74</td>
<td>£3,101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Damages

### Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme Life (Years)</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>75</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>250</th>
<th>500</th>
<th>1,000</th>
<th>2,000</th>
<th>5,000</th>
<th>10,000</th>
<th>20,000</th>
<th>50,000</th>
<th>75,000</th>
<th>100,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discount Rate (%)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discount factor</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAAD</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discount WAAD</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAAD</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discount WAAD</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undiscounted</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discounted</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Shops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme Life (Years)</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>75</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>250</th>
<th>500</th>
<th>1,000</th>
<th>2,000</th>
<th>5,000</th>
<th>10,000</th>
<th>20,000</th>
<th>50,000</th>
<th>75,000</th>
<th>100,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discount Rate (%)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discount factor</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAAD</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discount WAAD</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAAD</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discount WAAD</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undiscounted</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discounted</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Discount WAAD

#### Weighted Average - Commercial without PLP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural level of protection</th>
<th>0 year</th>
<th>2 year</th>
<th>5 year</th>
<th>10 year</th>
<th>20 year</th>
<th>50 year</th>
<th>75 year</th>
<th>100 year</th>
<th>250 year</th>
<th>500 year</th>
<th>1,000 year</th>
<th>2,000 year</th>
<th>5,000 year</th>
<th>10,000 year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WAAD Damage without PLP (per sqm)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAAD Damage with PLP (per sqm)</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>1,716</td>
<td>3,245</td>
<td>5,199</td>
<td>8,247</td>
<td>22,227</td>
<td>36,315</td>
<td>72,207</td>
<td>120,410</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>301,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoided damage with PLP (per sqm)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>1,296</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Weighted Average - Commercial with PLP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural level of protection</th>
<th>0 year</th>
<th>2 year</th>
<th>5 year</th>
<th>10 year</th>
<th>20 year</th>
<th>50 year</th>
<th>75 year</th>
<th>100 year</th>
<th>250 year</th>
<th>500 year</th>
<th>1,000 year</th>
<th>2,000 year</th>
<th>5,000 year</th>
<th>10,000 year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WAAD Damage without PLP (per sqm)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAAD Damage with PLP (per sqm)</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>1,716</td>
<td>3,245</td>
<td>5,199</td>
<td>8,247</td>
<td>22,227</td>
<td>36,315</td>
<td>72,207</td>
<td>120,410</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>301,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoided damage with PLP (per sqm)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>1,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discount factor</td>
<td>WAAD</td>
<td>Discount WAAD</td>
<td>WAAD</td>
<td>Discount WAAD</td>
<td>WAAD</td>
<td>Discount WAAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 year</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>10,533</td>
<td>199,529</td>
<td>1.628</td>
<td>28,265</td>
<td>8.649</td>
<td>131,063</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 year</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>9,374</td>
<td>181,028</td>
<td>1.470</td>
<td>25,555</td>
<td>7.543</td>
<td>114,164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 year</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>5,075</td>
<td>77,207</td>
<td>1.254</td>
<td>16,315</td>
<td>3.721</td>
<td>58,092</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 year</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>2,573</td>
<td>38,475</td>
<td>1.152</td>
<td>10,960</td>
<td>2.193</td>
<td>28,145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 year</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>23,165</td>
<td>1.085</td>
<td>7,298</td>
<td>1.474</td>
<td>15,035</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 year</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>15,509</td>
<td>1.042</td>
<td>5,354</td>
<td>1.047</td>
<td>9,933</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 year</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>10,299</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>3,992</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>6,965</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 year</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>6,441</td>
<td>0.967</td>
<td>2,888</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>4,281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 year</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>4,154</td>
<td>0.937</td>
<td>1,783</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>2,941</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125 year</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>1,369</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1,123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 year</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>0.884</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>905</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 year</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>416</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discount factor</th>
<th>WAAD</th>
<th>Discount WAAD</th>
<th>WAAD</th>
<th>Discount WAAD</th>
<th>WAAD</th>
<th>Discount WAAD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 year</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>9,675</td>
<td>146,575</td>
<td>1.628</td>
<td>28,265</td>
<td>8.649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 year</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>8,473</td>
<td>128,687</td>
<td>1.470</td>
<td>25,555</td>
<td>7.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 year</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>4,633</td>
<td>70,588</td>
<td>1.254</td>
<td>16,315</td>
<td>3.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 year</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>2,377</td>
<td>45,301</td>
<td>1.152</td>
<td>10,960</td>
<td>2.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 year</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>1,389</td>
<td>21,128</td>
<td>1.085</td>
<td>7,298</td>
<td>1.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 year</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>14,567</td>
<td>1.042</td>
<td>5,354</td>
<td>1.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 year</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>9,151</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>3,992</td>
<td>945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 year</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>5,927</td>
<td>0.967</td>
<td>2,888</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 year</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>3,754</td>
<td>0.937</td>
<td>1,783</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125 year</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>1,428</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 year</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>0.884</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 year</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Weighted Average - Residential (with PLP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural level of protection</th>
<th>WAAD Damage with PLP (per unit)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Detached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 year</td>
<td>2,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 year</td>
<td>2,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 year</td>
<td>985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 year</td>
<td>678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 year</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 year</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 year</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 year</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 year</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Weighted Average - Residential (without PLP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural level of protection</th>
<th>WAAD Potential Average without PLP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Detached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 year</td>
<td>12,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 year</td>
<td>11,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 year</td>
<td>6,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 year</td>
<td>3,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 year</td>
<td>1,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 year</td>
<td>1,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 year</td>
<td>526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 year</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 year</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 year</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Waad Damage with PLP (per unit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural level of protection</th>
<th>Waad Damage with PLP (per unit)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Detached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 year</td>
<td>2,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 year</td>
<td>2,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 year</td>
<td>985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 year</td>
<td>678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 year</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 year</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 year</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 year</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 year</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Waad Potential Average without PLP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural level of protection</th>
<th>Waad Potential Average without PLP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Detached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 year</td>
<td>12,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 year</td>
<td>11,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 year</td>
<td>6,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 year</td>
<td>3,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 year</td>
<td>1,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 year</td>
<td>1,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 year</td>
<td>526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 year</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 year</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 year</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Waad Potential Average without PLP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural level of protection</th>
<th>Waad Potential Average without PLP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Detached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 year</td>
<td>2,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 year</td>
<td>2,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 year</td>
<td>985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 year</td>
<td>678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 year</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 year</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 year</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 year</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 year</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Waad Potential Average without PLP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural level of protection</th>
<th>Waad Potential Average without PLP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Detached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 year</td>
<td>12,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 year</td>
<td>11,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 year</td>
<td>6,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 year</td>
<td>3,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 year</td>
<td>1,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 year</td>
<td>1,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 year</td>
<td>526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 year</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 year</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 year</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Cost of manual resistance package

### Residential Costs Band

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs Band</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Shop</th>
<th>Detached</th>
<th>Flat</th>
<th>Semi-detached</th>
<th>Terraced</th>
<th>Total Discounted Cost (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIGH COST</strong></td>
<td>£7,060</td>
<td>£5,060</td>
<td>£3,570</td>
<td>£2,743</td>
<td>£3,310</td>
<td>£2,713</td>
<td>£9,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£141.20</td>
<td>£120.60</td>
<td>£71</td>
<td>£55</td>
<td>£66</td>
<td>£54</td>
<td>£151.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOW COST</strong></td>
<td>£5,660</td>
<td>£4,730</td>
<td>£2,610</td>
<td>£2,048</td>
<td>£2,450</td>
<td>£2,030</td>
<td>£7,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£113.20</td>
<td>£94.60</td>
<td>£52</td>
<td>£41</td>
<td>£49</td>
<td>£41</td>
<td>£151.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Calculation

- **£151.33** Annual capital cost on 20 year basis
- **£302.65** Annual Maintenance
- **£3.98** Total Average Annual Mitigation - per residential unit
- **£39.82** Total Average Annual Mitigation - per sqm (based on average dwelling 76 sqm)
- **£0.80** Lump sum figure per sqm (excluding maintenance)
- **£0.80** Annual maintenance per sqm @ 2%
### Assumptions

#### Appraisal Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Source:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>years (2012 - 2100)</td>
<td>Study team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Treasury Green Book (2003 Edition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Treasury Green Book (2003 Edition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Treasury Green Book (2003 Edition)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Potential Average Annual Damage costs: Increase in AAD driven by climate change - Commercial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Baseline - Average Annual Damage (AAD)</th>
<th>% increase</th>
<th>2020s</th>
<th>2050s</th>
<th>2080s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire &amp; Humber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>£3.67</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>126%</td>
<td>126%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med</td>
<td>£4.65</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>138%</td>
<td>251%</td>
<td>251%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>£6.00</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>207%</td>
<td>377%</td>
<td>377%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>£3.29</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>126%</td>
<td>126%</td>
<td>126%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med</td>
<td>£4.65</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>251%</td>
<td>251%</td>
<td>251%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>£6.00</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>377%</td>
<td>377%</td>
<td>377%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>£0.73</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med</td>
<td>£0.73</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>167%</td>
<td>167%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>£0.73</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>138%</td>
<td>251%</td>
<td>251%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>£0.73</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med</td>
<td>£0.73</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>167%</td>
<td>167%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>£0.73</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>138%</td>
<td>251%</td>
<td>251%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>£0.73</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med</td>
<td>£0.73</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>£0.73</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>126%</td>
<td>126%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>£0.73</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med</td>
<td>£0.73</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>£0.73</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>126%</td>
<td>126%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>£0.73</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med</td>
<td>£0.73</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>167%</td>
<td>167%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>£0.73</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>138%</td>
<td>251%</td>
<td>251%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>£0.73</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>126%</td>
<td>126%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med</td>
<td>£0.73</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>138%</td>
<td>251%</td>
<td>251%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>£0.73</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>207%</td>
<td>377%</td>
<td>377%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Potential Average Annual Damage costs: Increase in AAD driven by climate change - Residential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Baseline - Average Annual Damage (AAD) - Location</th>
<th>£ per residential unit</th>
<th>2050s</th>
<th>2080s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire &amp; Humber</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>£113</td>
<td>£1.49</td>
<td>75 year level of protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>£258</td>
<td>£3.40</td>
<td>40 year level of protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>£110</td>
<td>104%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>£52</td>
<td>£0.69</td>
<td>200 year level of protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>£181</td>
<td>£2.38</td>
<td>50 year level of protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>£181</td>
<td>119%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>£52</td>
<td>£0.69</td>
<td>200 year level of protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>£181</td>
<td>£2.38</td>
<td>50 year level of protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>£181</td>
<td>119%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>£52</td>
<td>£0.69</td>
<td>200 year level of protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>£181</td>
<td>£2.38</td>
<td>50 year level of protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>£181</td>
<td>119%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>£181</td>
<td>£2.38</td>
<td>50 year level of protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>£181</td>
<td>£2.38</td>
<td>50 year level of protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>£181</td>
<td>119%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>£113</td>
<td>£1.49</td>
<td>75 year level of protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>£258</td>
<td>£3.40</td>
<td>40 year level of protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>£110</td>
<td>104%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>