



City of Manchester Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment

Appendix F - Local Plan Sites Assessment Summary

Final Report

Prepared for
Manchester City Council

Date
June 2026



MANCHESTER
CITY COUNCIL

Document Status

Issue date	24 June 2026
Issued to	Duncan McCorquodale
BIM reference	RZS-JBA-XX-XX-RP-EN-0005
Revision	P02

Prepared by	Laura Thompson-Jones BSc FRGS Senior Analyst
-------------	---

Reviewed by	Mike Williamson BSc MSc CGeog FRGS EADA Principal Analyst
-------------	--

Authorised by	Mike Williamson BSc MSc CGeog FRGS EADA Principal Analyst
---------------	--

Carbon Footprint

The format of this report is optimised for reading digitally in pdf format. Paper consumption produces substantial carbon emissions and other environmental impacts through the extraction, production and transportation of paper. Printing also generates emissions and impacts from the manufacture of printers and inks and from the energy used to power a printer. Please consider the environment before printing.

Accessibility

JBA aims to align with [governmental guidelines on accessible documents](#) and [WCAG 2.2 AA](#) standards, so that most people can read this document without having to employ special adaptation measures. This document is also optimised for use with assistive technology, such as screen reading software.

Contents

1	Local Plan sites screening assessment	1
1.1	Screening of potential sites	2
1.2	Summary of site assessment outcomes	10

List of Tables

Table 1-1: Flood risk categories	2
Table 1-2: Number of sites at risk from fluvial flooding	3
Table 1-3: Number of sites at risk from surface water flooding	3
Table 1-4: Number of sites per strategic recommendation	4

Abbreviations

AEP	Annual Exceedance Probability
ACDP	Areas with Critical Drainage Problems
BNG	Biodiversity Net Gain
EA	Environment Agency
FRA	Flood Risk Assessment
FRCC-PPG	Flood Risk and Coastal Change Planning Practice Guidance
GIS	Geographic Information System
LLFA	Lead Local Flood Authority
LPA	Local Planning Authority
NaFRA2	National Flood Risk Assessment 2
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
RFM	Reservoir Flood Map
RoFSW	Risk of Flooding from Surface Water
SFRA	Strategic Flood Risk Assessment
SuDS	Sustainable Drainage System

1 Local Plan sites screening assessment

Appendix F provides a strategic assessment of the suitability, relative to flood risk, of the sites to be considered for allocation in Manchester City Council's (referred to hereafter as the Council) new Local Plan.

The information and guidance provided in this Appendix can be used by the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to inform the application of the Sequential Test in the allocation of sites in the new Local Plan, and the development management process.

The LPA must use the spreadsheet in Appendix E to record their decisions on how to take each site forward for allocation or whether to withdraw a site from allocation, based on the evidence and strategic recommendations provided. Recording decisions in the sites assessment spreadsheet demonstrates that a sequential, sustainable approach to development and flood risk has been adopted.

The Council provided a GIS layer containing 606 potential development sites. In order to inform the Sequential Test for the allocation of development through the new Local Plan, this assessment entails a high-level GIS screening exercise overlaying the potential development sites against present day risk Flood Zones 1, 2, 3a and 3b (the functional floodplain), calculating the area of each site at risk. Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3 are sourced from the Environment Agency's (EA) latest version of the Flood Map for Planning, downloaded in March 2026 for this Level 1 SFRA. Flood Zone 3 is split into Flood Zone 3a and Flood Zone 3b (functional floodplain) as part of this Level 1 SFRA, as required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), 2025.

The impacts of climate change have also been included in the sites screening process using the delineated future functional floodplain extent and available EA detailed modelling. Following consultation with the EA, it was agreed that the Flood Map for Planning - Flood Zones plus Climate Change would be used to represent fluvial climate change for watercourses where up to date detailed climate change modelling was unavailable. See Section 1.1.2 for details.

Surface water risk to assessed sites is analysed by way of the EA's latest version of the national scale FMfP - Surface Water Spatial Planning Extents - Present Day dataset, downloaded in June 2026. The FMfP - Surface Water Spatial Planning Extents - Climate Change dataset includes mapping representing the 2070s Upper End climate change allowance scenario for peak rainfall. The impacts of climate change on surface water have been assessed using this dataset.

It is important to consider that each individual site will require further investigation, following this assessment, as local circumstances may dictate the outcome of the strategic recommendation. Such local circumstances are discussed in Section 1.1. The outcomes of the site assessments are presented in the sites assessment spreadsheet in Appendix E.

1.1 Screening of potential sites

This section of the report draws together the screening results included in Appendix E. The LPA should use the spreadsheet to assist them in carrying out the Sequential Test. If sites cannot be directed to areas of low flood risk, or where wider strategic objectives require development in areas identified through this Level 1 SFRA to be at medium or high risk from flooding now or in the future, then the LPA should consider the Flood Risk Vulnerability Classifications and Flood Zones in the NPPF. The LPA must consider whether a more detailed Level 2 SFRA (including for application of the Exception Test where applicable) will be required before finalising sites for allocation in the LPU. Strategic recommendations are based on Tables 1 and 2 of the [Flood Risk and Coastal Change Planning Practice Guidance](#) (FRCC-PPG) (Paragraphs 077 - 079), and Annex 3 of the [NPPF](#).

The decision-making process on site suitability should be transparent and information from this Level 1 SFRA should be used to justify decisions to allocate land in areas shown to be at high or medium risk of flooding (Table 1-1), from any source, now or in the future.

Table 1-1: Flood risk categories

Risk	Fluvial	Surface water
High	Flood Zone 3	3.3% AEP event
Medium	Flood Zone 2	1% AEP and 0.1% AEP events
Low	Flood Zone 1	Outside of 0.1% AEP event

The Sites Assessment Spreadsheet provides a breakdown of each site and the area (in hectares) and percentage coverage of fluvial and surface water flood zones. Fluvial Flood Zones 3b, 3a, 2 and 1 are considered in isolation. Any area of a site within the higher risk Flood Zone 3b that is also within Flood Zone 3a is excluded from Flood Zone 3a and any area within Flood Zone 3a is excluded from Flood Zone 2. Similarly for surface water risk, the 3.3% AEP, 1% AEP and 0.1% AEP events are all considered in isolation.

This allows for the sequential assessment of risk at each site by addressing those sites at higher risk first. The effects of climate change on fluvial flood risk have been assessed additionally to existing risk. Table 1-2 and Table 1-3 show the proposed use of the sites and the number of sites within each fluvial flood zone and each surface water flood zone respectively.

Table 1-2: Number of sites at risk from fluvial flooding

Proposed use	Number of sites within each flood zone						
	Flood Zone 1*	Flood Zone 2	Flood Zone 3a	Flood Zone 3b	FMfP Flood Zones plus Climate Change	Modelled undefended 1% AEP + central climate change	Future functional floodplain
Housing	427	68	39	26	8	26	27
Employment	37	21	17	15	5	13	15
Industrial	29	6	5	2	0	2	1
Total	493	95	61	43	13	41	43
*Sites with 100% area within Flood Zone 1 Note: sites may be in more than one flood zone. In reality, a site in Flood Zone 3a will also be within Flood Zone 2.							

Table 1-3: Number of sites at risk from surface water flooding

Proposed use	Number of sites within each surface water flood zone				
	Less than 0.1% AEP*	0.1% AEP	1% AEP	3.3% AEP	1% AEP plus 2070s Upper End Climate Change
Residential	128	373	278	204	332
Employment	10	50	44	36	49
Industrial	5	31	22	17	29
Total	143	454	344	257	410
*Sites with 100% area within the less than 0.1% AEP risk zone Note: sites may be in more than one surface water risk category. In reality, a site in the 3.3% AEP event category will also be in the 1% and 0.1% AEP risk categories.					

1.1.1 Strategic recommendations

The strategic recommendations are intended to assist the LPA in carrying out the Sequential Test and to highlight those sites at greatest flood risk. They do not account for local circumstances, only that part of a site area falls within a flood risk area.

Table 1-4 shows the number of sites each strategic recommendation applies to:

- Strategic Recommendation A - recommend for withdrawal if built development cannot avoid Flood Zone 3b;
- Strategic Recommendation B - Level 2 SFRA required due to high and/or medium risk now or in the future. Exception Test required if site is at high and/or medium fluvial risk now or in the future, and categorised as more vulnerable or highly vulnerable;
- Strategic Recommendation C - progress to developer-led Flood Risk Assessment (FRA); and
- Strategic Recommendation D - development could be allocated on flood risk grounds based on the evidence of this Level 1 SFRA. LPA to make decision on allocation.

Table 1-4: Number of sites per strategic recommendation

Proposed use	Number of sites assigned to each strategic recommendation			
	A	B	C	D
Residential	26	361	40	82
Employment	15	35	3	7
Industrial	2	30	1	4
Total	43	426	44	93

It is important to note that each individual site will require further investigation before development is allocated, as local circumstances may dictate the outcome of the strategic recommendation. Such local circumstances may include the following:

- Flood depths, velocities, and hazards will differ locally at each site, therefore modelled depth, hazard and velocity data should be assessed for the relevant flood event through a Level 2 SFRA;
- The FMfP - Flood Zones and FMfP - Surface Water Spatial Planning datasets are designed to only give an indication of flood risk to an area of land and are not suitable for showing whether an individual property is at risk of flooding. This is because we cannot know all the details about each property.
- For sites identified to be at medium or high risk from surface water based on the FMfP - Surface Water Spatial Planning datasets, a proportionately more detailed assessment of surface water may reveal higher or lower risk to the site. The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) should be consulted when considering development at such sites. The datasets do not map flooding less than 0.075m (7.5cm) in

depth. Therefore, where the datasets may show no flooding, there may be shallow flooding up to a depth of 0.075m;

- Current surface water drainage infrastructure and sustainable drainage system (SuDS) suitability are likely to differ at each site considered to be at risk from surface water flooding. Further investigation may therefore be required for any site at high/medium surface water flood risk. The LLFA should require that planning applications must be accompanied by a drainage strategy appropriate to the level of risk, independent of the requirement for a site-specific FRA;
- It may be possible at some sites to develop around the flood risk. Planners are best placed to make this judgement i.e. will the site still be deliverable if part of it needs to be retained to make space for floodwater? Yields may be impacted;
- Surrounding existing infrastructure may influence scope for layout redesign/removal of site footprints from risk;
- Some sites not currently shown to be at flood risk may be at residual risk through the failure of defences during a flood event or through blockage/failure of drainage assets such as culverts. Assessment may be required through a Level 2 SFRA;
- Safe and dry access and escape routes must exist at all times during a flood event for emergency response and evacuation. Emergency planners should be consulted and appropriate emergency plans put in place;
- Current land use. A number of sites included in the assessment are likely to be brownfield containing existing development structures, thus the existing development structure and footprint should be considered insofar that additional development should not lead to increased flood risk; and
- Existing planning permissions may exist on some sites where the EA may have already passed comment and/or agreed to appropriate remedial works concerning flood risk. Previous flood risk investigations/FRAs may already have been carried out at some sites.

1.1.1.1 Strategic Recommendation A - recommend for withdrawal if built development cannot avoid Flood Zone 3b

Strategic Recommendation A applies to any site where the following criteria is true:

- Any proportion of the site area is within the functional floodplain. The FRCC-PPG flood risk vulnerability and flood zone 'incompatibility' table (Table 2) states that only water compatible uses and essential infrastructure could be permitted in the functional floodplain, though any essential infrastructure must pass the Exception Test and water compatible uses must be designed and constructed to remain operational and safe for users in times of flood; must result in no net loss of floodplain storage; and must not impede water flows and not increase flood risk elsewhere. Development should not be permitted for any proportion of sites within the highly, more, or less vulnerable categories that fall within the functional floodplain.

It is important to state that it may still be possible to deliver a site that has been recommended for withdrawal from allocation upon more detailed investigation through a Level 2 SFRA and subsequent updates of the Flood Zone 3b outline through more detailed modelling, if applicable.

Depending on local circumstances, if it is not possible to remove the developable area from Flood Zone 3b to a lower risk zone then the site should not be allocated or permitted.

43 of the 606 potential development sites have been recommended for withdrawal if built development cannot avoid the functional floodplain.

Any area within Flood Zone 3b should be left as or converted to open green space. For smaller sites, this approach may be challenging to achieve compared to larger sites or strategic sites where there may be enough space to limit the impact through effective flood storage or blue green infrastructure. If this is not possible, the site should be withdrawn.

1.1.1.2 Strategic Recommendation B - Level 2 SFRA required due to high and/or medium risk now or in the future. The Exception Test may be required.

Strategic Recommendation B applies to any site where the following criteria is true:

- Any part of a site is within Flood Zone 3a (high risk)
- Any part of a site is within Flood Zone 2 (medium risk)
- Any part of a site is at future fluvial risk (based on the future functional floodplain extent, modelled undefended 1% AEP + central climate change allowance extent or the EA Flood Map for Planning Flood Zones plus Climate Change Extent)
- Any part of a site is within a surface water present day extent
- Any part of a site is within the 1% AEP (2070s upper end) surface water climate change extent

NOTE: the Exception Test only applies to sites at fluvial flood risk, depending on the vulnerability of the site use (see Table 2 of the FRCC-PPG). Less vulnerable uses of land do not require the Exception Test but may still require a Level 2 SFRA to show whether they can be safe for the lifetime of development.

According to diagrams 1, 2 and 3 and Table 2 of the FRCC-PPG, any site at high or medium flood risk now and in the future should be assessed in more detail through a Level 2 SFRA. Strategic Recommendation B applies to sites where a Level 2 SFRA is required, unless the LPA can state in Local Plan policy that built development can avoid the risk area. This may be applicable where the proportion of a site at risk is small (i.e. less than 10% of the total site area is at surface water risk) or where the risk area is spatially isolated to specific areas of a site.

Sites included within Strategic Recommendation B may be subject to application of the Exception Test through a Level 2 SFRA i.e. more vulnerable sites in Flood Zone 3a. However, the Sequential Test should have been passed first, using this Level 1 SFRA, before the Exception Test is applied. The LPA should always attempt to avoid risk areas where possible.

Strategic Recommendation B applies to 426 of the 606 potential development sites assessed. 350 of these sites may require a Level 2 SFRA to further inform on surface water flood risk only, depending on the extent of risk across the site. When considering the medium risk surface water flood event, 300 of these sites have less than 10% of the total site area at medium surface water risk. Therefore, a Level 2 SFRA may not be required if development within the risk areas can be avoided through policy wording. The LPA should review the sites, using the site screening spreadsheet in Appendix E, to narrow down list of sites that may require Level 2 assessment. A Level 2 SFRA is only required for sites that are at either high or medium risk and will be allocated in the new Local Plan. A Level 2 SFRA Scoping Assessment will assist in identifying a final list of sites requiring a Level 2 assessment.

1.1.1.3 Strategic Recommendation C - allocate and progress to developer-led FRA

Strategic Recommendation C applies to any site where the following criteria is true:

- 100% within Flood Zone 1 (low risk) and not shown to be at surface water risk, but is greater than 1 hectare in area
- 100% within Flood Zone 1 (low risk) and not shown to be at additional risk from climate change, but is greater than 1 hectare in area
- 100% within Flood Zone 1 (low risk), not shown to be at surface water risk, but shown to be at risk from other sources, i.e. groundwater emergence or reservoir flooding

Strategic Recommendation C applies to 44 of the 606 potential development sites assessed.

1.1.1.4 Strategic Recommendation D - development could be allocated on flood risk grounds based on the evidence of this Level 1 SFRA. LPA to make decision on allocation

Strategic Recommendation D applies to any site where the following criteria is true:

- 100% within Flood Zone 1 and not at surface water risk or at risk from other sources, and less than 1 hectare in area
- Site not shown to be at additional risk from climate change

Strategic Recommendation D applies to 93 of the 606 potential development sites assessed. Further investigation (i.e. FRA) may be required by the developer at the planning application stage if any further or new information becomes available since the publication of this Level 1 SFRA.

1.1.2 Assessment of climate change

The Site Assessment Spreadsheet highlights the potential additional risk to sites, where applicable, as a result of climate change. To represent the increased flood risk resulting from climate change in fluvially dominated scenarios, a future functional floodplain, as delineated in this Level 1 SFRA, detailed EA modelled fluvial climate change outputs and the EA Flood Map for Planning Flood Zones plus Climate Change Extents have been assessed.

The spreadsheet highlights the **additional** risk to the potential development sites from climate change, i.e. areas at risk in the future that are not at risk in the present day. The 'Risk of Flooding from Fluvial Climate Change' columns indicate the area of each site that intersects with each flood extent. This is based on the NaFRA2 climate change modelling and available EA detailed model outlines. No additional modelling has been carried out for this Level 1 SFRA, as agreed with the EA.

The fluvial climate change scenarios assessed were:

- Modelled 3.3% AEP event + central climate change allowance (future functional floodplain)
- Modelled 1% AEP event + central climate change allowance (EA detailed model flood outlines)
- Combined 1% AEP and 0.1% AEP event + central climate change allowance (Flood Map for Planning - Flood Zones plus Climate Change Extent)

For representation of surface water plus climate change in this SFRA, the FMfP - Surface Water Spatial Planning Extents - Climate Change datasets have been assessed (1% AEP plus 2070s Upper End allowance for peak rainfall).

1.1.3 Assessment of groundwater emergence risk

The Site Assessment Spreadsheet contains a flag for potential groundwater emergence risks within each site, informed by the JBA Groundwater Map. This flags the highest risk category present within the site, not the category that covers the largest area. This is to help to understand where there may be groundwater issues within the site that may require further investigation at the FRA stage.

The JBA Groundwater Map does potentially enable a risk-based approach to be taken as it depicts different levels of risk. However, this is based on the risk of emergence of groundwater and not the risk of flooding due to groundwater. It should be noted that the location of highest risk of emergence might not be coincident with the location at highest risk of flooding.

Therefore, it is recommended that groundwater flood risk is not considered in the Sequential Test on the basis that the JBA Groundwater Map does not provide the confidence or certainty required to undertake the Sequential Test. As the available mapping does not provide competent evidence on the relative risk of flooding, it could potentially result in inappropriate allocations if used without understanding the limitations of the data. Appendix B addresses the use of flood risk information in the application of the Sequential Test.

1.1.4 Assessment of reservoir risk

The EA's Reservoir Flood Map (RFM) (2021) shows where water may go in the unlikely event of a reservoir or dam failure. A 'dry day' scenario assumes that the water level in the reservoir is the same as the spillway level or the underside of the roof for a service reservoir and the watercourses upstream and downstream of the reservoir are at a normal level.

The RFM dry day extents have been considered within the Site Assessment Spreadsheet. This is a flag as to whether the site is at potential residual risk from a reservoir breach. The mapping does not describe a risk-based scenario as it does not provide the probability of a dam failure but is intended to describe a 'worst credible case' in the unlikely scenario of a dam failure. Therefore, it is recommended that the RFM is not included in the Sequential Test as the available data is inappropriate to be used alongside risk mapping from other

sources. Appendix B addresses the use of flood risk information in the application of the Sequential Test.

A more detailed assessment in a Level 2 SFRA would identify locations where proposed development could result in a change to the risk designation of a reservoir. If proposed sites are located in a zone at reservoir risk, it will be necessary to understand the extent to which the flooding could be made worse and to report on the implications with respect to allocating the land for development. On that basis such an approach is recommended. If proposed development is located in a hazard zone in the vicinity of an existing dam structure the implications should be considered in a Level 2 SFRA or site-specific FRA and where appropriate an assessment made of whether alternative sites should be considered.

1.1.5 Assessment of unmodelled watercourses

The presence of nearby or on site fluvial watercourses that have not been modelled through either EA detailed modelling or national scale modelling have been documented within the Site Assessment Spreadsheet. This indicates sites where there may be some fluvial risk present that hasn't been modelled or mapped by the EA. Watercourses have been identified using the Ordnance Survey MasterMap Water Network dataset. For these sites, it is recommended that the risk from the currently unmodelled watercourses is quantified through a site-specific FRA.

1.2 Summary of site assessment outcomes

There are several consequential development considerations which could come out of the site assessment Sequential Testing process. Each outcome is discussed below. The LPA should refer to Section 1.1 and Appendix E for details on the site assessments carried out for this Level 1 SFRA.

1.2.1 Rejection of site

A site which fails to pass the Sequential Test and/or the Exception Test should be rejected and development not permitted. Rejection would also apply to any built development within the functional floodplain (unless water compatible or essential infrastructure informed by a FRA). However, if the developer can avoid built development within the functional floodplain, part of the site could still be delivered.

In terms of surface water flood risk, if risk is considered significant (i.e. large, sporadic areas at medium or high risk now or in the future with major flow paths) or where the size of the site does not allow for onsite storage or application or appropriate SuDS then such sites could be rejected. The LLFA will be best placed to advise on site-specific surface water flood risk and whether sites can be taken forward or not.

1.2.2 Exception Test required

Applies to those sites that, according to diagrams 1, 2 and 3, and Table 2 of the FRCC-PPG, would require the Exception Test. Only less vulnerable land uses would not require application of the Exception Test in Flood Zone 3a. More vulnerable uses are only permitted if both parts of the Exception Test are passed. Passing the Exception Test at the plan making stage does not negate the requirement for a FRA at the planning application stage. A Level 2 SFRA will inform the application of the Exception Test and the likelihood of passing part b of the test. Where any new or updated flood risk data to become available at the planning application stage, then the Exception Test should be reapplied using the new data.

1.2.3 Consideration of site layout and design

Site layout and design are important to consider early on in the site planning stage where flood risk exists. The site area would have to be large enough to enable any alteration of the developable area of the site to remove development from a risk area, or to leave space for onsite storage of floodwater. Careful layout and design at the site planning stage may apply to such sites where it is considered viable based on the level of risk. Surface water risk and opportunities for SuDS should also be assessed during the planning stage. Blue green corridors can be used as multifunctional spaces providing mitigation for flood risk management, ecology, biodiversity net gain (BNG), and amenity and social benefits.

Any development within 8 metres of any flood defence structure or culvert on a non-tidal main river is likely to be a regulated flood risk activity under Schedule 25 of the Environment Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016. Any site redesign, where Flood Zone 3a is included within the site footprint, should allow water to flow naturally or be stored in times of flood. Similarly, any change or alteration to an ordinary watercourse within a site would need consent from the LLFA under the [Land Drainage Act 1991](#).

1.2.4 Site-specific Flood Risk Assessment

A site-specific FRA should assess whether a potential development site is likely to be affected by current or future flooding from any source. This should include referencing this Level 1 SFRA to help to establish sources of flooding. Further analysis should be performed to improve the understanding of flood risk including agreement with the LPA and the EA on areas of functional floodplain that may not have been robustly defined within this SFRA due to the absence of appropriate information from the EA. The LLFA should be consulted on risk from surface water and from ordinary watercourses.

For further detail regarding the requirements of a site-specific FRA, refer to Section 7.2 of the main report. Together with the information in the FRCC-PPG, there is further detail and support provided for the LPAs and developers online via:

- [National flood risk standing advice for local planning authorities](#)
- [Preparing a flood risk assessment: standing advice](#)
- [Flood risk assessments: Applying for planning permission](#)

- Flood risk assessment: Flood Zones 1, 2, 3 and 3b

1.2.5 Sites passing the Sequential and Exception Tests

Development sites can be allocated or granted planning permission through a suitable site-specific FRA, approved and signed off by the LPA, where the Sequential Test and the Exception Test (if required) are passed and agreement is reached between the LPA/LLFA, the EA, the water companies and any ancillary stakeholders. In addition, a site is likely to be allocated without the need to assess flood risk where the indicative use is for open space. Assuming the site is not to include any development or land raising / regrading works and is to be left open in its original state then the allocation is likely to be acceptable from a flood risk point of view. However, for sites where there is potential for flood storage, options should be explored as part of a FRA.

In terms of opportunities for reducing flood risk overall as a requirement of the Exception Test, the FRCC-PPG states:

“Developers should refer to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessments and site-specific Flood Risk Assessments to identify opportunities to reduce flood risk overall and to demonstrate that the measures go beyond just managing the flood risk resulting from the development. Reductions could be achieved, for example by:

- *Incorporating green infrastructure within the layout and form of development to make additional space for the flow and storage of flood water;*
- *Providing Sustainable Drainage Systems, that manage flood risk beyond the proposed site and above the usual standard, such as by removing surface water from existing combined sewers;*
- *Providing or making contributions to flood risk management infrastructure that will provide additional benefits to existing communities and/or by safeguarding the land that would be needed to deliver it.” (Paragraph 37).*

1.2.6 Surface water flood risk to assessed sites

For sites at surface water flood risk, the following should be considered, proportionate to the risk shown by the FMfP - Surface Water Spatial Planning datasets:


- More detailed surface water assessment or modelling may reveal increased risk or less risk to a site compared to what is shown by the national FMfP - Surface Water Spatial Planning datasets. The LLFA should be consulted when considering development viability at such sites;
- The FMfP - Surface Water Spatial Planning datasets do not map flooding less than 0.075m (7.5cm) in depth. Therefore, where the dataset may show no flooding, there may be shallow flooding up to a depth of 0.075m;
- Outline drainage strategy to ascertain natural flow paths and topographic depressions, particularly for the larger sites which may influence development at sites elsewhere;

- Full drainage strategy encompassing detailed surface water modelling of proposed site layouts, attenuation areas, diversion of flow routes, SuDS;
- Ensuring future maintenance of surface water and SuDS assets through s106 agreements;
- The size of development and the possibility of increased surface water flood risk caused by development on current greenfield land (where applicable) and cumulative impacts of this within specific areas;
- Management and re-use of surface water onsite, assuming the site is large enough to facilitate this and achieve effective mitigation. Effective surface water management should ensure risks on and off site are controlled;
- Larger sites could leave surface water flood-prone areas as open greenspace, incorporating social and environmental benefits;
- SuDS must be used where possible for all developments of more than one property. Appropriate SuDS may offer opportunities to control runoff to greenfield rates or better. Restrictions on surface water runoff from new development should be incorporated into the development planning stage. For brownfield sites, where current infrastructure may be staying in place, then runoff should attempt to mimic that of greenfield rates, unless it can be demonstrated that this is unachievable or hydraulically impractical. Developers should refer to the 'National standards for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS)', updated July 2025, relevant Local Plan policies and other guidance documents cited in the main report. Note that SuDS should not be sited in locations of fluvial flood risk unless they are designed to mitigate for both sources of risk;
- Runoff up to and including the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) event, including for climate change, should be managed onsite where possible;
- Measures of source control should be required for all development sites;
- Developers should be required to set part of their site aside for surface water management, to contribute to flood risk management in the wider area and supplement blue green infrastructure networks;
- Developers should be required to maximise permeable surfaces;
- Flow routes on new development where the sewerage system surcharges as a consequence of exceedance of the 3.3% AEP design event should be retained;
- It may be beneficial to carry out a local Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP) or wider drainage strategies for targeted locations with any known critical drainage problems. Investigation into the capacity of existing sewer systems would be required in order to identify critical parts of the system i.e. pinch points. Drainage model outputs could be obtained from the water company to confirm the critical parts of the drainage network and subsequent recommendations could then be made for future development i.e. strategic SuDS sites, parts of the drainage system where any new connections should be avoided, and parts of the system that may have any additional capacity and recommended runoff rates. A Water Cycle Study would help to inform this.

Our Offices

Bristol
Coleshill
Cork
Doncaster
Dublin
Edinburgh
Exeter
Glasgow
Haywards Heath
Leeds
Limerick

Newcastle
Newport
Peterborough
Portsmouth
Saltaire
Skipton
Tadcaster
Thirsk
Wallingford
Warrington



Registered Office

1 Broughton Park
Old Lane North
Broughton
SKIPTON
North Yorkshire
BD23 3FD
United Kingdom

+44(0) 1756 799919
info@jbaconsulting.com
www.jbaconsulting.com

Follow us on  

Jeremy Benn
Associates Limited
Registered in
England
3246693

JBA Group Ltd is
certified to
ISO 9001:2015
ISO 14001:2015
ISO 27001:2022
ISO 45001:2018

