





















North Street, Biddenden - BD20a

Area of site (ha): 10.8 (4.12 developed)		Site Address: North Street, Biddenden		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 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 Inundation 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 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 superficial 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 unlikely to be suitable, due to impermeable bedrock geology. Mapping suggests a low risk of ground water emergence, with no aquifer identified in the BGS Aquifer Map. 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 unlikely to be suitable, depending on infiltration suitability. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.			
Conveyance		Mapping indicates 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					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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 • 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 at Parsons Mead - CH37				
Area of site (ha): 1.9		Site Address: Land at Parsons Mead		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 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 Inundation 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 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		West Melbury Marly 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 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 indicates 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				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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. 				

Rear of Mill House, Challock - DW42






Area of site (ha): 0.36	Site Address: Mill House, Challock	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 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 ASStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence			
Reservoir flood risk:	The National Reservoir Inundation 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 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	Seaford 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		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 contamination or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.		
- Implications for development				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 Calleywell Lane, Aldington - SS60				
Area of site (ha): 2.98		Site Address: Land at Calleywell Lane, 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 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 Inundation 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 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		Hythe Formation and Atherfield Clay Formation		
Superficial Deposits		No superficial 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 and risk of contaminated lands from designated landfill within the site boundary.		
Infiltration		Infiltration likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests a low risk of ground water flooding, however areas of the site have been designated as containing historic landfill. Therefore, further site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration. If infiltration is suitable it should be avoided in areas where the depth to the water table is <1m.		
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 this feature is feasible a liner maybe required given the possible risk of contaminated land		
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 this feature is feasible it should be located where the depth to the water table is >1m		
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.		
- Implications for development				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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 rear of Plough Inn - SS61

Area of site (ha): 0.45	Site Address: Brabourne Lees	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 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 Inundation 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 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 superficial 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. Mapping also 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 this feature is feasible a liner maybe required to prevent the egress of groundwater.		
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 this feature is feasible it should be located where the depth to the water table is >1m.		
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.		
- Implications for development				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 				






Church Road, Smeeth - SS62

Area of site (ha): 1.94	Site Address: Walnut Tree Farm, Smeeth		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 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 Inundation 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 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	Sandgate Formation and 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 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		All filtration techniques are likely to be suitable. If the site has contamination 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 contamination issues; a liner will be required.		
- Implications for development				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. 				






Stevenson Bros., High Halden - WC92






Area of site (ha): 3.5	Site Address: Stevenson Bros., High Halden	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 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 ASStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence				
Reservoir flood risk: The National Reservoir Inundation 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 superficial 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 unlikely to be suitable, due to impermeable bedrock geology. Mapping suggests a low risk of ground water emergence, with no aquifer identified in the BGS Aquifer Map. 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 unlikely to be suitable, depending on infiltration suitability. 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 contamination issues; a liner will be required.		
- Implications for development				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA. • 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. • 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 rear of Red Lion, Charing Heath - WC95

Area of site (ha): 0.45		Site Address: Charing Heath		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 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 ASStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence					
Reservoir flood risk: The National Reservoir Inundation 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 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		Folkestone Formation			
Superficial Deposits		No superficial deposits recorded within the site submission area No superficial 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					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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 south of jn.Stone Hill Road/New Road, Egerton - WN24

Area of site (ha): 1.3	Site Address: 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 defences located at this site.			
Surface Water flood risk: The uMfSW 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 the postcode area TN27 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	Hythe Formation			
Superficial Deposits	No superficial 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		All filtration techniques are likely to be suitable. If the site has contamination issues; a liner will be required.		
Conveyance		Mapping indicates 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				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1 require a full FRA. • 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. • 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. 				

Woodchurch Road, Shadoxhurst - WS73				
Area of site (ha): 1.5		Site Address: Woodchurch Road, Shadoxhurst		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 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 ASStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence				
Reservoir flood risk: The National Reservoir Inundation 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		Weald Clay Formation		
Superficial Deposits		No superficial 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 unlikely to be suitable, due to impermeable bedrock geology. Mapping suggests a low risk of ground water emergence, with no aquifer identified in the BGS Aquifer Map. 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 unlikely to be suitable, depending on infiltration suitability. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required.		
Conveyance		Mapping indicates 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				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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. 				

Findon Stables, Shadoxhurst - WS74				
Area of site (ha): 2.32		Site Address: Findon Stables, Shadoxhurst		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 located Flood Zone 2.	FZ3a: The site is not located Flood Zone 3a.	FZ3b: The site is not located 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 Inundation 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		Weald Clay Formation		
Superficial Deposits		No superficial 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 unlikely to be suitable, due to impermeable bedrock geology. Mapping suggests a low risk of ground water emergence. 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 unlikely to be suitable, depending on infiltration suitability. If the site has contaminated land or groundwater issues; a liner will be required		
Conveyance		Mapping indicates 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				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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. 				