Between Roman Road and Goldwell Lane - SS5			
Area of site (ha): 3.62	**Site Address:** Between Roman Road and Goldwell Lane, Aldington, TN25		**Site Use:** Mixed
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Hythe Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests permeability at this site, a site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

• Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

By The Way - SS2			
Area of site (ha): 0.32	**Site Address:** Land adjacent to By The Way, frith Road, Aldington, TN25 7DG		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology	Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits	No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area

SuDS Type	Potential Suitability	Comments
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Coopers Field - SS1			
Area of site (ha): 1.56	**Site Address:** Coopers Field, Roman Road, Aldington, TN25 6DH		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Hythe Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests permeability at this site, a site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land east of Goldwell Lane - SS4			
Area of site (ha): 2.22	**Site Address:** Land east of Goldwell Lane, Aldington, TN25 7DX		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Hythe Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests permeability at this site, a site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Quarry Wood - SS3			
Area of site (ha): 1.85	**Site Address:** Land south and west of Quarry Wood, Aldington		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Hythe Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests permeability at this site, a site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site.

- Implications for development

• Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Rear of Appledore Village Hall - IO2			
Area of site (ha): 1.63	**Site Address:** Land rear of Appledore Village Hall and Doctors Surgery, Appledore, TN26 2AE		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1.	**FZ2 :** less than 10% coverage	**FZ3a:** less than 10% coverage	**FZ3b :** less than 10% coverage
Flood Warning	The site submission is within an Environment Agency flood warning area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in postcode area TN26 2

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Tunbridge Wells Sand Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests permeability at this site, a site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

• Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
• Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.
• For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary.

South east of May House - IO1			
Area of site (ha): 0.23	**Site Address:** Land south east of May House, Tenterden Road, Appledore, TN26 2AL		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Tunbridge Wells Sand Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests permeability at this site, a site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Beechbrook - DW12			
Area of site (ha): 51.12	**Site Address:** Beechbrook, Maidstone Road, Ashford, TN25		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Folkestone Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay and Silt
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Former Concorde House - NO1			
Area of site (ha): 0.4	**Site Address:** Land at Former Concorde House, Ashford, TN23 6JR	**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where at least 25% to 50% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology	Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits	Sand and Gravel

SuDS Type	Potential Suitability	Comments
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

• Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Former Powergen Site NORTH - VC1			
Area of site (ha): 1.25	**Site Address:** Former Powergen Site NORTH, Ashford, TN23 1HS		**Site Use:** Mixed
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	Sept 1973 - Fluvial flooding		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1.	**FZ2 :** Between 10% and 50% coverage	**FZ3a:** Between 10% and 50% coverage	**FZ3b :** Between 10% and 50% coverage
Flood Warning	The site submission is within an Environment Agency flood warning area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where at least 25% to 50% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus central climate change (+35%) modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature maybe feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

• Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
• Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Former Powergen Site SOUTH - VC2			
Area of site (ha): 2.43	**Site Address:** Former Powergen Site SOUTH, Ashford, TN23 1HS	**Site Use:** Mixed	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	Yes		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	Sept 1973 - Fluvial flooding		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1.	**FZ2 :** Greater than 50% coverage	**FZ3a:** Greater than 50% coverage	**FZ3b :** Greater than 50% coverage
Flood Warning	The site submission is within an Environment Agency flood warning area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where at least 25% to 50% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus central climate change (+35%) modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature maybe feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
- A Flood Defence Consent is required from the Environment Agency for any development proposals within 8m of a designated Main River/Flood Defence.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Klondyke - AG1			
Area of site (ha): 0.98	**Site Address:** Klondyke, Newtown Road, Ashford, TN24 0PN		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	Sept 1973 - Fluvial flooding		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** Less than 10% coverage	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	The site submission is within an Environment Agency flood warning area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where at least 25% to 50% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control excluding pervious pavements would be suitable.
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature maybe feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land at Victoria Road - VC3				
Area of site (ha): 2.4	**Site Address:** Land at Victoria Road, Ashford, TN23 7HE		**Site Use:** Mixed	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	Yes			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes			
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1.	**FZ2 :** less than 10% coverage	**FZ3a:** less than 10% coverage	**FZ3b :** less than 10% coverage
Flood Warning	The site submission is within an Environment Agency flood warning area.			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus upper end climate change (+105%) modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
- A Flood Defence Consent is required from the Environment Agency for any development proposals within 8m of a designated Main River/Flood Defence.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Policy U7 of the Leacon Road, Ashford - VC4			
Area of site (ha): 2.03	**Site Address:** Land adjacent to Leacon Road and Beaver Lane		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	Sept 1973, Nov/Dec 2009 - Fluvial flooding		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** Greater than 50% coverage	**FZ3a:** Greater than 50% coverage	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	The site submission is within an Environment Agency flood warning area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where at least 25% to 50% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus upper end climate change (+105%) modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Romney Marsh Road - NO2				
Area of site (ha): 4.76	**Site Address:** Romney Marsh Road, Ashford, TN24 0SD		**Site Use:** Mixed	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	Yes			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes			
Historic Flooding	Sept 1973, Oct 2000 Nov 2000, Feb 2001 - Records describe flooding in and around the Romney Marsh Road including property and the Ashford Outlet Centre area.			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1.	**FZ2 :** Greater than 50% coverage	**FZ3a:** Greater than 50% coverage	**FZ3b :** Greater than 50% coverage
Flood Warning	The site submission is within an Environment Agency flood warning area.			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where at least 25% to 50% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in postcode area TN23 7

Effects of climate change:
This site is within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus central climate change (+35%) modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
- A Flood Defence Consent is required from the Environment Agency for any development proposals within 8m of a designated Main River/Flood Defence.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary.

The Warren - BO1			
Area of site (ha): 4.15	**Site Address:** The Warren, land adjacent Drovers roundabout (Policy U8) TN25 4DT		**Site Use:** Mixed
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Hythe Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests permeability at this site, a site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Ulley Farm - KE1			
Area of site (ha): 11.24	**Site Address:** Land at Ulley Farm, Ball Lane, Kennington, Ashford		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1.	**FZ2 :** less than 10% coverage	**FZ3a:** less than 10% coverage	**FZ3b :** less than 10% coverage
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Gault Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay and Silt
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land at Church Hill - WC5			
Area of site (ha): 1.57	**Site Address:** Land at Church Hill, Bethersden, TN		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	Yes		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1.	**FZ2 :** Between 10% and 50% coverage	**FZ3a:** Between 10% and 50% coverage	**FZ3b :** less than 10% coverage
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
- A Flood Defence Consent is required from the Environment Agency for any development proposals within 8m of a designated Main River/Flood Defence.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land to the east of Bethersden - WC1			
Area of site (ha): 1.05	**Site Address:** Land to the east of Bethersden, TN26 3AT		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in postcode area TN26 3

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary.

Mill Road and Old Surrenden Manor Road - WC3			
Area of site (ha): 1.14	**Site Address:** Land fronting Mill Road and Old Surrenden Manor Road, Bethersden, TN26	**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

North of the A28 - WC4			
Area of site (ha): 1.62	**Site Address:** Land to the north of the A28 off Forge Hill, Bethersden, TN26 3AF		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in postcode area TN26 3

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary.

Rear of Mill Road - WC2				
Area of site (ha): 1	**Site Address:** Land to the rear of proposed development off Mill Road, Bethersden		**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No			
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Crampton Meadows - BD7			
Area of site (ha): 8.06	**Site Address:** Crampton Meadows, Biddenden, TN26 3HR		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Foxwood Farm - BD3			
Area of site (ha): 5.43	**Site Address:** Land at Foxwood Farm, Cranbrook Road, Tenterden, TN30 6UR	**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Tunbridge Wells Sand Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature maybe feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land adjoining Gate House - BD4			
Area of site (ha): 0.91	**Site Address:** Land adjoining Gate House, Biddenden, TN27 8AS		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in postcode area TN27 8

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control excluding pervious pavements would be suitable.
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature maybe feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

• ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
• Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.
• For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary.

Land at North Street - BD8			
Area of site (ha): 3.27	**Site Address:** Land at North Street, Biddenden, TN27 8BA		**Site Use:** Mixed
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

New House Farmland - BD5			
Area of site (ha): 0.32	**Site Address:** New House Farmland, Biddenden, TN27 8HJ		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

• Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Newcastle Farm Field - BD6			
Area of site (ha): 1.45	**Site Address:** Newcastle Farm Field, Newcastle Corner, Headcorn Road, Biddenden, TN27 8JW	**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Priorywoods - BD1			
Area of site (ha): 2.55	**Site Address:** Priorywoods, Tenterden Road, Biddenden, TN27 8BH		**Site Use:** Gypsy
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'highly vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Tunbridge Wells Sand Formation and Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests permeability at this site, a site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Rose Garden Paddock - BD2			
Area of site (ha): 1.84	**Site Address:** Rose Garden Paddock, Hareplain Road, Biddenden, TN27 8LJ		**Site Use:** Gypsy
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'highly vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land at Bonnington - SS6			
Area of site (ha): 1.11	**Site Address:** Land at Bonnington, TN25 7BN		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control excluding pervious pavements would be suitable.
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature maybe feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

• Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
• Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Former Sandpit - BAE2			
Area of site (ha): 2.34	**Site Address:** Former Sandpit, Sandyhurst Lane, Boughton Aluph		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
TThe AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology	Folkestone Formation
Superficial Deposits	No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area

SuDS Type	Potential Suitability	Comments
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature maybe feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

• Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
• Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land adjacent to Gardeners House, Faversham Road - BAE3			
Area of site (ha): 0.95	**Site Address:** Land adjacent to Gardeners House, Faversham Road, Boughton Aluph, TN25 4HP		**Site Use:** Leisure
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of a potiential leisure development.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Zig Zag Chalk Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control excluding pervious pavements would be suitable.
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature maybe feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Lenacre Hall Farm - BAE1			
Area of site (ha): 12.61	**Site Address:** Lenacre Hall Farm, 393 Sandyhurst Lane, Boughton Aluph, TN25 4PF		**Site Use:** Mixed
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Gault Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay and Silt
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Nats Lane - WY1			
Area of site (ha): 1.25	**Site Address:** Nats Lane, The Street, Brook, TN25 5PJ		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	Yes		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1.	**FZ2 :** less than 10% coverage	**FZ3a:** less than 10% coverage	**FZ3b :** less than 10% coverage
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where at least 25% to 50% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Gault Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
- A Flood Defence Consent is required from the Environment Agency for any development proposals within 8m of a designated Main River/Flood Defence.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Clockhouse Land - DW4			
Area of site (ha): 2.23	**Site Address:** Clockhouse Land, Clockhouse Farm Land, Canterbury Road, Challock, TN25 4BJ	**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Seaford Chalk Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

High Tree Lodge - DW1				
Area of site (ha): 1.77	**Site Address:** High Tree Lodge, Buck Street, Challock, TN25 4AT		**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No			
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Seaford Chalk Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land adjacent to Alicia - DW3			
Area of site (ha): 1.87	**Site Address:** Land adjacent to Alicia, Challock, Tn25 4DP		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology	Seaford Chalk Formation
Superficial Deposits	Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel

SuDS Type	Potential Suitability	Comments
Source Control		All forms of source control excluding pervious pavements would be suitable.
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature maybe feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

• Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land South of Blind Lane - DW5			
Area of site (ha): 5.98	**Site Address:** Land South of Blind Lane and West of Church Lane, Challock, TN25		**Site Use:** Mixed
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Seaford Chalk Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Pony Park - DW2			
Area of site (ha): 3.67	**Site Address:** Land at Pony Park, Challock, TN25 4DL		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Seaford Chalk Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Flexford Nurseries - CH2			
Area of site (ha): 1.9	**Site Address:** Flexford Nurseries, Charing Hill, Charing, TN27 0LX		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Zig Zag Chalk Formation and Holywell Nodular Chalk Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests permeability at this site, a site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land at Brockton Farm Paddock - WC20			
Area of site (ha): 1.69	**Site Address:** Land at Brockton Farm Paddock, Vicarage Lane, Egerton Road, Charing Heath, Ashford, TN27 0AX	**Site Use:** Gypsy	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'highly vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in postcode area TN27 0

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Sandgate Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

• Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
• Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.
• For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary.

Land at top of Charing Hill - CH6				
Area of site (ha): 0.48	**Site Address:** Land at top of Charing Hill, Charing		**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No			
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land on western side of Pluckley Road - CH7			
Area of site (ha): 4.76	**Site Address:** Land on western side of Pluckley Road, Charing		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	Sept 1973, Mar 1974, Nov 2000 and Feb 2001 - Fluvial Flooding		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Folkestone Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests permeability at this site, a site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Lyndhurst House - CH5				
Area of site (ha): 0.22	**Site Address:** Land at Charing Hill (adjoining Lyndhurst House) TN27 0NG		**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No			
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Northdowns Service Station - CH4			
Area of site (ha): 1.36	**Site Address:** Northdowns Service Station, A20, Charing, TN27 0JS		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		West Melbury Marly Chalk Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay and Silt
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Oak Barn - CH1			
Area of site (ha): 0.21	**Site Address:** Land Adjacent Oak Barn, Pett Lane. Charing, TN27 0DS		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		West Melbury Marly Chalk Formation and Zig Zag Chalk Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests permeability at this site, a site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Pluckley Road - CH3			
Area of site (ha): 23.27	**Site Address:** Land West of Pluckley Road, Charing, TN27 0AL	**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	Regular surface water flooding recorded on Charing Heath Road and Pluckley Road.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology	Folkestone Formation
Superficial Deposits	Clay and Silt

SuDS Type	Potential Suitability	Comments
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

• Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
• ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
• Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

The Abbatoir, Dog Kennel Lane - CH8			
Area of site (ha): 1.92	**Site Address:** The Abbatoir, Dog Kennel Lane (Anglo Dutch Meats Ltd), Charing, TN27 0JL		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Gault Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Ashford Road Service Station - DN3			
Area of site (ha): 0.19	**Site Address:** Ashford Road Service Station, Ashford Road, Chilham, CT4 8EE	**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1.	**FZ2 :** Greater than 50% coverage	**FZ3a:** Between 10% and 50% coverage	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	The site submission is within an Environment Agency flood warning area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where at least 25% to 50% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus central climate change (+35%) modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay and Silt
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Cobbs Hill - DN1			
Area of site (ha): 1.19	**Site Address:** Land between Cobbs Hill and Long Hill, Old Wives Lees, CT4 8AL	**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in postcode areas TN23 3 and TN26 1

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Seaford Chalk Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary.

Land at Harvest House - DN2			
Area of site (ha): 0.8	**Site Address:** Land at Harvest House, Branch Road, Chilham, CT4 8DR	**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1.	**FZ2 :** less than 10% coverage	**FZ3a:** less than 10% coverage	**FZ3b :** less than 10% coverage
Flood Warning	The site submission is within an Environment Agency flood warning area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where at least 25% to 50% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus central climate change (+35%) modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay and Silt
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land at Mulberry Hill - DN4			
Area of site (ha): 1.13	**Site Address:** Land at Mulberry Hill, Chilham, CT4 8AH		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Seaford Chalk Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests permeability at this site, a site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Noveis - DN5			
Area of site (ha): 0.21	**Site Address:** Noveis, Canterbury Road, Chilham, CT4 8DX		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where at least 25% to 50% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay and Silt
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Former Nickolls Quarry - GCS1			
Area of site (ha): 3.45	**Site Address:** Former Nickolls Quarry, Chilmington		**Site Use:** Gypsy
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'highly vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Hythe Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests permeability at this site, a site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land at Rook Toll - BAE4			
Area of site (ha): 3.5	**Site Address:** Land at Rook Toll, Eastwell		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Zig Zag Chalk Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Broad Ham - WN1			
Area of site (ha): 2	**Site Address:** Broad Ham, Rock Hill Road, Egerton, TN27 9DP		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

NE of New Road - WN2				
Area of site (ha): 1.69	**Site Address:** Land to the NE of New Road, Egerton		**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No			
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Hythe Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests permeability at this site, a site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

A28 Bethersden Road - GCS5			
Area of site (ha): 20.27	**Site Address:** A28 Bethersden Road (Land north of Possingham Farmhouse) TN26 1JL		**Site Use:** Mixed
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Great Chart Golf Course - GCS3			
Area of site (ha): 10.27	**Site Address:** Great Chart Golf Course, Bears Lane, Great Chart, TN23 3BW		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature maybe feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Pig and Whistle - GCS4			
Area of site (ha): 0.97	**Site Address:** Pig and Whistle, Ashford Road, Great Chart, TN23 3DH		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

The Meadows - GCS2			
Area of site (ha): 0.58	**Site Address:** The Meadows, Sandy Lane, Great Chart, TN26 1JN		**Site Use:** Gypsy
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'highly vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

• Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Hamstreet Garden Centre - WS1			
Area of site (ha): 3.59	**Site Address:** Hamstreet Garden Centre, Marsh Road, Hamstreet, TN26 2QP		**Site Use:** Mixed
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	Yes		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1.	**FZ2 :** less than 10% coverage	**FZ3a:** less than 10% coverage	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	The site submission is within an Environment Agency flood warning area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus central climate change (+35%) modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology		Tunbridge Wells Sand Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay and Silt
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature maybe feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
- A Flood Defence Consent is required from the Environment Agency for any development proposals within 8m of a designated Main River/Flood Defence.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land north of St Marys Close - WS30			
Area of site (ha): 8.54	**Site Address:** Land north of St Marys Close, Hamstreet, TN26 2DX	**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1.	**FZ2 :** less than 10% coverage	**FZ3a:** less than 10% coverage	**FZ3b :** less than 10% coverage
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus central climate change (+35%) modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Black Cottage Orchard - WC9			
Area of site (ha): 0.66	**Site Address:** Black Cottage Orchard (2 sites), High Halden, TN26 3BS		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Homestall Farm - WC8			
Area of site (ha): 0.4	**Site Address:** Land to the East of Homestall Farm, Ashford Road, High Halden, TN26 3BS		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	2009 - Surface water flooding on Ashford Road		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

• Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Hope House - WC12			
Area of site (ha): 2.17	**Site Address:** Land at Hope House, High Halden, TN26 3NA		**Site Use:** Mixed
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land to the north side of Church Hill - WC11			
Area of site (ha): 1.12	**Site Address:** Land to the north side of Church Hill, High Halden, TN26 3JB		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Lees Paddock - WC6			
Area of site (ha): 1.32	**Site Address:** Lees Paddock, Pot Kiln Lane, High Halden, TN26 3HJ	**Site Use:** Gypsy	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'highly vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Outbuildings at Quakers - WC10			
Area of site (ha): 0.21	**Site Address:** Outbuildings at Quakers, Woodchurch Road, High Halden, TN26 3JQ	**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Pasture land adjoining St Michales Court - WC13			
Area of site (ha): 5.82	**Site Address:** Pasture land adjoining St Michales Court and Sportsman Farm, Halden Lane, High Halden	**Site Use:** Mixed	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Tyrol Farm - WC7			
Area of site (ha): 0.18	**Site Address:** Tyrol Farm, Plurenden Road, High Halden, TN26 3JN		**Site Use:** Gypsy
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'highly vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Station Road Coach Drive - DW6			
Area of site (ha): 3	**Site Address:** Station Road Coach Drive, Home Farm, Hothfield, TN26 1AB		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Folkestone Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests permeability at this site, a site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

• Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
• Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

High House Nursery - IO4			
Area of site (ha): 1.99	**Site Address:** High House Nursery, Kenardington, TN26 2LX		**Site Use:** Mixed
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Tunbridge Wells Sand Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests permeability at this site, a site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land at High House Farm - IO3			
Area of site (ha): 2.62	**Site Address:** Land at High House Farm, Kenardington, TN26 2LX		**Site Use:** Mixed
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Tunbridge Wells Sand Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests permeability at this site, a site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Ashford Golf Club - BBAE1			
Area of site (ha): 41.33	**Site Address:** Ashford Golf Club, Sandyhurst Lane, Kennington, TN25 4NT		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology		Folkestone Formation and Sandgate Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land at Eureka Park - BBAE2			
Area of site (ha): 61.28	**Site Address:** Land at Eureka Park, Kennington		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Folkestone Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land east of A28 - KE4			
Area of site (ha): 36.45	**Site Address:** Land east of A28, Kennington		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1.	**FZ2 :** less than 10% coverage	**FZ3a:** less than 10% coverage	**FZ3b :** less than 10% coverage
Flood Warning	The site submission is within an Environment Agency flood warning area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology	Gault Formation
Superficial Deposits	Clay and Silt

SuDS Type	Potential Suitability	Comments
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land NE of A2070 - KE3			
Area of site (ha): 33.29	**Site Address:** Land NE of A2070, Willesborough Road, Kennington		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	Sept 1973 - Fluvial flooding		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** Between 10% and 50% coverage	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	The site submission is within an Environment Agency flood warning area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Folkestone Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay and Silt
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Orchard Farm - KE2			
Area of site (ha): 5.57	**Site Address:** Orchard Farm, Kennington, TN25 4DU		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Folkestone Formation and Gault Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay and Silt
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Rugby Club - BY1				
Area of site (ha): 8.8	**Site Address:** Ashford Rugby Club, Kennington, Ashford, TN24 9QB		**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	Yes			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes			
Historic Flooding	Nov 2000, Feb 2001 - Fluvial flooding			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1.	**FZ2 :** Greater than 50% coverage	**FZ3a:** Greater than 50% coverage	**FZ3b :** Greater than 50% coverage
Flood Warning	The site submission is within an Environment Agency flood warning area.			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in postcode area TN24 9

Effects of climate change:
This site is within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus central climate change (+35%) modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Folkestone Formation and Sandgate Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
- A Flood Defence Consent is required from the Environment Agency for any development proposals within 8m of a designated Main River/Flood Defence.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary.

The Bamboos and Longwood - BO2			
Area of site (ha): 0.96	**Site Address:** The Bamboos and Longwood, Kennington, TN25 4AH		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Folkestone Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests permeability at this site, a site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

• Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

The Croft Hotel - KE5			
Area of site (ha): 0.64	**Site Address:** Croft Hotel, Canterbury Road, Kennington, TN25 4DU		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Gault Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay and Silt
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

• Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Ashford Canal District - NPFN1				
Area of site (ha): 52.26	**Site Address:** Ashford Canal District, Kingsnorth		**Site Use:** Mixed	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	Yes			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes			
Historic Flooding	Sept 1973, Mar 1974, Nov 2000, Feb 2001 - Fluvial flooding			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1.	**FZ2 :** Greater than 50% coverage	**FZ3a:** Greater than 50% coverage	**FZ3b :** Greater than 50% coverage
Flood Warning	The site submission is within an Environment Agency flood warning area.			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in postcode area TN23 7

Effects of climate change:
This site is within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus central climate change (+35%) modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- A Flood Defence Consent is required from the Environment Agency for any development proposals within 8m of a designated Main River/Flood Defence.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary.

Ashford Road - WS2			
Area of site (ha): 3.58	**Site Address:** Ashford Road, Kingsnorth, (Land south of Kingsnorth Ironworks) TN26 1NJ		**Site Use:** Gypsy
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'highly vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Briars - WS4			
Area of site (ha): 0.43	**Site Address:** Briars, Church Hill, Kingsnorth, TN23 3EG		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Finn Farm House - WS5			
Area of site (ha): 0.57	**Site Address:** Land adjoining Finn Farm House, Finn Farm Road, Kingsnorth, TN23 3EX		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

• Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Halfway Bungalow - WS3			
Area of site (ha): 10.92	**Site Address:** Fields behind Halfway Bungalow & Yard, Ashford Road, Kingsnorth, TN26 1NJ	**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	2012 - Surface water on Bear's Lane		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in postcode area TN26 2

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature maybe feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary.

Hookstead - WS9			
Area of site (ha): 15.59	**Site Address:** Hookstead, Steeds Lane, Kingsnorth, TN26 1NH		**Site Use:** Mixed
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Kingsnorth - WS10			
Area of site (ha): 55.09	**Site Address:** Kingsnorth TN26		**Site Use:** Mixed
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	Mar 1974 - Fluvial flooding		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1.	**FZ2 :** less than 10% coverage	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	The site submission is within an Environment Agency flood warning area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in postcode areas TN23 3 and TN26 1

Effects of climate change:
This site is within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus higher central climate change (+45%) modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control excluding pervious pavements would be suitable.
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature maybe feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary.

Land Adjacent To Hookstead - WE13			
Area of site (ha): 0.14	**Site Address:** Land adjacent to Hookstead, Steeds Lane, Kingsnorth, Kent, TN26 1NH		**Site Use:** Gypsy
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'highly vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where at least 25% to 50% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control excluding pervious pavements would be suitable.
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature maybe feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

• Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land at Court Lodge - WS11			
Area of site (ha): 97.96	**Site Address:** Land at Court Lodge, Kingsnorth, TN23		**Site Use:** Mixed
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	Yes		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	Mar 1974 - Fluvial flood		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1.	**FZ2 :** Between 10% and 50% coverage	**FZ3a:** Between 10% and 50% coverage	**FZ3b :** Between 10% and 50% coverage
Flood Warning	The site submission is within an Environment Agency flood warning area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in postcode area TN23 3

Effects of climate change:
This site is within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus central climate change (+35%) modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

• Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
• A Flood Defence Consent is required from the Environment Agency for any development proposals within 8m of a designated Main River/Flood Defence.
• Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.
• For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary.

Land at Finn Farm - WE4			
Area of site (ha): 17.21	**Site Address:** Land at Finn Farm, Kingsnorth, TN25 7EX		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land east of The Greens Business Centre - WE3			
Area of site (ha): 1.86	**Site Address:** Land east of The Greens Business Centre, Cheesemans Green Lane, Kingsnorth, TN25 7HY		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where at least 25% to 50% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

• Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
• Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land south of Magpie Hall Road - WS7				
Area of site (ha): 27.41	**Site Address:** Land south of Magpie Hall Road, Kingsnorth, TN26 1HF		**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No			
Historic Flooding	Mar 1974 - Fluvial flood			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in postcode area TN26 1

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

• Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
• Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.
• For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary.

Magpie Hall Road - WS6			
Area of site (ha): 17.15	**Site Address:** Magpie Hall Road, Kingsnorth End, (land to the south of Wainsbrook), TN26 1HG		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	Yes		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1.	**FZ2 :** Between 10% and 50% coverage	**FZ3a:** Between 10% and 50% coverage	**FZ3b :** Between 10% and 50% coverage
Flood Warning	The site submission is within an Environment Agency flood warning area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in postcode area TN26 1

Effects of climate change:
This site is within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus central climate change (+35%) modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
- A Flood Defence Consent is required from the Environment Agency for any development proposals within 8m of a designated Main River/Flood Defence.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary.

The Greens Business Centre - WE2			
Area of site (ha): 0.38	**Site Address:** The Greens Business Centre, Cheesemans Green Lane, Kingsnorth, TN25 7HY	**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where at least 25% to 50% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

• Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

The Park, Cheesemans Green - WS12			
Area of site (ha): 23.49	**Site Address:** The Park, Cheesemans Green, Kingsnorth, TN24 0LH		**Site Use:** Mixed
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	Sept 1973, Mar 1974, Nov 2000, Feb 2001 - Fluvial flooding		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1.	**FZ2 :** Between 10% and 50% coverage	**FZ3a:** Between 10% and 50% coverage	**FZ3b :** less than 10% coverage
Flood Warning	The site submission is within an Environment Agency flood warning area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where at least 25% to 50% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus central climate change (+35%) modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Triumvirate House - WS8			
Area of site (ha): 1.82	**Site Address:** Triumvirate House, Millbank Road, Kingsnorth, TN23 3JD	**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	Mar 1974 - Fluvial flooding		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in postcode area TN23 3

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary.

Chequer Tree Cottage - WE7			
Area of site (ha): 1.31	**Site Address:** Land Adjacent 1 Chequer Tree Cottage, Chequer Tree Lane, Mersham, TN25 7HL	**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

• Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
• Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Cranwell House - WE9			
Area of site (ha): 1.26	**Site Address:** Cranwell House, The Forstall, Mersham, TN25 6NU		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	Mar 1974 - Fluvial flooding		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation and Atherfield Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Frith Business Centre - WE14			
Area of site (ha): 1.06	**Site Address:** Frith Business Centre, Frith Road, Aldington Frith, TN25 7HJ	**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature maybe feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Frith Field - WE1			
Area of site (ha): 3.08	**Site Address:** Frith Field, Aldington Frith		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature maybe feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land at South Stour Apiary/Munday Farm House - WE10			
Area of site (ha): 3.62	**Site Address:** Land at South Stour Apiary/Munday Farm House, Mersham, TN25 7EX		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Orchard Cottage - WE8			
Area of site (ha): 0.53	**Site Address:** Land to the north of Orchard Cottage and Marden, Kingsford Street, Mersham, TN25 6PF	**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Hythe Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests permeability at this site, a site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

• ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
• Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Sevington Park - NWWE1			
Area of site (ha): 41.48	**Site Address:** Sevington Park, Land East of U19 Sevington		**Site Use:** Employment
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, a potential emplyment site falls within the 'less vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology		Hythe Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests permeability at this site, a site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

• Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
• Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land at Church Lane - DN7			
Area of site (ha): 0.24	**Site Address:** Land at Church Lane, Molash, CT4 8HD		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Seaford Chalk Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

• Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Pound Lane - DN6				
Area of site (ha): 0.25	**Site Address:** Land adjacent to No 1 Pound Lane, Molash, CT4 8HG		**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No			
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Seaford Chalk Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

• Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land to the south of Park Farm East - WE5			
Area of site (ha): 5.38	**Site Address:** Land to the south of Park Farm East, Park Farm, TN25 7AB	**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Park Farm South East - WE6			
Area of site (ha): 21.32	**Site Address:** Park Farm South East, Park Farm, TN25 7AB		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	Yes		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	Mar 1974, Nov 2000, Feb 2001 - Fluvial flooding Dec 2012- Sandbags were requested to protect properties		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1.	**FZ2 :** Between 10% and 50% coverage	**FZ3a:** Between 10% and 50% coverage	**FZ3b :** less than 10% coverage
Flood Warning	The site submission is within an Environment Agency flood warning area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus central climate change (+35%) modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
- A Flood Defence Consent is required from the Environment Agency for any development proposals within 8m of a designated Main River/Flood Defence.
- A Flood Defence Consent is required from the Environment Agency for any development proposals within 8m of a designated Main River/Flood Defence.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Former Pluckley Brickworks - WC16			
Area of site (ha): 13.43	**Site Address:** Former Pluckley Brickworks, Pluckley, TN27 0RP		**Site Use:** Mixed
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land NE of Smarden Road - WC14				
Area of site (ha): 1.54	**Site Address:** Land NE of Smarden Road, Pluckley		**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No			
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

• Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
• Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land west of Smarden Road - WC15				
Area of site (ha): 1.34	**Site Address:** Land west of Smarden Road, Pluckley		**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No			
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Redundant coal yard and retail centre - WC17			
Area of site (ha): 0.78	**Site Address:** Redundant coal yard and retail centre, Pluckley		**Site Use:** Mixed
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Copfield Farm - RTW1			
Area of site (ha): 4.04	**Site Address:** Copfield Farm, Rolvenden, TN17 4PN		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Wadhurst Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land adjacent to Church Road - HG1			
Area of site (ha): 1.64	**Site Address:** Land adjacent to Church Road, Sevington, TN24 0LE		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	Yes		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	Sept 1973 - Fluvial flooding		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1.	**FZ2 :** Greater than 50% coverage	**FZ3a:** Greater than 50% coverage	**FZ3b :** Between 10% and 50% coverage
Flood Warning	The site submission is within an Environment Agency flood warning area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus central climate change (+35%) modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Atherfield Clay Formation and Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control excluding pervious pavements would be suitable.
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature maybe feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
- A Flood Defence Consent is required from the Environment Agency for any development proposals within 8m of a designated Main River/Flood Defence.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Waterbrook Park - WE11				
Area of site (ha): 37.88	**Site Address:** Waterbrook Park, Sevington		**Site Use:** Mixed	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	Yes			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes			
Historic Flooding	Mar 1974, Nov 2000, Feb 2001 - Fluvial flooding			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1.	**FZ2 :** Between 10% and 50% coverage	**FZ3a:** Between 10% and 50% coverage	**FZ3b :** Between 10% and 50% coverage
Flood Warning	The site submission is within an Environment Agency flood warning area.			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus central climate change (+35%) modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control excluding pervious pavements would be suitable.
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature maybe feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
- A Flood Defence Consent is required from the Environment Agency for any development proposals within 8m of a designated Main River/Flood Defence.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Behind Tally Ho Road - WS22			
Area of site (ha): 5.57	**Site Address:** Shadoxhurst - behind Tally Ho Road (Land south of Blindgrooms Lane) TN26 1HL	**Site Use:** Mixed	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	Yes		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1.	**FZ2 :** Greater than 50% coverage	**FZ3a:** Greater than 50% coverage	**FZ3b :** Between 10% and 50% coverage
Flood Warning	The site submission is within an Environment Agency flood warning area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus central climate change (+35%) modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
- A Flood Defence Consent is required from the Environment Agency for any development proposals within 8m of a designated Main River/Flood Defence.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Criol Barn Field - WS18			
Area of site (ha): 1.08	**Site Address:** Criol Barn Field, Shadoxhurst, TN26 1LL		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Field to the north of Woodchurch Road - WS17			
Area of site (ha): 0.95	**Site Address:** Field to the north of Woodchurch Road, Shadoxhurst, TN26 1LE		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Hazeldene Lodge - WS15			
Area of site (ha): 2.95	**Site Address:** Hazeldene Lodge, Hamstreet Road, Shadoxhurst, TN26 1NN		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in postcode area TN26 2

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature maybe feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary.

Hornash Lane - WS23			
Area of site (ha): 6.01	**Site Address:** Hornash Lane (Land to the east of Haywain House) TN26 1HU		**Site Use:** Mixed
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control excluding pervious pavements would be suitable.
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature maybe feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Kings Head - WS21			
Area of site (ha): 1.56	**Site Address:** Land rear of Kings Head PH, Woodchurch Road, Shadoxhurst, TN26 1LQ	**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control excluding pervious pavements would be suitable.
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature maybe feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

• Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
• Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land North of Farley Close - WS19			
Area of site (ha): 0.34	**Site Address:** Land North of Farley Close, Shadoxhurst, TN26 1NB	**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

• Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Milee - WS13			
Area of site (ha): 1.53	**Site Address:** Land South of Milee, Nickley Wood Road, Shadoxhurst, TN26 1LZ	**Site Use:** Gypsy	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'highly vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

• Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
• Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Monks Field - WS16				
Area of site (ha): 20.81	**Site Address:** Monks Field, Blindgrooms Lane, Shadoxhurst, TN26 1HN		**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	Yes			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes			
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1.	**FZ2 :** less than 10% coverage	**FZ3a:** less than 10% coverage	**FZ3b :** less than 10% coverage
Flood Warning	The site submission is within an Environment Agency flood warning area.			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus central climate change (+35%) modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

• Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
• A Flood Defence Consent is required from the Environment Agency for any development proposals within 8m of a designated Main River/Flood Defence.
• Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

T.K. Banburys - WS14			
Area of site (ha): 0.48	**Site Address:** T.K. Banburys Yard, Blindgrooms Lane, Shadoxhurst, TN26 1HN		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	Yes		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1.	**FZ2 :** Between 10% and 50% coverage	**FZ3a:** Between 10% and 50% coverage	**FZ3b :** Between 10% and 50% coverage
Flood Warning	The site submission is within an Environment Agency flood warning area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus central climate change (+35%) modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
- A Flood Defence Consent is required from the Environment Agency for any development proposals within 8m of a designated Main River/Flood Defence.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Adjacent Smarden Village Hall - WN4			
Area of site (ha): 3.54	**Site Address:** Land adjacent to Smarden Village Hall. TN27 8NF	**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where at least 25% to 50% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land to the south of Smarden - WN7			
Area of site (ha): 3.6	**Site Address:** Land to the south of Smarden, Smarden, TN27 8QP	**Site Use:** Mixed	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Long Meadow - WN5			
Area of site (ha): 1.02	**Site Address:** Land adjacent to Long Meadow, Smarden, TN27 8NQ	**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where at least 25% to 50% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Mill Lane - WN3			
Area of site (ha): 0.61	**Site Address:** Mill Lane, Smarden (land between Boughton Cottage and Millview Cottage) TN27 8NN	**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where at least 25% to 50% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Ware Field - WN6			
Area of site (ha): 2.55	**Site Address:** Ware Field, Copper Lodge Farm, Water Lane, Smarden, TN27 8NR		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1.	**FZ2 :** Between 10% and 50% coverage	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	The site submission is within an Environment Agency flood warning area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land at Church Road - SS7			
Area of site (ha): 0.58	**Site Address:** Land at Church Road, Smeeth, TN26 6SA		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Folkestone Formation
Superficial Deposits		Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests permeability at this site, a site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

• Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Old Builders Yard - SS8			
Area of site (ha): 0.45	**Site Address:** Old Builders Yard, Plain Road, Smeeth, TN25 6QX		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Folkestone Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests permeability at this site, a site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Opposite Evegate Business Park - SS9			
Area of site (ha): 7.62	**Site Address:** Land to west of Station Road, opposite Evegate Business Park, Smeeth, TN25 6SX	**Site Use:** Mixed	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Hythe Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests permeability at this site, a site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Beechwood Farm - SM1			
Area of site (ha): 0.53	**Site Address:** Adjacent to Beechwood Farm, St Michaels, TN30 6SP		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Pope House Farm Fields - WC19			
Area of site (ha): 2.77	**Site Address:** Pope House Farm Fields, Ashford Road, St Michaels, TN30 6SS		**Site Use:** Other
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

S Edwards Engineering - WC18			
Area of site (ha): 0.28	**Site Address:** S Edwards Engineering, Pope House Farm, St Michaels, TN30 6SS		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

51-57 Appledore Road - TS1			
Area of site (ha): 0.35	**Site Address:** Land to the rear of 51-57 Appledore Road, Tenterden, TN30 7BD		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Wadhurst Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Appledore Road/Woodchurch Road - TS3			
Area of site (ha): 21.27	**Site Address:** Land at Appledore Road/Woodchurch Road, Tenterden, TN	**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in postcode area TN30 7

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Wadhurst Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary.

Former Service Station - TS5			
Area of site (ha): 0.87	**Site Address:** Former Leigh Green Service Station, Tenterden, TN30 7DF		**Site Use:** Mixed
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Wadhurst Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature maybe feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

• Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Forstal Field - TS6			
Area of site (ha): 1.53	**Site Address:** Forstal Field, Leigh Green, Tenterden, TN30 7DF		**Site Use:** Mixed
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Wadhurst Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature maybe feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Hopes Grove North - TS4			
Area of site (ha): 1.22	**Site Address:** Hopes Grove, Tenterden, TN30 7DH		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Wadhurst Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Hopes Grove South - TSTRW2				
Area of site (ha): 8.37	**Site Address:** Hopes Grove, Tenterden, TN30 7DH		**Site Use:** Mixed	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes			
Historic Flooding	Regular flooding of Smallhythe Road due to poor drainage			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Wadhurst Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land at Belgar Farm - TS2			
Area of site (ha): 3.64	**Site Address:** Land at Belgar Farm, Appledore Road, Tenterden, TN30 7DB		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in postcode area TN30 7

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Wadhurst Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control excluding pervious pavements would be suitable.
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature maybe feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary.

North west of Rolvenden Road - TNRTW1			
Area of site (ha): 9.31	**Site Address:** Land north west of Rolvenden Road, Tenterden	**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Tunbridge Wells Sand Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests permeability at this site, a site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

• Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
• ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
• Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Phase 3 of Tent1 Allocation - TSTRW1			
Area of site (ha): 11.03	**Site Address:** Phase 3 of Tent1 Allocation, Tenterden		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Wadhurst Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Pickhill Business Centre - RTW2			
Area of site (ha): 1	**Site Address:** Pickhill Business Centre, Tenterden, TN30 7LZ		**Site Use:** Employment
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, a potential emplyment site falls within the 'less vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology		Wadhurst Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land at Watery Lane - DW8				
Area of site (ha): 3.93	**Site Address:** Land at Watery Lane, Westwell		**Site Use:** Gypsy	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'highly vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No			
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Folkestone Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests permeability at this site, a site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

• Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
• Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Sunnybridge Farm - DW7			
Area of site (ha): 0.27	**Site Address:** Land North East of Sunnybridge Farm, Watery Lane, Westwell, TN25 4JJ	**Site Use:** Gypsy	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'highly vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Folkestone Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests permeability at this site, a site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

• Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Tutt Hill Farm - DW10			
Area of site (ha): 1.23	**Site Address:** Land adjacent Tutt Hill Farm, Westwell		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Folkestone Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests permeability at this site, a site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

West of Sandyhurst Lane - DW11			
Area of site (ha): 6.8	**Site Address:** Land west of Sandyhurst Lane (Behind Kingsland), Westwell Lane, Westwell	**Site Use:** Leisure	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of a potiential leisure development.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Folkestone Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay and Silt
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

• Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
• Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Woodside - DW9			
Area of site (ha): 9.62	**Site Address:** Woodside, Westwell Lane, Westwell		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Folkestone Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests permeability at this site, a site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land adjacent to Julie Rose Stadium - NW3			
Area of site (ha): 3.04	**Site Address:** Land adjacent to Julie Rose Stadium, Willesborough, TN24 0UL		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Folkestone Formation
Superficial Deposits		Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control excluding pervious pavements would be suitable.
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature maybe feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land at 10A Blackwall Road North - NW2			
Area of site (ha): 1.09	**Site Address:** Land at 10A Blackwall Road North, Willesborough, TN24 0NU	**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	Yes		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	Nov 2000, Feb 2001 - Fluvial flooding		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1.	**FZ2 :** Between 10% and 50% coverage	**FZ3a:** Between 10% and 50% coverage	**FZ3b :** Between 10% and 50% coverage
Flood Warning	The site submission is within an Environment Agency flood warning area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus central climate change (+35%) modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Folkestone Formation and Sandgate Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control excluding pervious pavements would be suitable.
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature maybe feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
- A Flood Defence Consent is required from the Environment Agency for any development proposals within 8m of a designated Main River/Flood Defence.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Willesborough Garden Centre - WE12			
Area of site (ha): 2.31	**Site Address:** Willesborough Garden Centre, Hythe Road, Willesborough, TN24 0NE		**Site Use:** Mixed
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	Yes		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1.	**FZ2 :** less than 10% coverage	**FZ3a:** less than 10% coverage	**FZ3b :** less than 10% coverage
Flood Warning	The site submission is within an Environment Agency flood warning area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where at least 25% to 50% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus central climate change (+35%) modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- A Flood Defence Consent is required from the Environment Agency for any development proposals within 8m of a designated Main River/Flood Defence.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Willesborough Lees Park - NW1			
Area of site (ha): 27.82	**Site Address:** Willesborough Lees Park, Willesborough	**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	Yes		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	Sept 1973, Nov 2000, Feb 2001 - Fluvial flooding		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1.	**FZ2 :** Between 10% and 50% coverage	**FZ3a:** Between 10% and 50% coverage	**FZ3b :** Between 10% and 50% coverage
Flood Warning	The site submission is within an Environment Agency flood warning area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus central climate change (+35%) modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology		Sandgate Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
- A Flood Defence Consent is required from the Environment Agency for any development proposals within 8m of a designated Main River/Flood Defence.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land at Lloyds Farm - IO5			
Area of site (ha): 1.74	**Site Address:** Land at Lloyds Farm, Wittersham		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Wadhurst Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

• Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
• Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land north of Stocks Road - IO6			
Area of site (ha): 2.52	**Site Address:** Land north of Stocks Road, Wittersham, TN30		**Site Use:** Mixed
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Wadhurst Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land between 82 and 120 Front Road - WS28			
Area of site (ha): 1.52	**Site Address:** Land between 82 and 120 Front Road, Woodchurch, TN26 3SA		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land to the south of Rectory Close - WS27			
Area of site (ha): 2.04	**Site Address:** Land to the south of Rectory Close, Woodchurch, TN26 3QD		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Lower Road - WS25			
Area of site (ha): 1.35	**Site Address:** Land at Lower Road, Woodchurch (north of The Granary) TN26 3SG		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Lower Road Site 1 - WS29				
Area of site (ha): 0.53	**Site Address:** Land to the west of Lower Road, Woodchurch		**Site Use:** Mixed	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No			
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site. (Slope <1)

- Implications for development

• Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Lower Road Site 2 - WS26				
Area of site (ha): 1.24	**Site Address:** Land to the west of Lower Road, Woodchurch		**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No			
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Susans Hill - WS24			
Area of site (ha): 9.15	**Site Address:** Susans Hill, Woodchurch, (land east of Woodchurch Village Life Museum), TN26 3RE	**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Luckley Field - WY3			
Area of site (ha): 3.8	**Site Address:** Luckley Field, Wye		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	Nov 2000, Feb 2001 - Fluvial flooding		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1.	**FZ2 :** less than 10% coverage	**FZ3a:** less than 10% coverage	**FZ3b :** less than 10% coverage
Flood Warning	The site submission is within an Environment Agency flood warning area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus central climate change (+35%) modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology		Gault Formation
Superficial Deposits		Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Wye Court Farm - WY2				
Area of site (ha): 1.15	**Site Address:** Wye Court Farm, Wye		**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No			
Historic Flooding	Nov 2000, Feb 2001 - Fluvial flooding			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1.	**FZ2 :** less than 10% coverage	**FZ3a:** less than 10% coverage	**FZ3b :** less than 10% coverage
Flood Warning	The site submission is within an Environment Agency flood warning area.			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in postcode area TN25 5

Effects of climate change:
This site is within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus central climate change (+35%) modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Gault Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary.

WYE3, Land at Olantigh Road and Occupation Road - WY4			
Area of site (ha): 24.5	**Site Address:** WYE3, Land at Olantigh Road and Occupation Road, Wye		**Site Use:** Mixed
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology	West Melbury Marly Chalk Formation
Superficial Deposits	Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel

SuDS Type	Potential Suitability	Comments
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land North Of West Street - DW35				
Area of site (ha): 4.77	**Site Address:** North Of West Street, Hothfield, Ashford, TN26 1		**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No			
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2:** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defences located at this site			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in the postcode area TN26 1

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology	Sandgate Formation
Superficial Deposits	Silt, Peat, Sand and Clay

SuDS Type	Potential Suitability	Comments
Source Control		Most source control techniques are likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests that slopes may be unsuitable for selective source control techniques.
Infiltration		Infiltration may be suitable. Further site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration. Proposed SuDS should be discussed with relevant stakeholders (LPA, LLFA and EA) at an early stage to understand possible constraints given that the site is located with a Source Protection Zone
Detention		This option is unlikely to be feasible as mapping suggests mean site slopes are > 5%. Feasibility of such options should be assessed as part of a site specific assessment. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Filtration		This option is unlikely to be feasible as mapping suggests mean site slopes are > 5%. Feasibility of such options should be assessed as part of a site specific assessment. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		All forms of conveyance are likely to be suitable. Where the slopes are >5% features should follow contours or utilise check dams to slow flows. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water runoff from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary
- Liaison with the LLFA and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land South Of West Street - DW34				
Area of site (ha): 2.69	**Site Address:** South Of West Street, Hothfield, Ashford, TN26 1		**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No			
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2:** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defences located at this site			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in the postcode area TN26 1

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology	Folkestone Formation
Superficial Deposits	Sand and Gravel

SuDS Type	Potential Suitability	Comments
Source Control		All forms of source control are likely to be suitable.
Infiltration		Infiltration may be suitable. Further site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration. Proposed SuDS should be discussed with relevant stakeholders (LPA, LLFA and EA) at an early stage to understand possible constraints given that the site is located with a Source Protection Zone
Detention		Mapping suggests that the site slopes are suitable for all forms of detention. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Filtration		Filtration techniques are likely to be suitable.. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indiciates that all forms of conveyance are likely to be suitable. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water runoff from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary
- Liaison with the LLFA and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Kempton Manor Farm - DW36				
Area of site (ha): 3.33	**Site Address:** Kempton Manor Farm, Maidstone Road, Hothfield, Ashford, TN26 1		**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes			
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2:** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defences located at this site			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in the postcode area TN26 1

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology		Folkestone Formation
Superficial Deposits		Silt, Peat, Sand and Clay
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		Most source control techniques are likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests that slopes may be unsuitable for selective source control techniques.
Infiltration		Infiltration may be suitable. Further site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration. Proposed SuDS should be discussed with relevant stakeholders (LPA, LLFA and EA) at an early stage to understand possible constraints given that the site is located with a Source Protection Zone
Detention		This option is unlikely to be feasible as mapping suggests mean site slopes are > 5%. Feasibility of such options should be assessed as part of a site specific assessment. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Filtration		This option is unlikely to be feasible as mapping suggests mean site slopes are > 5%. Feasibility of such options should be assessed as part of a site specific assessment. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		All forms of conveyance are likely to be suitable. Where the slopes are >5% features should follow contours or utilise check dams to slow flows. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.

- Implications for development

- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water runoff from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary
- Liaison with the LLFA and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Squids Gate Farm - DW37				
Area of site (ha): 0.95	**Site Address:** Squids Gate Farm, Challock, Ashford, TN25 4		**Site Use:** Not Specified	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No			
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2:** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defences located at this site			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register within this postcode area

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology	Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation
Superficial Deposits	Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel

SuDS Type	Potential Suitability	Comments
Source Control		All forms of source control are likely to be suitable.
Infiltration		Infiltration may be suitable. Further site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration. Proposed SuDS should be discussed with relevant stakeholders (LPA, LLFA and EA) at an early stage to understand possible constraints given that the site is located with a Source Protection Zone
Detention		Mapping suggests that the site slopes are suitable for all forms of detention. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Filtration		Filtration techniques are likely to be suitable.. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature is probably not suitable, due to the slopes on site (slope <1%)

- Implications for development

- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water runoff from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Liaison with the LLFA and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Ninn Lane - GCS14				
Area of site (ha): 1.15	**Site Address:** Ninn Lane, Great Chart, Ashford, TN23 3		**Site Use:** Not Specified	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No			
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2:** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defences located at this site			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in the postcode area TN23 3

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology	Weald Clay Formation and Atherfield Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits	No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area

SuDS Type	Potential Suitability	Comments
Source Control		Most source control techniques are likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests that slopes may be unsuitable for selective source control techniques.
Infiltration		Infiltration may be suitable. Areas of the site have been designated as containing historic landfill. Further site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		This option is unlikely to be feasible as mapping suggests mean site slopes are > 5%. Feasibility of such options should be assessed as part of a site specific assessment. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Filtration		This option is unlikely to be feasible as mapping suggests mean site slopes are > 5%. Feasibility of such options should be assessed as part of a site specific assessment. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		All forms of conveyance are likely to be suitable. Where the slopes are >5% features should follow contours or utilise check dams to slow flows. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.

- Implications for development

- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water runoff from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary
- Liaison with the LLFA and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Magpie Farm - IO28				
Area of site (ha): 0.91	**Site Address:** Magpie Farm, The Street, Appledore, Ashford, TN26 2		**Site Use:** Exclusive Homes	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with the NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No			
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2:** Less than 10% coverage	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b:** Less than 10% coverage
Flood Warning	The site submission is within an Environment Agency flood warning area			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defences located at this site			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in the postcode area TN26 2

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology	Tunbridge Wells Sand Formation
Superficial Deposits	No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area

SuDS Type	Potential Suitability	Comments
Source Control		All forms of source control are likely to be suitable.
Infiltration		Infiltration likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests a low risk of ground water flooding however, site investigations should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		Mapping suggests that the site slopes are suitable for all forms of detention.
Filtration		Filtration techniques are likely to be suitable.. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indiciates that all forms of conveyance are likely to be suitable. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.

- Implications for development

- Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water runoff from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary
- Liaison with the LLFA and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land West Of School Road - IO30				
Area of site (ha): 1.32	**Site Address:** Land West Of School Road, Appledore, Ashford, TN26 2		**Site Use:** Not Specified	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No			
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2:** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defences located at this site			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in the postcode area TN26 2

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology	Tunbridge Wells Sand Formation
Superficial Deposits	No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area

SuDS Type	Potential Suitability	Comments
Source Control		All forms of source control are likely to be suitable.
Infiltration		Infiltration likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests a low risk of ground water flooding however, site investigations should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		Mapping suggests that the site slopes are suitable for all forms of detention.
Filtration		Filtration techniques are likely to be suitable.. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indiciates that all forms of conveyance are likely to be suitable. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.

- Implications for development

- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water runoff from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary
- Liaison with the LLFA and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

School Field - IO29				
Area of site (ha): 1.93	**Site Address:** School Field, School Road, Appledore, Ashford, TN26 2		**Site Use:** Not Specified	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No			
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2:** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defences located at this site			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in the postcode area TN26 2

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology	Tunbridge Wells Sand Formation
Superficial Deposits	No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area

SuDS Type	Potential Suitability	Comments
Source Control		All forms of source control are likely to be suitable.
Infiltration		Infiltration likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests a low risk of ground water flooding however, site investigations should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		Mapping suggests that the site slopes are suitable for all forms of detention.
Filtration		Filtration techniques are likely to be suitable.. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indiciates that all forms of conveyance are likely to be suitable. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.

- Implications for development

- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water runoff from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary
- Liaison with the LLFA and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land between Canterbury Road and Lees Road - SS57				
Area of site (ha): 9.72	**Site Address:** Bradbourne Lees, Ashford, TN25 6		**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No			
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2:** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defences located at this site			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register within this postcode area

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology	Folkestone Formation and Gault Formation
Superficial Deposits	No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area

SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control are likely to be suitable.
Infiltration		Infiltration likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests a low risk of ground water flooding however, site investigations should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		Mapping suggests that the site slopes are suitable for all forms of detention.
Filtration		Filtration techniques are likely to be suitable.. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indiciates that all forms of conveyance are likely to be suitable. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.

- Implications for development

- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water runoff from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Liaison with the LLFA and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land At The Caldecott Foundation School - SS58				
Area of site (ha): 5.79	**Site Address:** Land At The Caldecott Foundation School, Hythe Road, Smeeth, Ashford, TN25 6		**Site Use:** Not Specified	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No			
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2:** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defences located at this site			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register within this postcode area

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology	Hythe Formation and Sandgate Formation
Superficial Deposits	Sand and Gravel

SuDS Type	Potential Suitability	Comments
Source Control		All forms of source control are likely to be suitable.
Infiltration		Infiltration likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests a low risk of ground water flooding however, site investigations should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		Mapping suggests that the site slopes are suitable for all forms of detention.
Filtration		Filtration techniques are likely to be suitable.. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indiciates that all forms of conveyance are likely to be suitable. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.

- Implications for development

- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water runoff from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Liaison with the LLFA and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Seemth Playing Fields - SS59				
Area of site (ha): 4.30	**Site Address:** Seemth Playing Fields, Church Road, Smeeth, Ashford, TN25 6		**Site Use:** Housing And Football Pitches	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No			
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2:** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defences located at this site			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register within this postcode area

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology		Folkestone Formation and Sandgate Formation
Superficial Deposits		Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control are likely to be suitable.
Infiltration		Infiltration likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests a low risk of ground water flooding however, site investigations should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		Mapping suggests that the site slopes are suitable for all forms of detention.
Filtration		Filtration techniques are likely to be suitable.. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indiciates that all forms of conveyance are likely to be suitable. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.

- Implications for development

- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water runoff from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Liaison with the LLFA and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

ASHFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL

JBA group

St Michaels Vicarage - WC85				
Area of site (ha): 1.29	**Site Address:** St Michaels Vicarage, Ashford Road, St Michaels, Tenterden, TN30 6		**Site Use:** Not Specified	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes			
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2:** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defences located at this site			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in the postcode area TN30 6

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology	Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits	No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area

SuDS Type	Potential Suitability	Comments
Source Control		All forms of source control are likely to be suitable.
Infiltration		Infiltration likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests a low risk of ground water flooding however, site investigations should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		Mapping suggests that the site slopes are suitable for all forms of detention.
Filtration		Filtration techniques are likely to be suitable.. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indiciates that all forms of conveyance are likely to be suitable. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water runoff from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary
- Liaison with the LLFA and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Batts Farm - WE44				
Area of site (ha): 3.08	**Site Address:** Batts Farm, Rear Of Sevington Church, Sevington, Willesborough, Ashford, TN24 0		**Site Use:** Not Specified	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No			
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2:** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defences located at this site			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in the postcode area TN24 0

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology	Hythe Formation
Superficial Deposits	No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area

SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control are likely to be suitable.
Infiltration		Infiltration likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests a low risk of ground water flooding however, site investigations should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		Mapping suggests that the site slopes are suitable for all forms of detention.
Filtration		Filtration techniques are likely to be suitable.. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indiciates that all forms of conveyance are likely to be suitable. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.

- Implications for development

- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water runoff from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary
- Liaison with the LLFA and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Kingsnorth Gelbe - WE46				
Area of site (ha): 6.74	**Site Address:** Kingsnorth Gelbe & The Rectory, Church Hill, Kingsnorth, Ashford, TN23 3		**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No			
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2:** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defences located at this site			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in the postcode area TN23 3

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology	Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits	No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area

SuDS Type	Potential Suitability	Comments
Source Control		All forms of source control are likely to be suitable.
Infiltration		Infiltration likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests a low risk of ground water flooding however, site investigations should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		Mapping suggests that the site slopes are suitable for all forms of detention.
Filtration		Filtration techniques are likely to be suitable.. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indiciates that all forms of conveyance are likely to be suitable. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.

- Implications for development

- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water runoff from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary
- Liaison with the LLFA and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Steeds Lane (Land South Of Park Farm South East Allocation) - WE47				
Area of site (ha): 13.58	**Site Address:** Steeds Lane (Land South Of Park Farm South Allocation), Steeds Lane, Kingsnorth, Ashford, TN26 1		**Site Use:** Not Specified	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	Yes			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes			
Historic Flooding	Mar 1974 – Fluvial Flooding			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2:** Less than 10% coverage	**FZ3a:** Between 10% and 50% coverage	**FZ3b:** Between 10% and 50% coverage
Flood Warning	The site submission is within an Environment Agency flood warning area			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defences located at this site			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does indicate a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in the postcode areas TN26 1 & TN25 7

Effects of climate change:
This site is within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus central climate change (+35%) modelled outline

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		Most source control techniques are likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests that permeable paving may have to use non-infiltrating systems given the possible risk from groundwater.
Infiltration		Infiltration may be suitable. Mapping suggests moderate risk of groundwater flooding and underlying soils may be permeable. Further site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		Mapping suggests that the site slopes are suitable for all forms of detention. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Filtration		Filtration techniques are likely to be suitable. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indiciates that all forms of conveyance are likely to be suitable. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.

- Implications for development

- Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
- An Environmental Permit Flood is required from the Environment Agency for any development proposals within 8m of a designated Main River/Flood Defence.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water runoff from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary
- Liaison with the LLFA and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Cheeseman's Green Lane (South) - WE48				
Area of site (ha): 13.35	**Site Address:** Cheeseman's Green Lane (South), Kingsnorth, Ashford, TN25 7		**Site Use:** Not Specified	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes			
Historic Flooding	Mar 1974, Nov 2000 and Fen 2001 – Fluvial Flooding			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2:** Between 10% and 50% coverage	**FZ3a:** Between 10% and 50% coverage	**FZ3b:** Less than 10% coverage
Flood Warning	The site submission is within an Environment Agency flood warning area			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defences located at this site			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where at least 25% to 50% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does indicate a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in the postcode area TN25 7

Effects of climate change:
This site is within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus central climate change (+35%) modelled outline

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		Most source control techniques are likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests that permeable paving may have to use non-infiltrating systems given the possible risk from groundwater.
Infiltration		Infiltration may be suitable. Mapping suggests moderate risk of groundwater flooding and underlying soils may be permeable. Further site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		Mapping suggests that the site slopes are suitable for all forms of detention. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Filtration		Filtration techniques are likely to be suitable. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indiciates that all forms of conveyance are likely to be suitable. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.

- Implications for development

- Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water runoff from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary
- Liaison with the LLFA and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Cheeseman's Green Lane (North) - WE49				
Area of site (ha): 32.27	**Site Address:** Cheeseman's Green Lane (North), Kingsnorth, Ashford, TN25 7		**Site Use:** Not Specified	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes			
Historic Flooding	Mar 1974, Nov 2000 and Fen 2001 – Fluvial Flooding			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2:** Between 10% and 50% coverage	**FZ3a:** Between 10% and 50% coverage	**FZ3b:** Less than 10% coverage
Flood Warning	The site submission is within an Environment Agency flood warning area			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defences located at this site			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where at least 25% to 50% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does indicate a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in the postcode area TN25 7

Effects of climate change:
This site is within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus central climate change (+35%) modelled outline

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		Most source control techniques are likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests that permeable paving may have to use non-infiltrating systems given the possible risk from groundwater.
Infiltration		Infiltration may be suitable. Mapping suggests moderate risk of groundwater flooding and underlying soils may be permeable. Further site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		Mapping suggests that the site slopes are suitable for all forms of detention. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Filtration		Filtration techniques are likely to be suitable. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indiciates that all forms of conveyance are likely to be suitable. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.

- Implications for development

- Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water runoff from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary
- Liaison with the LLFA and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Swanton A - WE50			
Area of site (ha): 15.40	**Site Address:** Swanton A, Mersham, Ashford, TN25 7		**Site Use:** Not Specified
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	Mar 1974, Nov 2000 and Fen 2001 – Fluvial Flooding		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2:** Less than 10% coverage	**FZ3a:** Less than 10% coverage	**FZ3b:** Less than 10% coverage
Flood Warning	The site submission is within an Environment Agency flood warning area		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defences located at this site		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does indicate a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in the postcode areas TN25 7 & TN24 0

Effects of climate change:
This site is within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus central climate change (+35%) modelled outline

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology	Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits	No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area

SuDS Type	Potential Suitability	Comments
Source Control		Most source control techniques are likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests that permeable paving may have to use non-infiltrating systems given the possible risk from groundwater.
Infiltration		Infiltration may be suitable. Mapping suggests moderate risk of groundwater flooding and underlying soils may be permeable. Further site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		Mapping suggests that the site slopes are suitable for all forms of detention. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Filtration		Filtration techniques are likely to be suitable. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indiciates that all forms of conveyance are likely to be suitable. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.

- Implications for development

- Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water runoff from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary
- Liaison with the LLFA and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Swanton B - WE50				
Area of site (ha): 12.60	**Site Address:** Swanton (B), Mersham, Ashford, TN25 7		**Site Use:** Not Specified	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No			
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2:** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defences located at this site			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in the postcode area TN25 7

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology	Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits	No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area

SuDS Type	Potential Suitability	Comments
Source Control		Most source control techniques are likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests that permeable paving may have to use non-infiltrating systems given the possible risk from groundwater.
Infiltration		Infiltration may be suitable. Mapping suggests moderate risk of groundwater flooding and underlying soils may be permeable. Further site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		Mapping suggests that the site slopes are suitable for all forms of detention. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Filtration		Filtration techniques are likely to be suitable. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indiciates that all forms of conveyance are likely to be suitable. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.

- Implications for development

- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water runoff from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary
- Liaison with the LLFA and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Swanton C - WE50			
Area of site (ha): 0.93	**Site Address:** Swanton (C), Mersham, Ashford, TN25 7	**Site Use:** Not Specified	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2:** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defences located at this site		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in the postcode area TN25 7

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		Most source control techniques are likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests that permeable paving may have to use non-infiltrating systems given the possible risk from groundwater.
Infiltration		Infiltration may be suitable. Mapping suggests moderate risk of groundwater flooding and underlying soils may be permeable. Further site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		Mapping suggests that the site slopes are suitable for all forms of detention. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Filtration		Filtration techniques are likely to be suitable. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indiciates that all forms of conveyance are likely to be suitable. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.

- Implications for development

- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water runoff from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary
- Liaison with the LLFA and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Waterbrook Gateway - WE51				
Area of site (ha): 7.65	**Site Address:** Waterbrook Gateway, Sevington, Ashford, TN24 0		**Site Use:** Not Specified	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	Yes			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes			
Historic Flooding	Mar 1974, Nov 2000 and Fen 2001 – Fluvial Flooding			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2:** Less than 10% coverage	**FZ3a:** Less than 10% coverage	**FZ3b:** Greater than 50% coverage
Flood Warning	The site submission is within an Environment Agency flood warning area			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defences located at this site			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does indicate a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in the postcode area TN24 0

Effects of climate change:
This site is within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus central climate change (+35%) modelled outline

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology	Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits	Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel

SuDS Type	Potential Suitability	Comments
Source Control		Most source control techniques are likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests that permeable paving may have to use non-infiltrating systems given the possible risk from groundwater.
Infiltration		Infiltration may be suitable. Mapping suggests moderate risk of groundwater flooding and underlying soils may be permeable. Further site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		Mapping suggests that the site slopes are suitable for all forms of detention. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Filtration		Filtration techniques are likely to be suitable. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indiciates that all forms of conveyance are likely to be suitable. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.

- Implications for development

- Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
- An Environmental Permit Flood is required from the Environment Agency for any development proposals within 8m of a designated Main River/Flood Defence.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water runoff from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary
- Liaison with the LLFA and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Bower Farm - WE52				
Area of site (ha): 0.96	**Site Address:** Bower Farm, Bower Road, Mersham, Ashford, TN25 6		**Site Use:** Exclusive Homes	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with the NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No			
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2:** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defences located at this site			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register within this postcode area

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology	Hythe Formaton
Superficial Deposits	No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area

SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control are likely to be suitable.
Infiltration		Infiltration likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests a low risk of ground water flooding however, site investigations should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		Mapping suggests that the site slopes are suitable for all forms of detention.
Filtration		Filtration techniques are likely to be suitable.. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indiciates that all forms of conveyance are likely to be suitable. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.

- Implications for development

- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water runoff from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Liaison with the LLFA and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land At Old Rectory Close - WE53				
Area of site (ha): 1.41	**Site Address:** Land At Old Rectory Close, Mersham, Ashford, TN 25 6		**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with the NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes			
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2:** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defences located at this site			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register within this postcode area

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology	Hythe Formaton
Superficial Deposits	No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area

SuDS Type	Potential Suitability	Comments
Source Control		Most source control techniques are likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests that slopes may be unsuitable for selective source control techniques.
Infiltration		Infiltration likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests a low risk of ground water flooding however, site investigations should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		This option is unlikely to be feasible as mapping suggests mean site slopes are > 5%. Feasibility of such options should be assessed as part of a site specific assessment. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Filtration		This option is unlikely to be feasible as mapping suggests mean site slopes are > 5%. Feasibility of such options should be assessed as part of a site specific assessment. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		All forms of conveyance are likely to be suitable. Where the slopes are >5% features should follow contours or utilise check dams to slow flows. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water runoff from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Liaison with the LLFA and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land On Church Hill - WE45				
Area of site (ha): 1.03	**Site Address:** Land On Church Hill, Kingsnorth, Ashford, TN23 3		**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with the NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No			
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2:** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defences located at this site			
Surface Water flood risk: The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event				
Groundwater flood risk: The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding				
Reservoir flood risk: The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site				
Sewer flood risk: The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in the postcode area TN23 3				
Effects of climate change: This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline				

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control are likely to be suitable.
Infiltration		Infiltration likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests a low risk of ground water flooding however, site investigations should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		Mapping suggests that the site slopes are suitable for all forms of detention.
Filtration		Filtration techniques are likely to be suitable.. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indiciates that all forms of conveyance are likely to be suitable. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.

- Implications for development

- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water runoff from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary
- Liaison with the LLFA and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

The Rectory - WE46				
Area of site (ha): 0.46	**Site Address:** Kingsnorth Gelbe & The Rectory, Church Hill, Kingsnorth, Ashford, TN23 3		**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with the NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No			
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2:** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defences located at this site			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in the postcode area TN23 4

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		Most source control techniques are likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests that slopes may be unsuitable for selective source control techniques.
Infiltration		Infiltration likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests a low risk of ground water flooding however, site investigations should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		This option is unlikely to be feasible as mapping suggests mean site slopes are > 5%. Feasibility of such options should be assessed as part of a site specific assessment. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Filtration		This option is unlikely to be feasible as mapping suggests mean site slopes are > 5%. Feasibility of such options should be assessed as part of a site specific assessment. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		All forms of conveyance are likely to be suitable. Where the slopes are >5% features should follow contours or utilise check dams to slow flows. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.

- Implications for development

- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water runoff from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary
- Liaison with the LLFA and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land At Bower Road - WE54				
Area of site (ha): 1.37	**Site Address:** Land At Bower Road, Bower Road, Merhsam, TN25 6		**Site Use:** Not Specified	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No			
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2:** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defences located at this site			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register within this postcode area

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology	Hythe Formation
Superficial Deposits	No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area

SuDS Type	Potential Suitability	Comments
Source Control		All forms of source control are likely to be suitable.
Infiltration		Infiltration likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests a low risk of ground water flooding however, site investigations should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		Mapping suggests that the site slopes are suitable for all forms of detention.
Filtration		Filtration techniques are likely to be suitable.. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indiciates that all forms of conveyance are likely to be suitable. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.

- Implications for development

- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water runoff from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Liaison with the LLFA and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land At Warehorn Road - WS38b			
Area of site (ha): 5.89	**Site Address:** Land At Warehorn Road, Hamstreet, Ashford, TN26 2		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with the NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2:** Less than 10% coverage	**FZ3a:** Less than 10% coverage	**FZ3b:** Less than 10% coverage
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defences located at this site		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in the postcode area TN26 2

Effects of climate change:
This site is within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus central climate change (+35%) modelled outline

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology	Weald Clay Formation and Tunbridge Wells Sand Formation
Superficial Deposits	Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel

SuDS Type	Potential Suitability	Comments
Source Control		Most source control techniques are likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests that slopes may be unsuitable for selective source control techniques.
Infiltration		Infiltration likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests a low risk of ground water flooding however, site investigations should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		This option is unlikely to be feasible as mapping suggests mean site slopes are > 5%. Feasibility of such options should be assessed as part of a site specific assessment. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Filtration		This option is unlikely to be feasible as mapping suggests mean site slopes are > 5%. Feasibility of such options should be assessed as part of a site specific assessment. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		All forms of conveyance are likely to be suitable. Where the slopes are >5% features should follow contours or utilise check dams to slow flows. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.

- Implications for development

- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water runoff from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary
- Liaison with the LLFA and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Former Railway Station - BD40				
Area of site (ha): 1.75	**Site Address:** Former Railway Station, Headcorn Road, Biddenden, Ashford, TN27 8		**Site Use:** Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with the NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No			
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2:** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defences located at this site			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in the postcode area TN27 8

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology	Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits	No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area

SuDS Type	Potential Suitability	Comments
Source Control		All forms of source control are likely to be suitable.
Infiltration		Infiltration likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests a low risk of ground water flooding however, site investigations should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		Mapping suggests that the site slopes are suitable for all forms of detention.
Filtration		Filtration techniques are likely to be suitable.. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indiciates that all forms of conveyance are likely to be suitable. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.

- Implications for development

- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water runoff from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary
- Liaison with the LLFA and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land Rear Of Cheeselands And Sandeman Way - BD5b				
Area of site (ha): 3.39	**Site Address:** Land Rear Of Cheeselands And Sandeman Way, Biddenden, Ashford, TN27 8			**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with the NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No			
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2:** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defences located at this site			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in the postcode area TN27 8

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control are likely to be suitable.
Infiltration		Infiltration likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests a low risk of ground water flooding however, site investigations should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		Mapping suggests that the site slopes are suitable for all forms of detention.
Filtration		Filtration techniques are likely to be suitable.. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indiciates that all forms of conveyance are likely to be suitable. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.

- Implications for development

- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water runoff from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary
- Liaison with the LLFA and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land West Of Pluckley Road - CH30				
Area of site (ha): 11.62	**Site Address:** Land West Of Pluckley Road, Charing, Ashford, TN27 0			**Site Use:** Not Specified
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes			
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2:** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defences located at this site			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in the postcode area TN27 0

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology		Gault Formation
Superficial Deposits		Silt, Peat, Sand and Clay
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control are likely to be suitable.
Infiltration		Infiltration may be suitable. Further site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration. Proposed SuDS should be discussed with relevant stakeholders (LPA, LLFA and EA) at an early stage to understand possible constraints given that the site is located with a Source Protection Zone
Detention		Mapping suggests that the site slopes are suitable for all forms of detention. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Filtration		Filtration techniques are likely to be suitable.. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indiciates that all forms of conveyance are likely to be suitable. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.

- Implications for development

- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water runoff from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary
- Liaison with the LLFA and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land West Of Poppyfields - CH17				
Area of site (ha): 7.15	**Site Address:** Land West Of Poppyfields, Charing, Ashford, TN27 0			**Site Use:** Not Specified
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes			
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2:** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defences located at this site			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in the postcode area TN27 0

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology		Gault Formation and West Melbury Marly Chalk Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay, Silt, Sand, Gravel and Clay
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control are likely to be suitable.
Infiltration		Infiltration may be suitable. Further site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration. Proposed SuDS should be discussed with relevant stakeholders (LPA, LLFA and EA) at an early stage to understand possible constraints given that the site is located with a Source Protection Zone
Detention		Mapping suggests that the site slopes are suitable for all forms of detention. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Filtration		Filtration techniques are likely to be suitable.. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indiciates that all forms of conveyance are likely to be suitable. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.

- Implications for development

- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water runoff from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary
- Liaison with the LLFA and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

ASHFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL

JBA group

Land Adjoining Poplar Farm - IO25				
Area of site (ha): 5.82	**Site Address:** Land Adjoining Poplar Farm, Wittersham, Tenterden, TN30 7		**Site Use:** Not Specified	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes			
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2:** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defences located at this site			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in the postcode area TN30 7

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology	Wadhurst Clay Formation and Ashdown Formation
Superficial Deposits	No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area

SuDS Type	Potential Suitability	Comments
Source Control		Most source control techniques are likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests that slopes may be unsuitable for selective source control techniques.
Infiltration		Infiltration likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests a low risk of ground water flooding however, site investigations should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		This option is unlikely to be feasible as mapping suggests mean site slopes are > 5%. Feasibility of such options should be assessed as part of a site specific assessment. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Filtration		This option is unlikely to be feasible as mapping suggests mean site slopes are > 5%. Feasibility of such options should be assessed as part of a site specific assessment. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		All forms of conveyance are likely to be suitable. Where the slopes are >5% features should follow contours or utilise check dams to slow flows. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.

- Implications for development

- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water runoff from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary
- Liaison with the LLFA and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land Adjacent To Julie Rose Stadium - NW3				
Area of site (ha): 4.70	**Site Address:** Land Adjacent To Julie Rose Stadium, Willesborough Road, Kennington, Ashford, TN24 9		**Site Use:** Additional Housing	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with the NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes			
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2:** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defences located at this site			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in the postcode area TN24 9

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology		Folkestone Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		Most source control techniques are likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests that permeable paving may have to use non-infiltrating systems given the possible risk from groundwater. Mapping also suggests that slopes may be unsuitable for selective source
Infiltration		Infiltration may be suitable. Mapping suggests moderate to high risk of groundwater flooding and underlying soils may be permeable. Further site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		This option is unlikely to be feasible as mapping suggests mean site slopes are > 5%. Feasibility of such options should be assessed as part of a site specific assessment. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Filtration		This option is unlikely to be feasible as mapping suggests mean site slopes are > 5%. Feasibility of such options should be assessed as part of a site specific assessment. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		All forms of conveyance are likely to be suitable. Where the slopes are >5% features should follow contours or utilise check dams to slow flows. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.

- Implications for development

- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water runoff from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary
- Liaison with the LLFA and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Pinetrees, Chapel Road - DW37				
Area of site (ha): 2.47	**Site Address:** Pinetrees, Chapel Road, Hothfield, Ashford, TN25 4		**Site Use:** Not Specified	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No			
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2:** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defences located at this site			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in the postcode area TN26 1

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology	Folkestone Formation
Superficial Deposits	No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area

SuDS Type	Potential Suitability	Comments
Source Control		Most source control techniques are likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests that slopes may be unsuitable for selective source control techniques.
Infiltration		Infiltration may be suitable. Further site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration. Proposed SuDS should be discussed with relevant stakeholders (LPA, LLFA and EA) at an early stage to understand possible constraints given that the site is located with a Source Protection Zone
Detention		This option is unlikely to be feasible as mapping suggests mean site slopes are > 5%. Feasibility of such options should be assessed as part of a site specific assessment. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Filtration		This option is unlikely to be feasible as mapping suggests mean site slopes are > 5%. Feasibility of such options should be assessed as part of a site specific assessment. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		All forms of conveyance are likely to be suitable. Where the slopes are >5% features should follow contours or utilise check dams to slow flows. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water runoff from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary
- Liaison with the LLFA and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land rear of Holiday Inn - DW39			
Area of site (ha): 44.54	**Site Address:** Land rear of Holiday Inn , A20, Hothfield, Ashford, TN26 1		**Site Use:** Not Specified
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission. (NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** Less than 10% coverage	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** Less than 10% coverage
Flood Warning	The site submission is within an Environment Agency flood warning area		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defences located at this site		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in the postcode area TN26 1

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology	Folketsone Formation and Sandgate Formation
Superficial Deposits	Silty, Peaty, Sandy, Clay

SuDS Type	Potential Suitability	Comments
Source Control		All forms of source control are likely to be suitable.
Infiltration		Infiltration may be suitable. Further site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration. Proposed SuDS should be discussed with relevant stakeholders (LPA, LLFA and EA) at an early stage to understand possible constraints given that the site is located with a Source Protection Zone
Detention		Mapping suggests that the site slopes are suitable for all forms of detention. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Filtration		Filtration techniques are likely to be suitable.. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indiciates that all forms of conveyance are likely to be suitable. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.

- Implications for development

- Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water runoff from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary
- Liaison with the LLFA and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land at Oakover Nurseries - DW40			
Area of site (ha): 8.63	**Site Address:** Land at Oakover Nurseries, A20, Hothfield, Ashford, TN26 1		**Site Use:** Not Specified
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission. (NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defences located at this site		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in the postcode area TN26 2

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology		Folkestone Formation
Superficial Deposits		Silty, Peaty, Sandy, Clay
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		Most source control techniques are likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests that slopes may be unsuitable for selective source control techniques.
Infiltration		Infiltration may be suitable. Further site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration. Proposed SuDS should be discussed with relevant stakeholders (LPA, LLFA and EA) at an early stage to understand possible constraints given that the site is located with a Source Protection Zone
Detention		This option is unlikely to be feasible as mapping suggests mean site slopes are > 5%. Feasibility of such options should be assessed as part of a site specific assessment. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Filtration		This option is unlikely to be feasible as mapping suggests mean site slopes are > 5%. Feasibility of such options should be assessed as part of a site specific assessment. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		All forms of conveyance are likely to be suitable. Where the slopes are >5% features should follow contours or utilise check dams to slow flows. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water runoff from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary
- Liaison with the LLFA and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land south-west of Tenterden Leisure Centre - TS13				
Area of site (ha): 6.92	**Site Address:** Land south-west of Tenterden Leisure Centre, Tenterden, TN30 6		**Site Use:** Not Specified	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission. (NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes			
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defences located at this site			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in the postcode area TN30 7

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology		Wadhurst Clay Formation and Tunbridge Wells Sand Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		Most source control techniques are likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests that slopes may be unsuitable for selective source control techniques.
Infiltration		Infiltration likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests a low risk of ground water flooding however, site investigations should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		This option is unlikely to be feasible as mapping suggests mean site slopes are > 5%. Feasibility of such options should be assessed as part of a site specific assessment. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Filtration		This option is unlikely to be feasible as mapping suggests mean site slopes are > 5%. Feasibility of such options should be assessed as part of a site specific assessment. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		All forms of conveyance are likely to be suitable. Where the slopes are >5% features should follow contours or utilise check dams to slow flows. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- ABC should consider requesting an FRA where a site is close to an ordinary watercourse that is not included in the Flood Zones.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water runoff from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary
- Liaison with the LLFA and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land Adjacent to Mountain Farm - WS35			
Area of site (ha): 1.63	**Site Address:** Land Adjacent to Mountain Farm, Marsh Road, Hamstreet, TN26 2		**Site Use:** Not Specified
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission. (NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** Less than 10% coverage	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	The site submission is within an Environment Agency flood warning area		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defences located at this site		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in the postcode area TN26 2

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation and Tunbridge Wells Sand Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay and Silt
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		Most source control techniques are likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests that slopes may be unsuitable for selective source control techniques.
Infiltration		Infiltration likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests a low risk of ground water flooding however, site investigations should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		This option is unlikely to be feasible as mapping suggests mean site slopes are > 5%. Feasibility of such options should be assessed as part of a site specific assessment. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Filtration		This option is unlikely to be feasible as mapping suggests mean site slopes are > 5%. Feasibility of such options should be assessed as part of a site specific assessment. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		All forms of conveyance are likely to be suitable. Where the slopes are >5% features should follow contours or utilise check dams to slow flows. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.

- Implications for development

• Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
• Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water runoff from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary
• Liaison with the LLFA and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land Adjacent to HA development - WS44			
Area of site (ha): 1.85	**Site Address:** Land Adjacent to HA development, Woodhurch, Ashford, TN26 3		**Site Use:** Not Specified
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission. (NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defences located at this site		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in the postcode area TN26 3

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology	Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits	Clay, Silt and Gravel

SuDS Type	Potential Suitability	Comments
Source Control		All forms of source control are likely to be suitable.
Infiltration		Infiltration likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests a low risk of ground water flooding however, site investigations should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		Mapping suggests that the site slopes are suitable for all forms of detention.
Filtration		Filtration techniques are likely to be suitable.. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indiciates that all forms of conveyance are likely to be suitable. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.

- Implications for development

• Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
• A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
• The strategy should demonstrate that surface water runoff from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
• For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary
• Liaison with the LLFA and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
• Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Bournes Place - WS69				
Area of site (ha): 1.67	**Site Address:** Bournes Place, Woodchurch, Ashford, TN26 3PD		**Site Use:** Not Specified	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission. (NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)			
Summary of flood risk to				
Within 8m of a Main River	No			
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No			
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found			
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area			
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defences located at this site			

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area is in an area of variable risk to groundwater flood emergence

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in the postcode area TN26 3

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology	Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits	No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area

SuDS Type	Potential Suitability	Comments
Source Control		All forms of source control are likely to be suitable.
Infiltration		Infiltration likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests a low risk of ground water flooding however, site investigations should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		Mapping suggests that the site slopes are suitable for all forms of detention.
Filtration		Filtration techniques are likely to be suitable.. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indiciates that all forms of conveyance are likely to be suitable. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water runoff from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary
- Liaison with the LLFA and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Nats Lane - SS12			
Area of site (ha): 1.25	**Site Address:** Nats Lane, The Street, Brook, TN25 5PJ		**Site Use:** Housing
Flood Risk Vulnerability	In accordance with NPPF, this site submission falls within the 'more vulnerable' category.(NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	Yes		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	Yes		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found.		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1.	**FZ2 :** less than 10% coverage	**FZ3a:** less than 10% coverage	**FZ3b :** less than 10% coverage
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area.		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defence located at this site.		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event.

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where at least 25% to 50% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site.

Sewer flood risk:
No incidents were recorded on the Southern Water sewer flooding register.

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline.

- Suitability of SuDS		
Bedrock Geology		Gault Formation
Superficial Deposits		No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		All forms of source control
Infiltration		Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.
Detention		This option may be feasible provided site slopes are < 5%. Liner is required for permanent wet features in pervious soils.
Filtration		This feature is probably feasible. If the site has contaminated land issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indicates that this feature may be suitable. Wet swales require liner in pervious soils.

- Implications for development

- Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
- A Flood Defence Consent is required from the Environment Agency for any development proposals within 8m of a designated Main River/Flood Defence.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- Liaison with the appropriate SUDS Approving Body and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water run off from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Land Adjacent to Mountain Farm - WS35			
Area of site (ha): 1.63	**Site Address:** Land Adjacent to Mountain Farm, Marsh Road, Hamstreet, TN26 2		**Site Use:** Not Specified
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission. (NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is partially located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** Less than 10% coverage	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	The site submission is within an Environment Agency flood warning area		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defences located at this site		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in the postcode area TN26 2

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology		Weald Clay Formation and Tunbridge Wells Sand Formation
Superficial Deposits		Clay and Silt
SuDS Type	**Potential Suitability**	**Comments**
Source Control		Most source control techniques are likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests that slopes may be unsuitable for selective source control techniques.
Infiltration		Infiltration likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests a low risk of ground water flooding however, site investigations should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		This option is unlikely to be feasible as mapping suggests mean site slopes are > 5%. Feasibility of such options should be assessed as part of a site specific assessment. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Filtration		This option is unlikely to be feasible as mapping suggests mean site slopes are > 5%. Feasibility of such options should be assessed as part of a site specific assessment. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		All forms of conveyance are likely to be suitable. Where the slopes are >5% features should follow contours or utilise check dams to slow flows. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.

- Implications for development

- Any site that falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3 will require an FRA in order to demonstrate how a potential development will mitigate against flood risk from all sources.
- Any site affected by the uFMfSW, or with a history of surface water flooding, should undertake an FRA including a comprehensive investigation into surface water flood risk. 'More vulnerable' development should be located in the areas of least flood risk through sequential design of the site. Mitigation of any surface water risk should be detailed in a drainage strategy.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water runoff from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary
- Liaison with the LLFA and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.

Ransley Farm - WC50			
Area of site (ha): 2.22	**Site Address:** Ransley Farm, Ashford Rd, High Halden, Ashford, TN26 3LW	**Site Use:** Not Specified	
Flood Risk Vulnerability	Refer to NPPF to determine the vulnerability class the of the site submission. (NPPF Technical Guide - Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability)		
Summary of flood risk to			
Within 8m of a Main River	No		
Within 8m of a Watercourse	No		
Historic Flooding	No records of historic flooding found		
Flood Zone	**FZ1:** This site is located in Flood Zone 1	**FZ2 :** The site is not within Flood Zone 2	**FZ3a:** The site is not within Flood Zone 3a	**FZ3b :** The site is not within Flood Zone 3b
Flood Warning	No Environment Agency flood warning within this area		
Flood Defences	There are no Environment Agency defences located at this site		

Surface Water flood risk:
The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Refer to the maps associated with this report for details of the 1 in 30-year and 1 in 1000-year event

Groundwater flood risk:
The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding

Reservoir flood risk:
The National Reservoir Innundation Mapping does not indicate that there is a risk of flooding from a breach of a reservoir to this site

Sewer flood risk:
The Southern Water sewer flooding register has recorded incidents in the postcode area TN26 3

Effects of climate change:
This site is not within the fluvial 1 in 100-year plus climate change modelled outline

- Suitability of SuDS

Bedrock Geology	Weald Clay Formation
Superficial Deposits	No superfical deposits recorded within the site submission area

SuDS Type	Potential Suitability	Comments
Source Control		All forms of source control are likely to be suitable.
Infiltration		Infiltration likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests a low risk of ground water flooding however, site investigations should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		Mapping suggests that the site slopes are suitable for all forms of detention.
Filtration		Filtration techniques are likely to be suitable.. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.
Conveyance		Mapping indiciates that all forms of conveyance are likely to be suitable. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.

- Implications for development

- Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA.
- A drainage strategy should be submitted at an early stage to show how the impact of the development will be reduced through site design and SUDS techniques.
- The strategy should demonstrate that surface water runoff from the site shall be no greater than the rates prior to the development. Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- For major developments, or where sewer flooding is a problem, the relevant water company should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in the wastewater system and any upgrades are carried out where necessary
- Liaison with the LLFA and ABC should be carried out in the early stages of the development.
- Developers should consider the surface water catchment when looking at solutions for mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development. This may require developers to consider solutions outside of their site.