



Flood Risk Sequential Test

April 2024



Contents

1.	Introduction	1
	The Sequential Test	1
	The Exception Test	
2.	Flood Risk in the Borough	11
3.	Site Analysis Methodology	15
4.	Site Assessment	18
	Windfall Sites	
	Site Status and Availability	
	Exception Test	
5.	Conclusion	166

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Elmbridge Borough Council submitted its draft new Local Plan to the Planning Inspectorate for Examination in August 2023. The Draft Elmbridge Local Plan sets out the Council's spatial strategy for the Borough for a 15-year period, that seeks to deliver the Council's vision for how the Borough's places and communities will grow. It includes borough-wide strategic and detailed development management policies to deliver sustainable growth. In addition, the Local Plan includes a set of sites allocated for development to meet the identified needs for housing, employment and open space.
- 1.2 National planning policy and guidance requires the Council to demonstrate that throughout the site allocation process a range of possible sites have been considered in conjunction with flood risk and vulnerability information through the application of the 'Sequential Test', and where necessary the 'Exception Test'.

The Sequential Test

- 1.3 The <u>National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)</u>¹ sets out at paragraph 159 that "*inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future*)..."
- 1.4 Paragraph 161 goes on to establish that "all plans should apply a sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development taking into account all sources of flood risk and the current and future impacts of climate change so as to avoid, where possible, flood risk to people and property. They should do this, and manage any residual risk, by: a) applying the Sequential Test and then, if necessary, the Exception Test..."
- 1.5 "The aim of the Sequential Test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding" (NPPF paragraph 162). The Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA)² provides the basis for applying the Sequential Test.
- 1.6 Paragraph 023 (Reference ID: 7-023-20220825) of the Planning Practice

¹ DLUHC, National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), September 2023.

² Elmbridge Borough Council, Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) – Level 1, April 2024 and associated appendices; SFRA – Level 2, April 2024 and associated appendices.

Guidance (PPG) on <u>Flood Risk and Coastal Change³</u> provides further detail on the aim of the Sequential Test, setting out that it is an approach designed to ensure that areas at little or no risk of flooding from any source are developed in preference to areas at higher risk. This means avoiding, so far as possible, development in current and future medium and high flood risk areas considering all sources of flooding, including areas at risk of surface water flooding.

- 1.7 Avoiding flood risk through the Sequential Test is the most effective way of addressing flood risk because it places the least reliance on measures like flood defences, flood warnings and property level resilience features. Even where a flood risk assessment shows the development can be made safe throughout its lifetime without increasing risk elsewhere, the sequential test still needs to be satisfied.
- 1.8 "The Sequential Test ensures that a sequential, risk-based approach is followed to steer new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding, taking all sources of flood risk and climate change into account" (PPG: Flood Risk and Coastal Change, Paragraph 024, Reference ID: 7-024-20220825) in accordance with paragraph 159 and 161 of the NPPF. The Sequential Test is applied to the whole local planning authority area to increase the possibilities of accommodating development that is not exposed to flood risk, both now and in the future (PPG: Flood Risk and Coastal Change, Paragraph 025, Reference ID: 7-025-20220825).
- 1.9 The process of applying the Sequential Test in the preparation of a Local Plan is illustrated in diagram 2 of the PPG on Flood Risk and Coastal Change (figure 1 below).

³ DLUHC and MHCLG, Planning Practice Guidance, Flood Risk and Coastal Change, August 2022.



Figure 1: Application of the Sequential Test for plan preparation.

1.10 Application of the Sequential Test requires an understanding of the defined 'Flood Zones' in the study area and the vulnerability classification of the proposed sites and developments being assessed.

Flood Zones

1.11 Flood Zones are spatial extents in which there is a defined probability of river or sea flooding. Flood Zone definitions are set out in table 1 of the PPG on Flood Risk and Coastal Change (table 1 below). They are also mapped spatially within the Environment Agency's Flood Map for Planning (Rivers and Sea)⁴ and the Council's SFRA.

Flood Zone	Definition									
Zone 1	Land	having	а	less	than	0.1%	annual			

⁴ Environment Agency, Flood Map for Planning (Rivers and Sea), November 2023.

	1
Low Probability	probability of river or sea flooding. (Shown as 'clear' on the Flood Map for Planning – all land
	outside Zones 2, 3a and 3b)
Zone 2	Land having between a 1% and 0.1% annual
Medium Probability	probability of river flooding; or land having
	between a 0.5% and 0.1% annual probability of
	sea flooding. (Land shown in light blue on the
	Flood Map)
Zone 3a	Land having a 1% or greater annual probability
High Probability	of river flooding; or Land having a 0.5% or
	greater annual probability of sea. (Land shown
	in dark blue on the Flood Map)
Zone 3b	This zone comprises land where water from
The Functional Floodplain	rivers or the sea has to flow or be stored in times of flood. The identification of functional floodplain should take account of local circumstances and not be defined solely on rigid probability parameters. Functional floodplain will normally comprise:
	 land having a 3.3% or greater annual probability of flooding, with any existing flood risk management infrastructure operating effectively; or
	 land that is designed to flood (such as a flood attenuation scheme), even if it would only flood in more extreme events (such as 0.1% annual probability of flooding).

Table 1: Flood Zones.

- 1.12 The Flood Zones defined in table 1 above only consider flood risk from the sea and rivers. The NPPF and PPG requires all sources of flooding to be considered in determining where development should be located and to inform the application of the Sequential Test, including flooding from land or surface water runoff; groundwater; sewers; and artificial sources. An assessment of the risk of flooding from these additional sources is included within the Council's SFRA.
- 1.13 In addition, the Flood Zones defined above and the Environment Agency's Flood Map for Planning (Rivers and Sea) do not take account of the possible impacts of climate change and consequent changes in the future probability of flooding. Again, an assessment of the potential impacts of climate change on flood risk in the Borough is included within the Council's SFRA.

Flood Zone 3b – the Functional Floodplain

- 1.14 Flood Zone 3b (the Functional Floodplain) is not separately distinguished from Zone 3a within the Environment Agency's Flood Map for Planning (Rivers and Sea). The PPG sets out that Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) should identify the extents of the functional floodplain and its boundaries within their SFRA and in agreement with the Environment Agency (PPG: Flood Risk and Coastal Change, Table 1: Flood Zones).
- 1.15 The Council's SFRA defines Flood Zone 3b within Elmbridge as land with an annual probability of flooding of 1 in 30 (3.3% AEP) associated with the Lower Thames (Thames Dominated and Tributary Dominated), Lower Wey, Middle Mole, Rythe and Dead River as a starting point.
- 1.16 As the 1 in 30 (3.3% AEP) annual probability flood outline was not available for the Lower Mole or Dead River, a conservative approach was used with the 1 in 75 (1.33% AEP) and 1 in 50 (2% AEP) respectively.
- 1.17 Within the Flood Zone 3b outline, undeveloped areas, where water has to flow or be stored in times of flood, are defined as Functional Floodplain and protected from non-compatible development (as defined in Table 2 - Flood Risk vulnerability and flood Zone incompatibility of PPG on Flood Risk and Coastal Change).
- 1.18 In Elmbridge there are some areas within the 1 in 30 (3.3% AEP) or greater flood extent that are already developed and are prevented from flooding by the presence of existing infrastructure or solid buildings. Whilst these areas will be subject to frequent flooding, it may not be practical to refuse all future development. As such, and in accordance with the PPG2, existing building footprints, where they can be demonstrated to exclude floodwater, will not be defined as Functional Floodplain. The land surrounding these buildings are important flow paths and flood storage areas and properties within these areas will be subject to frequent flooding; therefore, care must be given to the future sustainability of such development.
- 1.19 The approach to development within these areas recognises the importance of pragmatic planning solutions that will not unnecessarily 'blight' areas of existing development, the importance of the undeveloped land surrounding them and the potential opportunities to reinstate areas which can operate as Functional Floodplain through redevelopment to provide space for floodwater and reduce risk to new and existing development.

Vulnerability Classification

1.20 Annex 3 of the NPPF (table 2 below) sets out a classification system categorising types of development according to their vulnerability to flood risk.

Essential Infrastructure

- Essential transport infrastructure (including mass evacuation routes) which has to cross the area at risk.
- Essential utility infrastructure which has to be located in a flood risk area for operational reasons, including infrastructure for electricity supply including generation, storage and distribution systems; and water treatment works that need to remain operational in times of flood.
- Wind turbines.
- Solar farms.

Highly Vulnerable

- Police and ambulance stations; fire stations and command centres; telecommunications installations required to be operational during flooding.
- Emergency dispersal points.
- Basement dwellings.
- Caravans, mobile homes and park homes intended for permanent residential use.
- Installations requiring hazardous substances consent. (Where there is a demonstrable need to locate such installations for bulk storage of materials with port or other similar facilities, or such installations with energy infrastructure or carbon capture and storage installations, that require coastal or water-side locations, or need to be located in other high flood risk areas, in these instances the facilities should be classified as 'Essential Infrastructure'.)

More Vulnerable

- Hospitals
- Residential institutions such as residential care homes, children's homes, social services homes, prisons and hostels.
- Buildings used for dwelling houses, student halls of residence, drinking establishments, nightclubs and hotels.
- Non-residential uses for health services, nurseries and educational establishments.
- Landfill* and sites used for waste management facilities for hazardous waste.
- Sites used for holiday or short-let caravans and camping, subject to a specific warning and evacuation plan.

Less Vulnerable

- Police, ambulance and fire stations which are not required to be operational during flooding.
- Buildings used for shops; financial, professional and other services; restaurants, cafes and hot food takeaways; offices; general industry, storage and distribution; non-residential institutions not included in the 'more vulnerable' class; and assembly and leisure.
- Land and buildings used for agriculture and forestry.
- Waste treatment (except landfill* and hazardous waste facilities).
- Minerals working and processing (except for sand and gravel working).
- Water treatment works which do not need to remain operational during times of flood.
- Sewage treatment works, if adequate measures to control pollution and manage sewage during flooding events are in place.
- Car parks.

Water-compatible Development

- Flood control infrastructure.
- Water transmission infrastructure and pumping stations.
- Sewage transmission infrastructure and pumping stations.
- Sand and gravel working.
- Docks, marinas and wharves.
- Navigation facilities.
- Ministry of Defence installations.
- Ship building, repairing and dismantling, dockside fish processing and refrigeration and compatible activities requiring a waterside location.
- Water-based recreation (excluding sleeping accommodation).
- Lifeguard and coastguard stations.
- Amenity open space, nature conservation and biodiversity, outdoor sports and recreation and essential facilities such as changing rooms.
- Essential ancillary sleeping or residential accommodation for staff required by uses in this category, subject to a specific warning and evacuation plan.

* Landfill is as defined in Schedule 10 of the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010.

Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability classification (NPPF, Annex 3).

1.21 Figure 1 demonstrates that where it is not possible to locate development in low-risk areas, the Sequential Test defines a process by which reasonably available sites within medium risk areas and then, only where there are no reasonably available sites in low and medium risk areas, sites within high-risk

areas are to be considered for the allocation of development.

- 1.22 Paragraph 024 (Reference ID: 7-024-20220825) of the PPG on Flood Risk and Coastal Change provides further guidance on how the Sequential Test should be applied to the consideration of sites within medium and higher risk areas: *"initially, the presence of existing flood risk management infrastructure should be ignored, as the long-term funding, maintenance and renewal of this infrastructure is uncertain. Climate change will also impact upon the level of protection infrastructure will offer throughout the lifetime of development. The Sequential Test should then consider the spatial variation of risk within medium and then high flood risk areas to identify the lowest risk sites in these areas, ignoring the presence of flood risk management infrastructure.*
- 1.23 It may then be appropriate to consider the role of flood risk management infrastructure in the variation of risk within high and medium flood risk areas. In doing so, information such as flood depth, velocity, hazard and speed-of-onset in the event of flood risk management infrastructure exceedance and/or failure, should be considered as appropriate. Information on the probability of flood defense failure is unsuitable for planning purposes given the substantial uncertainties involved in such long-term predictions".

The Exception Test

- 1.24 Paragraph 162 of the NPPF establishes that in the event that the application of the Sequential Test identifies that it is not possible for development to be located in areas with a lower risk of flooding, the Exception Test may have to be applied.
- 1.25 In the context of the preparation of the Local Plan the application of the exception test is again informed by the Council's SFRA, in the context of the production of a Local Plan. "*To pass the exception test it should be demonstrated that:*
 - a) the development would provide wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh the flood risk; and
 - b) the development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall' (NPPF, paragraph 164).
- 1.26 The NPPF is clear that both elements of the exception test should be satisfied for development to be allocated (NPPF, paragraph 165). In addition, paragraph 031 (Reference ID: 7-031-20220825) of the PPG on Flood Risk and Coastal Change is clear that "the Exception Test is not a tool to justify development in

flood risk areas when the Sequential Test has already shown that there are reasonably available, lower risk sites, appropriate for the proposed development. It would only be appropriate to move onto the Exception Test in these cases where, accounting for wider sustainable development objectives, application of relevant local and national policies would provide a clear reason for refusing development in any alternative locations identified..."

1.27 The process of applying the Exception Test in the preparation of a Local Plan after the Sequential Test has been followed is illustrated in diagram 3 of the PPG on Flood Risk and Coastal Change (figure 2 below). An



Figure 2: Application of the Exception Test to plan preparation.

1.28 The Exception Test is applied as set out in Table 2 of the PPG on Flood Risk and Coastal Change (table 3 below), which combines an understanding of the Flood Zones within the study area and development vulnerability classifications set out in table 1 and 2 above, and only if the Sequential Test has shown that there are no reasonably available, lower-risk sites, suitable for the proposed development, to which the development could be steered.

	Essential	Highly	More	Less	Water
	Infrastructure	Vulnerable	Vulnerable	Vulnerable	Compatible
Zone	Exception	Exception	Exception	Exception	Exception
1	Test not	Test not	Test not	Test not	Test not
	required	required	required	required	required
Zone	Exception	Exception	Exception	Exception	Exception
2	Test not	test required	Test not	Test not	Test not
	required		required	required	required
Zone	Exception	Development	Exception	Exception	Exception
3a*	test required*	should not be	test required	Test not	Test not
		permitted		required	required
Zone	Exception	Development	Development	Development	Exception
3b**	test	should not be	should not be	should not be	test
	required**	permitted	permitted	permitted	required**

Table 3: Flood risk vulnerability and flood zone 'incompatibility'.

Notes to table 3:

* In Flood Zone 3a essential infrastructure should be designed and constructed to remain operational and safe in times of flood.

** In Flood Zone 3b (functional floodplain) essential infrastructure that has passed the Exception Test, and water-compatible uses, should be designed and constructed to:

- 1. remain operational and safe for users in times of flood;
- 2. result in no net loss of floodplain storage;
- 3. not impede water flows and not increase flood risk elsewhere.
- 1.29 Again, table 3 above only considers flood risk from the sea and rivers. The assessment of flood risk from all other sources included within the Council's SFRA must also be considered when applying the Exception Test. Where developments contain different elements of vulnerability, the highest vulnerability category should be used, unless the development is considered in its component parts (PPG: Flood Risk and Coastal Change, Paragraph 079, Reference ID: 7-079-20220825).
- 1.30 The Sequential and Exception Tests should be applied to all development, except those set out in footnote 56 of the NPPF. This includes householder development, small non-residential extensions (with a footprint of less than 250 m²) and changes of use; except for changes of use to a caravan, camping or chalet site, or to a mobile home or park home site, where the sequential and exception tests should be applied as appropriate.

2. Flood Risk in the Borough

2.1 The Council's SFRA – Level 1 and Level 2 identify the potential sources of flood risk in Elmbridge as river flooding, surface water flooding, groundwater flooding, sewer flooding and flooding due to reservoir failure.

River Flooding

- 2.2 A large proportion of the Elmbridge is located in areas that have a Medium and High probability of flooding from rivers (i.e. within Flood Zones 2 and 3), with 20% (20 km²) within Flood Zone 2 and a combined 11% (11 km²) within Flood Zone 3a and 3b. As such, river flooding is the most significant source of flood risk in the Borough and there is a long history of river flooding events, which are set out in detail within the Council's SFRA – Level 1.
- 2.3 The floodplain of the Lower Thames affects the northern and northeast fringe of the Borough including Walton, Molesey and Thames Ditton. Weybridge and the western edge of the Borough are within the floodplain of the River Wey. The River Mole and the River Rythe flow northwards through the Borough, with the floodplains associated with these watercourses affect the settlements of Cobham, Stoke D'Abernon, Downside, Esher, Claygate, West End, Hersham, Walton and Molesey.
- 2.4 The hydraulic modelling studies undertaken for the Council's SFRA Level 1 and indicates that climate change will not markedly increase the extent of river flooding within most areas of the Borough. However there are a few places where the extent of flooding is noticeably increased, including flooding from the Lower Thames in West Molesey and to the north of Thames Ditton; flooding from the Dead River in Walton on Thames and West Molesey; flooding from the Lower Mole in Lower Green and East Molesey; flooding from the Middle Mole in the east of Hersham and south of Stoke D'Abernon; flooding associated with the River Wey close to the Brooklands Industrial Estate and flooding from the River Rythe close to the west and north of Oxshott and to the north of Hinchley Wood.
- 2.5 In addition, the areas identified above, as well as those areas that are currently at risk of flooding may be susceptible to more frequent, more severe flooding in future years due to the impact of climate change. For this reason, the Council's SFRA Level 1 sets out a range of development management recommendations requiring all floor levels, access routes, drainage systems and flood mitigation measures to be designed with an allowance for climate change; and the potential impact that climate change may have over the lifetime

of a proposed development should be considered as part of a site-specific flood risk assessment. This provides a robust and sustainable approach to the potential impacts that climate change may have upon the Borough over the next 100 years, ensuring that future development is considered in light of the possible increases in flood risk over time.

- 2.6 Whilst a range of flood risk management schemes are in place within the Borough (these are detailed within the Council's SFRA Level 1). The risk of flooding from the rivers in Elmbridge can never be fully mitigated and there will always be a residual risk of flooding that will remain after measures have been implemented to protect an area or a particular site from flooding. This residual risk is associated with a number of potential risk factors including (but not limited to):
 - A flooding event that exceeds that for which the flood risk management measures have been designed;
 - The structural deterioration of flood defence structures (including informal structures acting as a flood defence) over time; and/or
 - General uncertainties inherent in the prediction of flooding.

Surface Water Flooding

2.7 In addition to the risk of flooding associated with the rivers running through the Borough, overland flow and surface water flooding is also a source of flood risk. Surface water flooding typically arises following periods of intense rainfall, often of short duration, that is unable to soak into the ground or enter drainage systems. It can run quickly off land and result in localised flooding. The Council's SFRA – Level 1 identifies that incidents of surface water flooding are widespread across most parts of the Borough, with a number of areas identified as being particularly at risk.

Groundwater Flooding

- 2.8 Groundwater flooding usually occurs in low lying areas underlain by permeable rock and aquifers that allow groundwater to rise to the surface through the permeable subsoil following long periods of wet weather. Low lying areas may be more susceptible to groundwater flooding because the water table is usually at a much shallower depth and groundwater paths tend to travel from high to low ground.
- 2.9 In broad terms there is limited potential for groundwater flooding in the central part of the Borough including Weybridge urban area, Esher and Cobham. However, the potential for groundwater flooding is greater in Hersham, Walton-on-Thames and East and West Molesey where the underlying geological

conditions are more permeable.

Sewer Flooding

- 2.10 During heavy rainfall, flooding from the sewer system may occur if:
 - 1. The rainfall event exceeds the capacity of the sewer system/drainage system Sewer systems are typically designed and constructed to accommodate rainfall events with an annual probability of 1 in 30 (3.3% AEP) or greater. Therefore, rainfall events with an annual probability less than 1 in 30 (3.3% AEP) would be expected to result in surcharging of some of the sewer system. While TWUL, as the sewerage undertaker within Elmbridge, recognise the impact that more extreme rainfall events may have, it is not cost beneficial to construct sewers that could accommodate every extreme rainfall event.
 - 2. **The system becomes blocked by debris or sediment** Over time there is potential that road gullies and drains become blocked from fallen leaves, build-up of sediment and debris (e.g. litter).
 - 3. The system surcharges due to high water levels in receiving watercourses Within the Borough there is potential for surface water outlets to become submerged due to high river levels. When this happens, water is unable to discharge. Once storage capacity within the sewer system itself is exceeded, the water will overflow into streets and potentially into houses. Where the local area is served by 'combined' sewers i.e. containing both foul and storm water, if rainfall entering the sewer exceeds the capacity of the combined sewer and storm overflows are blocked by high water levels in receiving watercourses, surcharging and surface flooding may again occur but in this instance floodwaters will contain untreated sewage.

Reservoir Flooding

- 2.11 There are four large water supply reservoirs present within the Borough, the Queen Elizabeth II Storage Reservoir, Bessborough Reservoir and Knight Reservoir all located within Walton-on-Thames; and Island Barn Reservoir in East and West Molesey. In addition, the Queen Mary Reservoir is located in neighbouring Spelthorne Borough to the north of Elmbridge. TWUL is responsible for the management of these reservoirs and ensuring all required safety standards are met.
- 2.12 The failure of a reservoir has the potential to cause catastrophic damage due to the sudden release of large volumes of water. Reservoirs in the UK have an

extremely good safety record. The Environment Agency is the enforcement authority for the Reservoirs Act 1975 in England and Wales. All large reservoirs must be inspected and supervised by reservoir panel engineers. Reservoir failure therefore presents a minimal risk in the Borough. That said, parts of the Borough are identified as being at risk of flooding from the five reservoirs identified above, including Walton-on-Thames and East and West Molesey and Thames Ditton.

3. Site Analysis Methodology

- 3.1 199 sites were taken forward for allocation in the Draft Elmbridge Local Plan. These are set out in Chapter 9 of the <u>Draft Elmbridge Local Plan⁵</u>. The Council's SFRA – Level 2 sets out a detailed assessment of the flood risk of each of these sites from all sources, including associated flood risk mapping.
- 3.2 The site assessment database establishes a ranking system (set out in table 5 below) which categorises the sites by the level of flood risk from all sources and identifies the relative level of flood risk among low, medium and high-risk areas. The ranking system allows for an understanding of the spatial variation of flood risk in the Borough to inform the Sequential Test.

Rank	Criteria
1	Part of the site is within Flood Zone 3b associated with the Dead River, Lower Mole,
	Middle Mole, Lower Wey, Lower Thames or Rythe.
2	More than 50% of the site is defined as Flood Zone 3a.
3	Less than 50% of the site is defined as Flood Zone 3a.
4	More than 50% of the site is defined as Flood Zone 2.
5	Less than 50% of the site is defined as Flood Zone 2.
6	The site is located within a High Priority Flood Area.
7	The site is located within a Medium Priority Flood Area.
8	The site is defined as Flood Zone 1 and intersects an area at high risk of flooding
	from surface water and/or intersects an area that has the potential for groundwater
	flooding to occur at surface and/or lies within a Postcode Area with 30 or more DG5
	sewer flood records.
9	The site is defined as Flood Zone 1 and intersects an area at medium risk of flooding
	from surface water and/or intersects an area that has the potential for groundwater
	flooding of property situated below ground level and/or lies within a Postcode Area
	with 20 or more DG5 sewer flood records.
10	The site is defined as Flood Zone 1 and intersects an area at low risk of flooding from
	surface water and/or intersects an area that has limited potential for groundwater
	flooding to occur and/or lies within a Postcode Area with 10 or more DG5 sewer flood
	records.
11	The site is defined as Flood Zone 1 and is at risk of reservoir flooding in the event of
	a failure or a breach on a wet or dry day or lies within a Postcode Area with 5 or more
	DG5 sewer flood records.
12	The site is defined as Flood Zone 1 and is not shown to be at risk of any flooding.

Table 4: SFRA ranking system.

3.3 Using the Level 2 SFRA site assessments, the Sequential Test has been applied to each site using the following the approach outlined below in accordance with Figure 1: application of the Sequential Test for plan

⁵ Elmbridge Borough Council, Regulation 19 Draft Elmbridge Local Plan 2037, June 2022.

preparation above (diagram 2 of the PPG on Flood Risk and Coastal Change):

- 1. Can development be allocated in areas of low flood risk both now and in the future? (Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment).
 - If Yes: Sequential Test passed.
 - If Not: progress to 2. below;
- 2. Can development be allocated in areas of medium flood risk, both now and in the future? (Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment) lowest risk sites first (referring to table 1 and 2 above).
 - If Yes: progress to Exception Test (referring to table 3 above).
 - If Not: progress to 3. below;
- 3. Can development be allocated within the lowest risk sites available in areas of high flood risk both now and in the future? (referring to table 1 and 2 above).
 - If Yes: progress to Exception Test (referring to table 3 above).
 - If Not: progress to 4. below;
- 4. Is the development appropriate in the remaining areas (referring to tables 1, 2 and 3 above)?
 - If Yes: progress to Exception Test.
 - If Not: progress to 5. below;
- 5. Strategically review the need for the development using Sustainability Appraisal.
- 3.4 Where the application of the Sequential Test identified it was necessary, the Exception Test was then applied to determine if the proposed site/development allocation was able to pass both part one and two of the test, in accordance with paragraph 165 of the NPPF. To determine if the Exception Test was required the following approach was taken in accordance with Figure 2: application of the Exception Test to plan preparation above (diagram 3 of the PPG on Flood Risk and Coastal Change):
 - 1. Has the sequential test been applied and shown that there are no

reasonably available, lower risk sites, suitable for the proposed development, to which the development could be steered?

- If Not: Do the Sequential Test.
- If Yes: progress to 2. below;
- 2. Is the Exception test required (referring to table 3 above)?

If Yes: Does the development pass both parts of the exception test?

- If Yes: Development can be considered for allocation or permission.
- If Not: Development is not appropriate and should not be considered.

If Not: Can the development be made safe throughout its lifetime, without increasing flood risk elsewhere (referring to table 2 and 3 above)?

- If Yes: Development can be considered for allocation or permission.
- If Not: Development is not appropriate and should not be considered.
- 3.5 To satisfy part one of the Exception Test *is it demonstrable that the development will provide wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk?* The framework objectives of the <u>Sustainability Appraisal for the Draft Local Plan⁶</u> were used as the basis for the assessment criteria.
- 3.6 In addition, the Sustainability Appraisal was used to understand the need for the development and its benefits. If other sustainability criteria outweighed flood risk issues, reasoned justifications have been provided to support the allocation of land in areas at high risk of flooding.
- 3.7 In accordance with national policy and guidance flood risk data from all sources and data on the potential impact of climate change on flood risk were used to inform the Sequential and Exception Tests were taken from the Council's SFRA.

⁶ Elmbridge Borough Council, Sustainability Appraisal for the Draft Local Plan, June 2022.

4. Site Assessment

- 4.1 The tables below set out the Sequential Test of each site allocation proposed in the Draft Elmbridge Local Plan.
- 4.2 The Sequential Test of each site assumes that development on all sites follows the recommendations of the Council's Level 1 and 2 SFRA, which recommend that all development proposals:
 - Seek to restrict surface water runoff rates to greenfield rates; demonstrate sustainable approaches to the management of surface water making use of SuDS; and incorporate soft landscaping, planting, and permeable surfacing.
 - Undertake a preliminary Hydrogeological Risk Assessment (HRA) to determine ground conditions and groundwater levels in proximity to the site, and to identify whether the proposed development will impact on groundwater, either from subsurface construction or from changes to surface water drainage. The potential impact of climate change will be included within this assessment. Should the preliminary HRA identify potential for impact, a full HRA should be prepared to identify proposed mitigation measures.
 - Basements, basement extensions, conversions of basements to a higher vulnerability classification or self-contained units will not permitted in Flood Zone 3b. Nor should they be permitted in areas prone to groundwater flooding.
 - Where development or redevelopment is proposed in areas at risk of flooding, flood resilience and resistance measures should be implemented in accordance with paragraph 173(b) of the NPPF. However, flood resistance and resilience measures cannot be used to justify development in inappropriate locations.

Windfall Sites

- 4.3 A large number of windfall sites come forward every year within the Borough. In this instance, developers will need to take into account the findings and recommendations of this Sequential Test and provide evidence that they have adequately considered other reasonably available sites.
- 4.4 Paragraph 166 of the NPPF sets out that "where planning applications come

forward on sites allocated in a development plan through the Sequential Test, applicants need not apply the Sequential Test again. However, the exception test may need to be reapplied if relevant aspects of the proposal had not been considered when the test was applied at the plan making stage, or if more recent information about existing or potential flood risk should be taken into account".

4.5 In addition, as outlined in paragraph 1.29 of section 1 above, paragraph 168 of the NPPF states that applications for minor development and changes of use should not be subject to the Sequential and Exception Tests. However, they should still meet the requirements for site-specific flood risk assessments set out in NPPF footnote 55⁷. Windfall sites are not assessed in this Sequential Test. Therefore, the need to apply the Sequential and Exception tests on windfall sites that come forward will depend on their size.

Site Status and Availability

- 4.6 It must be noted that a number of site allocations included in submitted Elmbridge Local Plan, which was published as a Regulation 19 document in June 2019 have since become unavailable and therefore will not be taken forward as site allocations. These are included within the Sequential Test site assessments to ensure to reflects the Plan as submitted.
 - MOL4 East Molesey Car Park, Walton Road
 - MOL10 Vine Medical Centre, 69 Pemberton Road, East Molesey
 - MOL14 43 Palace Road, East Molesey
 - MOL16 Tesco Metro car park, Walton Road
 - ESH15 Unit A & B Sandown Industrial Park, Esher

⁷ **NPPF Footnote 55:** A site-specific flood risk assessment should be provided for all development in Flood Zones 2 and 3. In Flood Zone 1, an assessment should accompany all proposals involving: sites of 1 hectare or more; land which has been identified by the Environment Agency as having critical drainage problems; land identified in a strategic flood risk assessment as being at increased flood risk in future; or land that may be subject to other sources of flooding, where its development would introduce a more vulnerable use.

Claygate

Site ref.	Site name	Site area (ha)	Flood zone	Proposed development	Vulnerability	SFRA rank	Flood Risk from all sources now and in the future	Can development be steered towards an area at lower risk?	Exception test required?	Sequential test passed?	Specific Requirements for applications
CL1	Torrington Lodge Car Park, Hare Lane	0.33	1	8 homes	More vulnerable	10	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (11% of site) Groundwater – NO RISK Sewer – LOW RISK (15 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
CL2	Garages to the rear of Foxwarren, Claygate	0.21	1	5 homes	More vulnerable	10	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (15% of site) Groundwater – NO RISK Sewer – LOW RISK (15 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	

CL3	Garages to the rear of Holroyd Road, Claygate	0.09	1	3 homes	More vulnerable	10	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (23% of site) Groundwater – NO RISK Sewer – LOW RISK (15 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
CL4	Hare Lane Car Park, Hare Lane, Claygate	0.16	1	7 homes	More vulnerable	10	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO RISK Groundwater – NO RISK Sewer – LOW RISK (15 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
CL5	Claygate Centre, Elm Road, Claygate	0.28	1	14 homes and reprovision of existing community use	More vulnerable	10	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO RISK Groundwater – NO RISK Sewer – LOW RISK (15 events in last 5 years)	Relocation not required. Is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	

							Reservoir – NO RISK				
CL6	Crown House, Church Road, Claygate	0.21	1	12 homes	More vulnerable	10	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (8% of site) Groundwater – NO RISK Sewer – LOW RISK (15 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
CL7	Claygate Station Car Park, The Parade	0.40	1	15 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (0.4% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (5% of site) AND OF PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND (37% of site) Sewer – LOW RISK (15 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Whilst there is a risk of groundwater flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	

Cobham, Oxshott and Stoke D'Abernon

Site ref.	Site name	Site area	Flood zone	Proposed development	Vulnerability	SFRA rank	Flood Risk from all sources now and in the future	Can development be steered towards an	Exception test	Sequential test	Requirements for
		(ha)		_				area at lower risk?	required?	passed?	applications
COS1	Cedar House, Mill Road, Cobham	0.27	1 (31%) 2 (69%)	7 homes	More Vulnerable	4	River – MEDIUM RISK Climate change – MIDDLE MOLE 25% CLIMATE CHANGE (2.1% of site) Surface water – NO RISK Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – LOW RISK (15 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – WET DAY (8% of site)	Overall, the site is considered to be at medium risk of flooding and is in an area at highest risk relatively to other medium risk sites. The Council has identified all reasonably available sites that have a lower risk of flooding from all sources in the site allocations proposed in the Draft Elmbridge Local Plan. It is not possible to accommodate the proposed development at COS1 in an area with lower risk, as all lower risk sites have already been identified for other development or	No	Passed	As the site is affected by Flood Zone 2 a site-specific FRA is required. Self-contained basement dwellings and basement bedrooms are not permitted. All other basements, basement extensions and basement conversions should be avoided.
COS2	Cedar Road Car Park, Cedar Road, Cobham	0.05	1	5 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of groundwater and sewer flooding, overall, the site is	No	Passed	

							Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – MEDIUM RISK (24 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.			
COS3	Site B Garages at Wyndham Avenue, Cobham	0.06	1	4 homes	More vulnerable	10	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (61% of site) Groundwater – LIMTED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (4 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
COS4	Garages to the rear of 6-32 Lockhart Road, Cobham	0.11	1	4 homes	More vulnerable	9	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (14% of site) Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – MEDIUM RISK (4 – 24 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of sewer flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	

COS5	Garages at Waverley Road, Oxshott	0.08	1	6 homes	More vulnerable	10	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (10% of site) Groundwater – NO RISK Sewer – LOW RISK (18 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
COS6	40 Fairmile Lane	0.19	1	13 homes	More vulnerable	9	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (15% of site) Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – MEDIUM RISK (24 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of sewer flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
COS7	4 Fernhill, Oxshott	0.13	1	5 homes	More vulnerable	10	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO RISK Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site)	Relocation not required. Is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	

							Sewer – LOW RISK (18 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK				
COS8	52 Fairmile Lane	0.28	1	7 homes	More vulnerable	9	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (8% of site) Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – MEDIUM RISK (24 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of sewer flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
COS9	Pine View, Fairmile Park Road, Cobham	0.24	1	6 homes	More vulnerable	9	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO RISK Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – MEDIUM RISK (24 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of sewer flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	

COS10	Garage block, Middleton Road, Downside	0.04	1	3 homes	More vulnerable	9	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO RISK Groundwater – NO RISK Sewer – MEDIUM RISK (20 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of sewer flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
COS11	Garages at Bennett Close, Cobham	0.07	1	4 homes	More vulnerable	10	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (1% of site) Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (4 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
COS12	Glenelm and 160 Anyard Road	0.45	1	34 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (73.8% of site); MEDIUM RISK (35% of site); HIGH RISK (15% of site)	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water and sewer flooding, overall and the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	

							Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – MEDIUM RISK (4 - 24 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK				
COS13	1, 3 and 5 Goldrings Road, Oxshott, Leatherhead	0.90	1	32 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (5.3% of site); MEDIUM RISK (2% of site); HIGH RISK (1.6% of site) Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – LOW RISK (18 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water flooding, this is over a very small portion of the site and overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
COS14	Cobham Village Hall and Centre for the Community, Lushington Drive, Cobham	0.84	1	37 homes and re- provision of community use	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (25.7% of site); MEDIUM RISK (4% of site); HIGH RISK (0.1% of site) Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – MEDIUM RISK (24 events in last 5 years)	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water and sewer flooding. The increased risk of surface water flooding is over a very small portion of the site and overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	

							Reservoir – NO RISK				
COS15	87 Portsmouth Road, Cobham	0.12	1	10 homes	More vulnerable	10	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO RISK Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (4 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
COS16	Cobham Health Centre and Garages off Tartar Road	0.90	1	11 homes and re- provision of community use	More vulnerable	9	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (10.2% of site); MEDIUM RISK (2% of site) Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – MEDIUM RISK (4- 24 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water and sewer flooding. The increased risk of surface water flooding is over a very small portion of the site and overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	

COS17	Selden	0.50	1	18 homes	More	7	SITE IS WITHIN A MEDIUM	Overall the site is	No	Passed	Applicants
00011	Cottage and	5100			vulnerable		PRIORITY AREA	considered to be at			should consult
	Ronmar				. dirici dolo			medium risk of			Surrey County
	Leatherhead						River – LOW RISK	flooding. There is an			Council to
	Road							increased risk of			understand
							Climate change – NO	surface water flooding			how best to
							IMPACT	and the site is in a			work within
							_	medium priority			and address
							Surface water –	flooding area.			the priority
							LOW RISK (43.3% of site);	However, the site is at			flood area.
							MEDIUM RISK (9.9% of site);	the lowest risk of			
							HIGH RISK (1.3% of site)	flooding relatively to			
								other medium risk			
							Groundwater – NO RISK	sites and is entirely			
								within Flood Zone 1.			
							Sewer – LOW RISK				
							(18 events in last 5 years)	The Council has			
								identified all			
							Reservoir – NO RISK	reasonably available			
								sites that have a			
								lower risk of flooding			
								from all sources in the			
								site allocations			
								proposed in the Draft			
								Elmbridge Local Plan.			
								It is not possible to			
								accommodate the			
								proposed			
								development at			
								COS17 in an area			
								with lower risk, as all			
								lower risk sites have			
								already been			
								identified for other			
								development or are			
								not available.			
COS18	73 Between	0.68	1	40 homes	More	9	River – LOW RISK	Relocation not	No	Passed	
	Streets,				vulnerable			required. Whilst there			
	Cobham							is a risk of surface			

							Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (9.2% of site); MEDIUM RISK (3% of site) Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (4 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	water flooding, this is over a very small portion of the site and overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.			
COS19	St Andrew's Church, Oakshade Road, Oxshott	0.40	1	127 sq.m community use	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (20.2% of site); MEDIUM RISK (7% of site); HIGH RISK (0.3% of site) Groundwater – NO RISK Sewer – LOW RISK (18 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water flooding, this is over a small portion of the site and overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
COS20	Ambleside, 3 The Spinney, Queens Drive	0.43	1	8 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (7.9% of site); MEDIUM RISK (4% of site); HIGH RISK (2% of site)	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water flooding, this is over a small portion of the site and overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all	No	Passed	•

							Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (84.9% of site) Sewer – LOW RISK (18 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	sources, now and in the future.			
COS21	Coveham House, Downside Bridge Road and The Royal British Legion, Hollyhedge Road, Cobham	0.26	1	14 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (2.8% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – MEDIUM RISK (4 - 20 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of groundwater and sewer flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
COS22	Shell Fairmile, 270 Portsmouth Road, Cobham	0.14	1	10 homes	More vulnerable	10	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (3% of site) Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (4 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	

COS23	68 Between Streets and 7-11 White Lion Gate, Cobham	0.16	1	6 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (3.1% of site); HIGH RISK (0.1% of site) Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (99.8% of site)	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water flooding, this is over a very small portion of the site and overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
							(4 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK				
COS24	Waitrose, 16-18 Between Streets, Cobham	0.67	1	20 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (32.3% of site); MEDIUM RISK (14% of site); HIGH RISK (1.2% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – MEDIUM RISK (20 - 24 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water, groundwater and sewer flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	

COS25	Garages and parking to the rear of Cobham Gate, Cobham	0.10	1	8 homes	More vulnerable	9	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (13% of site) Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – MEDIUM RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of sewer flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed
							(24 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK			
COS26	Tiltwood Care Home, Hogshill Lane, Cobham	0.58	1	24 care home units	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (7.2% of site); MEDIUM RISK (1% of site); HIGH RISK (0.1% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – MEDIUM RISK (24 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water, groundwater and sewer flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed
COS27	Ford Garage, 97 Portsmouth Road, Cobham	0.30	1	21 homes	More vulnerable	9	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO RISK Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – MEDIUM RISK (24 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of sewer flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed
-------	---	------	---	----------	--------------------	---	--	---	----	--------
COS28	Premier Service Station, 101 Portsmouth Road, Cobham	0.10	1	7 homes	More vulnerable	9	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (15% of site); MEDIUM RISK (1% of site) Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (4 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water flooding, this is over a very small portion of the site and overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed

House, Copse Road, Cobhamvulnerablevulnerablerequired. Whilst there is a risk of surface water and sewer flooding. The increased risk of surface water - LOW RISK (38% of site); MEDIUM RISK (1% of site)required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water and sewer flooding. The increased risk of surface water flooding is over a very small portion of the site and overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	 Passed	No	Relocation not	River – LOW RISK	9	More	28 homes	1	2.90	Protech	COS29
Copse Road, Cobham Climate change – NO IMPACT is a risk of surface water and sewer flooding. The increased risk of surface water – LOW RISK (38% of site); is over a very small portion of the site and overall, the site is Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.			required. Whilst there			vulnerable				House,	
Road, Cobham IMPACT water and sewer flooding. The increased risk of LOW RISK (38% of site); MEDIUM RISK (1% of site) Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) surface water flooding is over a very small portion of the site and overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.			is a risk of surface	Climate change – NO						Copse	
Cobham Surface water – increased risk of Surface water – LOW RISK (38% of site); surface water flooding MEDIUM RISK (1% of site) is over a very small portion of the site and Overall, the site is POTENTIAL (100% of site) located in an area at Iow risk of flooding Sewer – MEDIUM RISK (24 events in last 5 years) from all sources, now			water and sewer	IMPACT						Road,	
Surface water – increased risk of LOW RISK (38% of site); surface water flooding MEDIUM RISK (1% of site) is over a very small portion of the site and overall, the site is POTENTIAL (100% of site) located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now (24 events in last 5 years) and in the future.			flooding. The							Cobham	
Image: Low RISK (38% of site); Surace water flooding MEDIUM RISK (1% of site); is over a very small portion of the site and overall, the site is Image: Dot in the site is located in an area at Image: Dot in the site is low risk of flooding Sewer – MEDIUM RISK from all sources, now Image: Dot in the site is low risk of flooding			increased risk of	Surface water –							
MEDIOW RISK (1% of site) is over a very smail portion of the site and overall, the site is FOTENTIAL (100% of site) is over a very smail portion of the site and overall, the site is Is over a very smail portion of the site and overall, the site is is over a very smail portion of the site and overall, the site is Is over a very smail portion of the site and overall, the site is is overall, the site is Is over a very smail portion of the site and overall, the site is is overall, the site is Is over a very smail portion of the site and overall, the site is is overall, the site is Is over a very smail portion of the site and overall, the site is is overall, the site is Is over a very smail portion of the site and overall, the site is is overall, the site is Is over a very smail is overall, the site is is overall, the site is Is over a very smail is overall, the site is is overall, the site is Is over a very smail is overall, the site is is overall, the site is Is overall, the site is is overall, the site is is overall, the site is Is overall, the site is is overall, the site is is overall, the site is Is overall, the site is is overall, the site is is overall, the site is Is overall, the site is is overall, t			surface water flooding	LOW RISK (38% OF Site); MEDILIM BISK (19% of site)							
Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – MEDIUM RISK (24 events in last 5 years) Groundwater – LIMITED Iocated in an area at Iow risk of flooding and in the future.			is over a very small	MEDIUM RISK (1% 01 SILE)							
POTENTIAL (100% of site) located in an area at low risk of flooding Sewer – MEDIUM RISK (24 events in last 5 years) from all sources, now and in the future.			overall the site is	Groundwater – LIMITED							
Sewer – MEDIUM RISK (24 events in last 5 years) Ioward and a data low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.			located in an area at	POTENTIAL (100% of site)							
Sewer – MEDIUM RISK (24 events in last 5 years) from all sources, now and in the future.			low risk of flooding								
(24 events in last 5 years) and in the future.			from all sources, now	Sewer – MEDIUM RISK							
			and in the future.	(24 events in last 5 years)							
Reservoir – NO RISK				Reservoir – NO RISK							
COS30 38 Copse 0.30 1 7 homes More 9 River – LOW RISK Relocation not No Passed	Passed	No	Relocation not	River – LOW RISK	9	More	7 homes	1	0.30	38 Copse	COS30
Road, vulnerable required. Whilst there			required. Whilst there			vulnerable				Road,	
Cobham Climate change – NO is a risk of sewer			is a risk of sewer	Climate change – NO						Cobham	
IMPACT flooding, overall, the			flooding, overall, the	IMPACT							
Surface water			area at low risk of	Surface water							
LOW RISK (33% of site) flooding from all			flooding from all	I OW RISK (33% of site)							
sources, now and in			sources, now and in								
Groundwater – LIMITED the future.			the future.	Groundwater – LIMITED							
POTENTIAL (100% of site)				POTENTIAL (100% of site)							
				, , ,							
Sewer – MEDIUM RISK				Sewer – MEDIUM RISK							
(24 events in last 5 years)				(24 events in last 5 years)							
Reservoir – NO RISK				Reservoir - NO RISK							

COS31	20 Stoke Road, Cobham	0.18	1	8 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (70.9% of site); MEDIUM RISK (28% of site); HIGH RISK (9.2% of site) Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – MEDIUM RISK (20 events in last 5 years)	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water and sewer flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
COS32	Sainsbury's car park, Bridge Way, Cobham	0.31	1	58 homes	More vulnerable	9	Reservoir – NO RISK River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (32% of site); MEDIUM RISK (5% of site) Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (4 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water flooding, this is over a very small portion of the site and overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
COS33	BMW Cobham, 18-22 Portsmouth Road, Cobham	0.47	1	27 homes	More vulnerable	9	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water –	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water flooding, this is over a small portion of the site and overall,	No	Passed	

							LOW RISK (18.6% of site); MEDIUM RISK (7% of site) Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (4 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.			
COS34	Oxshott Medical Practice and Village Centre Hall, Holtwood Road	0.81	1	10 homes and 1,395 sq.m floorspace	More vulnerable	9	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (21% of site); MEDIUM RISK (2% of site) Groundwater – NO RISK Sewer – LOW RISK (18 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water flooding, this is over a very small portion of the site and overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
COS35	78 Portsmouth Road, Cobham	0.60	1	30 homes	More vulnerable	10	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (5% of site) Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (4 events in last 5 years)	Relocation not required. Is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	

			Reservoir – NO RISK		

Thames Ditton, Long Ditton, Hinchley Wood and Weston Green

Site ref.	Site name	Site area (ha)	Flood zone	Proposed development	Vulnerability	SFRA rank	Flood Risk from all sources now and in the future	Can development be steered towards an area at lower risk?	Exception test required?	Sequential test passed?	Requirements for applications
D1	Brook House, Portsmouth Road, Thames Ditton	0.39	1	30 homes	More vulnerable	9	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO RISK Groundwater – NO RISK Sewer – MEDIUM RISK (22 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – WET DAY (5% of site)	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of sewer and reservoir flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
D2	Car Park south of Southbank, Thorkhill Road, Thames Ditton	0.23	1 (70%) 2 (30%)	7 homes	More vulnerable	5	River – MEDIUM RISK Climate change – LOWER THAMES 35% CLIMATE CHANGE – Thames Dominated (7.4% of site); LOWER THAMES 81% CLIMATE CHANGE – Thames Dominated (44.8% of site); LOWER THAMES 0.5% AEP – Thames Dominated (7.4% of site); LOWER THAMES 0.1% AEP – Thames Dominated (7.4% of site) Surface water –	Overall, the site is considered to be at medium risk of flooding and is at the higher end of medium risk sites in the Borough. The Council has identified all reasonably available sites that have a lower risk of flooding from all sources in the site allocations proposed in the Draft Elmbridge Local Plan. It is not possible to accommodate the	No	Passed	As the site affected by Flood Zone 2, a site-specific FRA is required. Applicants should prioritise locating development within the portion of the site that is within Flood Zone 1 as far as possible in the first

							LOW RISK (13% of site) MEDIUM RISK (6% of site) HIGH RISK (3.9% of site) Groundwater – NO RISK Sewer – MEDIUM RISK (22 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – DRY DAY (21.3% of site) WET DAY (52.6% of site)	proposed development at D2 in an area with lower risk, as all lower risk sites have already been identified for other development or are not available.			instance. Then address and mitigate the sources of flooding on the site. Self-contained basement dwellings and basement bedrooms are not permitted. All other basement extensions and basement conversions should be avoided. Floodplain compensation should be provided with any increase in built footprint within the 1 in 100 plus appropriate climate change allowance.
D3	4-6 Manor Road South and 4 Greenways, Hinchley Wood	0.27	1	33 homes	More vulnerable	7	SITE IS WITHIN A MEDIUM PRIORITY AREA River – LOW RISK	Overall, the site is considered to be at medium risk of flooding. There is an increased risk of surface water and	No	Passed	Applicants should consult Surrey County Council to understand how best to

							Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (38.6% of site); MEDIUM RISK (0.5% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (59.4% of site) Sewer – LOW RISK (15 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	groundwater flooding. In addition, the site is in a medium priority flooding area. However, the site is at the lowest risk of flooding relatively to other medium risk sites and is entirely within Flood Zone 1. The Council has identified all reasonably available sites that have a lower risk of flooding from all sources in the site allocations proposed in the Draft Elmbridge Local Plan. It is not possible to accommodate the proposed development at D3 in an area with lower risk, as all lower risk sites have already been identified for other development or are not available			work within and address the priority flood area.
D4	Land to the rear of 5 Hinchley Way, Esher	0.19	1	6 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (100% of site); MEDIUM RISK (85% of site); HIGH RISK (56.8% of site)	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water and groundwater flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding	No	Passed	

_							Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – LOW RISK (15 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	from all sources, now and in the future.			
D5	89-90 Woodfield Road, Thames Ditton	0.07	2 (55%) 3a (45%)	/ homes	More vulnerable	3	River – HIGH RISK Climate change – RYTHE 20% CLIMATE CHANGE (97.1% of site) Surface water – LOW RISK (84.8% of site); MEDIUM RISK (17.2% of site); HIGH RISK (6.6% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (43.1% of site) AND OF PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND (56.9% of site) Sewer – LOW RISK (15 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – DRY DAY (100% of site) WET DAY (100% of site)	Overall, the site is considered to be at high risk of flooding but is at the lowest risk relatively to other high-risk sites in the Borough. The Council has identified all reasonably available sites that have a lower risk of flooding from all sources in the site allocations proposed in the Draft Elmbridge Local Plan. It is not possible to accommodate the proposed development at D5 in an area with lower risk, as all lower risk sites have already been identified for other development or are not available. The majority of the site (97%) is at risk of flooding during the	Yes <u>The</u> <u>details of</u> <u>the</u> <u>exception</u> <u>test are</u> <u>set out</u> <u>below.</u>	Failed	As safe access/egress is unlikely to be achievable, safe refuge should be designed into the development above the Level 2 SFRA extreme flood event plus an allowance for climate change that is outside the flooded area. A site-specific FRA is required to demonstrate the site will be safe. An increase in built footprint should not be proposed as it is not possible

								Diver Dythe design			to provide
								River Rythe design			to provide
								event (1% AEP plus a			floodplain
								20% climate change			compensation
								allowance) and it will			on site.
								not be possible to			
								deliver floodplain			Self-contained
								compensation storage			basement
								within the site.			dwellings and
								However, the existing			basement
								built footprint covers			bedrooms are
								the vast maiority of			not permitted.
								the site and it is			All other
								considered that an			basements
								increase in footprint is			basement
								not needed to deliver			extensions and
								the allocated			hasement
								development on this			conversions
								sito			should be
								Site.			avoided
								The Lovel 2 SERA			avolueu.
								identified that acfa			
								access/egress to the			
								site may not be			
								achievable. In			
								consultation with its			
								Emergency Planning			
								service, the Council			
								has concluded that			
								the proposed			
								development may not			
								be able to be made			
								safe and the lack of			
								safe access/egress			
								would place undue			
								burden on local			
								emergency services.			
D6	Sundial	0.64	1 (35%)	61 homes	More	1	River – HIGH RISK	Overall, the site is	No	Passed	Development
	House, the		2 (64%)		vulnerable			considered to be at			will typically
			3b (1%)				Climate change –	high risk of flooding			not be

Molesey			LOWER THAMES 3.3% AEP	and the highest risk		permitted
Venture			- Tributary Dominated (0.7%	relatively to other		within Flood
			of site);	high-risk sites in the		Zone 3b.
			LOWER THAMES 35%	Borough due to the		Development
			CLIMATE CHANGE -	presence of flood		will only be
			Tributary Dominated (25.7%	zone 3b. However,		considered
			of site);	this only covers a		where the
			LOWER THAMES 81%	very small (1%) of the		vulnerability of
			CLIMATE CHANGE –	site.		the
			Tributary Dominated (61% of			development is
			site);	The Council has		not increased
			LOWER THAMES 0.5% AEP	identified all		(and where
			- Tributary Dominated (0.7%	reasonably available		possible
			of site);	sites that have a		reduced) and
			LOWER THAMES 0.1% AEP	lower risk of flooding		the number of
			 Tributary Dominated 	from all sources in the		occupants
			(58.7% of site)	site allocations		does not
				proposed in the Draft		increase.
			Surface water –	Elmbridge Local Plan.		
			LOW RISK (9.4% of site)	It is not possible to		Applicants
				accommodate the		should take a
			Groundwater – NO RISK	proposed		sequential
				development at D6 in		approach and
			Sewer – LOW RISK	an area with lower		prioritise
			(10 events in last 5 years)	risk, as all lower risk		locating
				sites have already		development
			Reservoir –	been identified for		within the
			DRY DAY (100% of site)	other development or		portion of the
			WET DAY (100% of site)	are not available.		site that is
						within Flood
				A sequential		Zone 1, before
				approach to the site		looking to the
				layout - locating the		part in Flood
				development in the		Zone 2. Then
				lower risk portion of		address and
				the site, outside of		mitigate the
				flood zone 3b, would		sources of
				allow the proposed		flooding on
						site.

				development to be		
				located on the site.		As the site is
						affected by
						Flood Zone 2
						and 3b a site-
						and 55, a site-
						specific FRA is
						required.
						A site specific
						sequential and
						exception test
						will also be
						required to
						demonstrate
						that the site
						can be
						delivered.
						These should
						use the higher
						central
						allowance in
						accordance
						with the EA's
						FRA climate
						change
						allowances
						quidance
						<u>galaalie -</u> .
						Self-contained
						basement
						dwellings and
						hasement
						bedrooms are
						not permitted
						Solf-contained
						All other
						All Olliel
						basements,
						basement
						extensions and

											basement conversions should be
D7	47 Portsmouth Road, Thames Ditton	0.35	2 (99%) 3b (1%)	25 homes	More vulnerable	1	River – HIGH RISK Climate change – RYTHE 20% CLIMATE CHANGE (0.7% of site); RYTHE 3.3% AEP (0.5% of site); LOWER THAMES 81% CLIMATE CHANGE – Thames Dominated (4.7% of site); LOWER THAMES 0.5% AEP - Thames Dominated (5% of site); LOWER THAMES 0.1% AEP - Thames Dominated (5% of site); LOWER THAMES 0.1% AEP - Thames Dominated (5% of site); Surface water – LOW RISK (16.4% of site); MEDIUM RISK (2.9% of site); HIGH RISK (1% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (10.12% of site) Sewer – MEDIUM RISK (12 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – DRY DAY (42.1% of site) WET DAY (4.4% of site)	Overall, the site is considered to be at high risk of flooding and the highest risk relatively to other high-risk sites in the Borough due to the presence of flood zone 3b. However, this only covers a very small (1%) of the site. The Council has identified all reasonably available sites that have a lower risk of flooding from all sources in the site allocations proposed in the Draft Elmbridge Local Plan. It is not possible to accommodate the proposed development at D7 in an area with lower risk, as all lower risk sites have already been identified for other development or are not available. A sequential approach to the site	No	Passed	Development will not be permitted on the part of the site affected by Flood Zone 3b. As the site is affected by Flood Zone 2 and 3b, a site- specific FRA is required. A site specific sequential and exception test will also be required to demonstrate that the site can be delivered. These should use the higher central allowance in accordance with the EA's <u>FRA climate</u> <u>change</u> <u>allowances</u> <u>guidance</u> .

								layout - locating the development in the lower risk portion of the site, outside of flood zone 3b, would allow the proposed development to be located on the site.			Self-contained basement dwellings and basement bedrooms are not permitted. All other basements, basement extensions and basement conversions should be avoided.
D8	Torrington, 18-20 St Mary's Road, Long Ditton	0.29	1	9 homes	More vulnerable	11	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO RISK Groundwater – NO RISK Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (4 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
D9	Corner Cottage, Portsmouth Road	0.09	2	5 homes	More vulnerable	4	River – MEDIUM RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (1.9% of site) Groundwater – NO RISK Sewer – MEDIUM RISK (22 events in last 5 years)	Overall, the site is considered to be at medium risk of flooding but is in an area at highest risk relatively to other medium risk sites. The Council has identified all reasonably available sites that have a	No	Passed	As the site is affected by Food Zone 2, a site-specific FRA is required. Self-contained basement dwellings and basement bedrooms are

							Reservoir – DRY DAY (2.5% of site) WET DAY (12.8% of site)	lower risk of flooding from all sources in the site allocations proposed in the Draft Elmbridge Local Plan. It is not possible to accommodate the proposed development at D9 in an area with lower risk, as all lower risk sites have already been identified for other development or are not available.			not permitted. All other basements, basement extensions and basement conversions should be avoided.
D10	Bransby Lodge, St Leonards, Thames Ditton	0.18	1	5 homes	More vulnerable	9	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (6% of site) Groundwater – NO RISK Sewer – MEDIUM RISK (22 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of sewer flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
D11	Garages to the rear of Blair Avenue, Weston Green	0.11	2	4 homes	More vulnerable	4	River – MEDIUM RISK Climate change – LOWER MOLE 20% CLIMATE CHANGE (55% of site) Surface water – LOW RISK (21.4% of site)	Overall, the site is considered to be at medium risk of flooding but is in an area at highest risk relatively to other medium risk sites. The Council has identified all	No	Passed	Safe access/egress may not be achievable, safe refuge should be designed into the development above the

			Groundwater – NO RISK	reasonably available	Level 2 SFRA
				sites that have a	extreme flood
			Sewer – VERY LOW RISK	lower risk of flooding	event plus an
			(7 events in last 5 years)	from all sources in the	allowance for
				site allocations	climate change
			Reservoir –	proposed in the Draft	that is outside
			DRY DAY (100% of site)	Elmbridge Local Plan.	the flooded
			WET DAY (100% of site)	It is not possible to	area.
				accommodate the	
				proposed	A site-specific
				development at D11	FRA is
				in an area with lower	required to
				risk, as all lower risk	demonstrate
				sites have already	that the
				been identified for	development
				other development or	will be safe.
				are not available.	
					Development
				Approximately half of	should be
				the site (55%) is at	steered away
				risk of flooding during	from the part
				the Lower Mole	of the site at
				design event (1%	risk of flooding
				AFP plus a 20%	during the
				climate change	Lower Mole
				allowance) However	design event
				the existing built	(1% AFP plus
				footprint covers the	a 20% climate
				vast majority of the	change
				site and it is	allowance) as
				considered that an	far as possible
				increase in footprint is	141 45 000001010.
				not needed to deliver	Any increase
				the allocated	in built
				development on this	footprint within
				sito	the design
				510.	flood extent
				The Level 2 SERA	will need to be
				identified that safe	compensated
1				identified that sale	compensateu

				access/egress to the	for, on a level
				site may not be	for level
				achievable. In	volume for
				consultation with its	volume basis
				Emergency Planning	within the site
				service, the Council	to the 1 in 100
				has concluded that	plus
				the proposed	appropriate
				development can be	climate change
				made safe and the	allowance.
				lack of safe	(Applicants
				access/egress would	should refer to
				not place undue	Level 1 SFRA
				burden on local	for details of
				emergency services.	Floodplain
				0	Compensation
				The site is within an	Storage).
				area served by a	U <i>i</i>
				flood warning system	Self-contained
				(064FWF35Rythe	basement
				River Rythe between	dwellings and
				Oxshott and Thames	basement
				Ditton); there is a rest	bedrooms are
				centre at the Claygate	not permitted.
				centre available to	All other
				residents in an	basements,
				emergency; and the	basement
				Council has effective	extensions and
				emergency	basement
				procedures, including	conversions
				an evacuation plan,	should be
				detailed in its	avoided.
				Emergency Plan and	
				the Surrey Local	
				Resilience Forum	
				Multi-Agency Flood	
				Plan (MAFP) Part	
				Two – Elmbridge	

								Borough Council,			
								which is reviewed and			
								updated annually,			
								would be enacted in			
								the event of flooding.			
D12	Sandpiper,	0.53	1 (83%	21 homes	More	5	River – MEDIUM RISK	Overall, the site is	No	Passed	As the site is
	Newlands		2 (17%)		vulnerable			considered to be at			affected by
	Avenue,						Climate change – NO	medium risk of			Flood Zone 2,
	Thames						IMPACT	flooding and is at the			a site-specific
	Ditton							higher end of medium			FRA is
							Surface water –	risk sites in the			required.
							LOW RISK (9.4% of site)	Borough.			
								0			Self-contained
							Groundwater – POTENTIAL	The Council has			basement
							AT SURFACE (100% of site)	identified all			dwellings and
							· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	reasonably available			basement
							Sewer – MEDIUM RISK	sites that have a			bedrooms are
							(22 events in last 5 vears)	lower risk of flooding			not permitted.
								from all sources in the			All other
							Reservoir –	site allocations			basements.
							DRY DAY (91.9% of site)	proposed in the Draft			basement
							WET DAY (96.6% of site)	Elmbridge Local Plan.			extensions and
								It is not possible to			basement
								accommodate the			conversions
								proposed			should be
								development at D12			avoided
								in an area with lower			avoluou
								risk, as all lower risk			
								sites have already			
								been identified for			
								other development or			
								are not available			
D13	Thames	0.17	1	18 homes	More	8	River – LOW RISK	Relocation not	No	Passed	
	Ditton			and	vulnerable			required. Whilst there			
	Centre for			reprovision of			Climate change – NO	is a risk of			
	the			existing			IMPACT	groundwater and			
	Community			community				sewer and reservoir			
	Mercer			use			Surface water – NO RISK	flooding, overall, the			
		1	1						1		

	Thames Ditton						Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – MEDIUM RISK (22 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – WET DAY (96.6% of site)	area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.			
D14	British Legion, Betts Way, Long Ditton	0.17	1	Mixed use, including 9 homes	More vulnerable	9	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (46.1% of site); MEDIUM RISK (7% of site) Groundwater – NO RISK Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (4 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
D15	Flats 9-41 and Garages on Longmead Road, Thames Ditton	0.55	1 (79%) 2 (21%)	37 homes	More vulnerable	5	River – MEDIUM RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (3.6% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (45.28% of site) AND OF PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND LEVEL (54.72% of site) Sewer – MEDIUM RISK (22 events in last 5 years)	Overall, the site is considered to be at medium risk of flooding and is at the higher end of medium risk sites in the Borough. The Council has identified all reasonably available sites that have a lower risk of flooding from all sources in the site allocations proposed in the Draft	No	Passed	As the site is affected by Flood Zone 2, a site-specific FRA is required. Self-contained basement dwellings and basement bedrooms are not permitted. All other basements, basement

							Reservoir – DRY DAY (92.4% of site) WET DAY (17.2% of site)	Elmbridge Local Plan. It is not possible to accommodate the proposed development at D15 in an area with lower risk, as all lower risk sites have already been identified for other development or are not available.			extensions and basement conversions should be avoided.
D16	Ashley Road Car Park, Thames Ditton	0.21	1 (8%) 2 (92%)	14 homes	More vulnerable	4	River – MEDIUM RISK Climate change – LOWER THAMES 35% CLIMATE CHANGE – Thames Dominated (68.9% of site); LOWER THAMES 81% CLIMATE CHANGE – Thames Dominated (100% of site); LOWER THAMES 0.1% AEP – Thames Dominated (85.1% of site) Surface water – LOW RISK (74.4% of site) MEDIUM RISK (36.2% of site) HIGH RISK (11.46 of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL OF PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND (100% of site) Sewer – MEDIUM RISK (22 events in last 5 years)	Overall, the site is considered to be at medium risk of flooding but is in an area at highest risk relatively to other medium risk sites. The Council has identified all reasonably available sites that have a lower risk of flooding from all sources in the site allocations proposed in the Draft Elmbridge Local Plan. It is not possible to accommodate the proposed development at D16 in an area with lower risk, as all lower risk sites have already been identified for other development or are not available.	No	Failed	69% of the site is at risk of flooding during the Lower Thames: Thames dominated design event (1% AEP plus a 20% climate change allowance) and an increase in built footprint is not possible as flood compensation cannot be provided on site.

						Reservoir – DRY DAY (100% of site) WET DAY (100% of site)				
D17	Nuffield Health Club, Simpson Way, Long Ditton	0.69	16 homes	More vulnerable	10	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (2% of site) Groundwater – NO RISK Sewer – NO RISK Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	The River Thames is 100m to the north of the site, and access along Portsmouth Road to the west of the site is shown to be at risk during the 1 in 100 plus 35% climate change extent of the Thames dominated scenario of the Thames (Datchet to Teddington) 2023 model design event. Alternative safe routes of access/egress are available for the site; to the east along Portsmouth Road; west along Portsmouth

											Road and south on Windmill Lane; or pedestrian access to the south on to Williams Grove. It is recommended that an Emergency Plan is developed for occupants of the site to set out the response in the event of flooding in the
D18	118-120 Bridge Road East Molesey	0.08	1 (69%) 2 (31%)	6 homes	More vulnerable	5	River – MEDIUM RISK Climate change – LOWER THAMES 81% CLIMATE CHANGE – Tributary Dominated (100% of site); LOWER THAMES 0.1% AEP – Tributary Dominated (31.3% of site) Surface water – LOW RISK (0.1% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (68% of site) AND OF PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND LEVEL (32% of site)	Overall, the site is considered to be at medium risk of flooding but is at the higher end of medium risk sites in the Borough. The Council has identified all reasonably available sites that have a lower risk of flooding from all sources in the site allocations proposed in the Draft Elmbridge Local Plan. It is not possible to accommodate the	No	Passed	As the site is affected by Flood Zone 2 a site-specific FRA is required. Self-contained basement dwellings and basement bedrooms are not permitted. All other basement extensions and basement extensions and basement conversions

							Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (5 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – DRY DAY (100% of site) WET DAY (100% of site)	proposed development at D18 in an area with lower risk, as all lower risk sites have already been identified for other development or are not available.			should be avoided.
D19	Industrial units at 67 Summer Road East Molesey	0.17	2	12 homes	More vulnerable	4	River – MEDIUM RISK Climate change – LOWER THAMES 35% CLIMATE CHANGE – Tributary Dominated (100% of site); LOWER THAMES 0.1% AEP – Tributary Dominated (100% of site) Surface water – LOW RISK (18.8% of site) MEDIUM RISK (1.2% of site) Groundwater – NO RISK Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (5 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – DRY DAY (100% of site) WET DAY (100% of site)	Overall, the site is considered to be at medium risk of flooding but is in an area at highest risk relatively to other medium risk sites. The Council has identified all reasonably available sites that have a lower risk of flooding from all sources in the site allocations proposed in the Draft Elmbridge Local Plan. It is not possible to accommodate the proposed development at D19 in an area with lower risk, as all lower risk sites have already been identified for other development or are not available.	No	Passed	As the site is affected by Flood Zone 2, a site-specific FRA is required. Self-contained basement dwellings and basement bedrooms are not permitted. All other basements, basement extensions and basement conversions should be avoided.

D20	School Bungalow, Mercer Close, Thames Ditton	0.20	1	10 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (0.1% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (51% of site) AND OF PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND LEVEL (49% of site) Sewer – MEDIUM RISK (22 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – WET DAY (75.3% of site)	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of groundwater, sewer and reservoir flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
D21	Nuffield Health car park, Simpson Way, Long Ditton	0.32	1	10 homes	More vulnerable	11	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO RISK Groundwater – NO RISK Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (4 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – WET DAY (39% of site)	Relocation not required. Is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	The River Thames is 200m to the north of the site, and access along Portsmouth Road to the west of the site is shown to be at risk during the 1 in 100 plus 35% climate change extent of the Thames dominated scenario of the Thames (Datchet to

					Teddington)
					2023 model
					dooign ovent
					design event.
					Alternative
					routes of
					access/egress
					are available
					for the site: to
					the east slower
					the east along
					Portsmouth
					Road, and on
					to Brighton
					Road: west
					along
					Portsmouth
					Pood and
					Ruau anu
					south on
					Windmill Lane;
					or pedestrian
					access to the
					south on to
					Williams
					Grove It is
					crocommonded
					the steen
					that an
					Emergency
					Plan is
					developed for
					occupants of
					the site to set
					out the
					response in
					the event of
					flooding in the
					local area.

D22	46 St Marys Road, Long Ditton	0.25	1	5 homes	More vulnerable	10	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (5% of site) Groundwater – NO RISK Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (4 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
D23	Old Pauline Sports Ground Car Park	0.85	1	35 homes	More vulnerable	9	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (4.6% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL OF PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND LEVEL (100% of site) Sewer – MEDIUM RISK (22 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – DRY DAY (0.6% of site) WET DAY (22.5% of site)	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of groundwater, sewer and reservoir flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
D24	Community centres at the junction of Mercer Close and	0.36	1	29 homes and reprovision of existing	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of groundwater, sewer and reservoir	No	Passed	

	Watts Road, Thames Ditton			community use			Surface water – LOW RISK (5.8% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (97% of site) AND OF PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND LEVEL (3% of site) Sewer – MEDIUM RISK (22 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – WET DAY (1.1% of site)	flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.			
D25	5A-6A Station Road, Esher	0.09	1 (27%) 2 (73%)	5 homes	More vulnerable	4	River – MEDIUM RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (0.3% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (5 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – DRY DAY (96.1% of site) WET DAY (100% of site)	Overall, the site is considered to be at medium risk of flooding but is in an area at highest risk relatively to other medium risk sites. The Council has identified all reasonably available sites that have a lower risk of flooding from all sources in the site allocations proposed in the Draft Elmbridge Local Plan. It is not possible to accommodate the proposed development at D25 in an area with lower risk, as all lower risk sites have already been identified for	No	Passed	As the site is affected by Flood Zone 2, a site-specific FRA is required. Self-contained basement dwellings and basement bedrooms are not permitted. All other basements, basement extensions and basement conversions should be avoided.

			other development or are not available.		

Esher

Site ref.	Site name	Site area (ha)	Flood zone	Proposed development	Vulnerability	SFRA rank	Flood Risk from all sources now and in the future	Can development be steered towards an area at lower risk?	Exception test required?	Sequential test passed?	Requirements for applications
ESH1	Esher Place, 30 Esher Place Avenue, Esher	2.80	1	22 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (0.1% of site); MEDIUM RISK (1% of site); HIGH RISK (0.4% of site) Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (7 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water flooding, this is only over a very small portion of the site and overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
ESH2	30 Copsem Lane, Esher	0.56	1	21 homes	More vulnerable	10	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO RISK Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (9 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	

ESH3	1-5 Millbourne Lane, Esher	0.10	1	25 homes	More vulnerable	10	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (23% of site) Groundwater – NO RISK Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (9 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
ESH4	Hanover Cottage, 6 Claremont Lane, Esher	0.32	1	12 homes	More vulnerable	10	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO RISK Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (9 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
ESH5	35 New Road, Esher	0.26	1	5 homes	More vulnerable	10	River – LOW RISK	Relocation not required. Is located in an area at low risk	No	Passed	

							Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO RISK Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (9 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.			
ESH6	6 Bracondale and 43 Claremont Lane	0.22	1	16 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (75.6% of site); MEDIUM RISK (56% of site); HIGH RISK (23% of site) Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (7 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
ESH7	Willow House, Mayfair House and Amberhurst, Claremont More	0.50	1	57 homes	More vulnerable	10	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	

	vulnerable Lane, Esher						Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (9 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK				
ESH8	Highwaymans Cottage Car Park, Portsmouth Road, Esher	0.18	1	9 homes	More vulnerable	10	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (7% of the site) Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (7 - 9 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
ESH9	Cafe Rouge, Portsmouth Road, Esher	0.17	1 (13%) 2 (87%)	20 homes and 117 sq.m of mixed use floorspace	More vulnerable	4	River – MEDIUM RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (0.3% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (9 events in last 5 years)	Overall, the site is considered to be at medium risk of flooding and is at the highest risk relative to other medium risk sites in the Borough. The Council has identified all reasonably available sites that have a lower risk of flooding from all sources in	No	Passed	As the site is affected by Flood Zone 2, a site-specific FRA is required. Self-contained basement dwellings and basement bedrooms are not permitted. All other

							Reservoir – NO RISK	the site allocations proposed in the Draft Elmbridge Local Plan. It is not possible to accommodate the proposed development at ESH9 in an area with lower risk, as all lower risk sites have already been identified for other development or are not available.			basements, basement extensions and basement conversions should be avoided.
ESH10	40 New Road, Esher	0.30	1	6 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (25.4% of site); MEDIUM RISK (12% of site); HIGH RISK (1.4% of site) Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (9 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water flooding, this is only over a small portion of the site and overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
ESH11	45 More Lane, Esher	0.27	1	25 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of groundwater flooding, overall, the site is located in an	No	Passed	

							Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (7 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.			
ESH12	Garages at Farm Road, Esher	0.10	1 (2%) 2 (98%)	3 homes	More vulnerable	4	River – MEDIUM RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (1.2% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (7 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – DRY DAY (96.1% of site) WET DAY (100% of site)	Overall, the site is considered to be at medium risk of flooding and is at the highest risk relative to other medium risk sites. The Council has identified all reasonably available sites that have a lower risk of flooding from all sources in the site allocations proposed in the Draft Elmbridge Local Plan. It is not possible to accommodate the proposed development at ESH12 in an area with lower risk, as all lower risk sites have already been identified for other development or are not available.	No	Passed	As the site is affected by Flood Zone 2, a site-specific FRA is required. Self-contained basement dwellings and basement bedrooms are not permitted. All other basements, basement extensions and basement conversions should be avoided.

ESH13	42 New Road, Esher	0.27	1	6 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (31.4% of site); MEDIUM RISK (11% of site); HIGH RISK (0.4% of site) Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (9 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water flooding, this is only over a small portion of the site, and overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
ESH14	Two Furlongs and Wren House, Portsmouth Road, Esher	0.21	1	10 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO RISK Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (47.6% of site) AND POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (52% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (9 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of groundwater flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	

ESH15	Unit A & B	1.33	1 (97.4%)	40 homes	More	1	River – HIGH RISK	Overall, the site is	Yes	Passed	Development
	Sandown		2 (2.2%)		vulnerable			considered to be at			will typically
	Industrial		3a (0.3%)				Climate change –	high risk of flooding	The		not be
	Park, Esher		3b (0.1%)				MIDDLE MOLE 3.3% AEP	due to the presence	details of		permitted
							(0.1% of site);	of Flood Zone 3a	the		within Flood
							MIDDLE MOLE 25%	and at highest risk	exception		Zone 3b.
							CLIMATE CHANGE (0.3%	relative to other high-	test are		Development
							of site);	risk sites in the	set out		will only be
								Borough due to the	below.		considered
							Surface water –	presence of Flood			where the
							LOW RISK (0.4% of site);	Zone 3b. However,			vulnerability of
							MEDIUM RISK (0.1% of	this only covers a			the
							site);	very small (0.3% and			development
								0.1%) of the site,			is not
							Groundwater –	with 97.4% within			increased (and
							POTENTIAL AT SURFACE	Flood Zone 1.			where possible
							(97.22% of site)				reduced) and
								A sequential			the number of
							Sewer – VERY LOW RISK	approach to the site			occupants
							(7 events in last 5 years)	layout - locating the			does not
								development in the			increase.
							Reservoir –	lower risk portion of			
							DRY DAY (100% of site)	the site, outside of			The boundary
							WET DAY (0.7% of site)	flood zone 3a and			of site is within
								3b, would allow the			10 m of the
								proposed			River Mole.
								development to be			Development
								located on the site.			WIII not be
								The Courseil hee			permitted
								identified all			within a 10 m
											builer zone of
								reasonably available			the river.
								Siles that have a			As the site is
								from all sources in			AS THE SILE IS
								the site allocations			Elood Zone 2
								proposed in the Droft			3a and $3b$ a
								Elmbridge Local			site-specific
								Plan. It is not			Sile-specific
				possible to		FRA is					
--	--	--	--	-------------------------	--	-----------------------					
				accommodate the		required.					
				proposed							
				development at		A site specific					
				ESH15 in an area		sequential and					
				with lower risk. as all		exception test					
				lower risk sites have		will also be					
				already been		required to					
				identified for other		demonstrate					
				development or are		that the site					
				not available		can be					
				not available!		delivered					
						These should					
						use the higher					
						central					
						allowance in					
						accordance					
						with the EA's					
						FRA climate					
						change					
						allowances					
						quidance.					
						<u>gan a an 100</u> .					
						Self-contained					
						basement					
						dwellings and					
						basement					
						bedrooms are					
						not permitted.					
						All other					
						basements.					
						basement					
						extensions					
						and basement					
						conversions					
						should be					
						avoided.					

ESH16	River Mole	2.10	1 (98%)	200 homes	More	5	River – MEDIUM RISK	Overall, the site is	No	Passed	As the site is
	Business		2 (2%)		vulnerable			considered to be at	-		affected by
	Park, Mill						Climate change – NO	medium risk of			Flood Zone 2.
	Road. Esher						IMPACT	flooding and is at the			a site-specific
	,							higher end of			FRA is
							Surface water –	medium risk sites in			required.
							LOW RISK (17% of site)	the Borough due to			
							MEDIUM RISK (3.4% of	the presence of flood			Applications
							site)	zone 2. However.			should steer
							HIGH RISK (1.3% of site)	this is only over a			development
								verv small portion of			away from the
							Groundwater –	the site (2%).			part/s of the
							POTENTIAL AT SURFACE				site that are
							(79% of site) AND OF	The Council has			affected by
							PROPERTIÉS BELOW	identified all			Flood Zone 2
							GROUND LEVEL (5.7% of	reasonably available			as far as
							site)	sites that have a			possible in the
							,	lower risk of flooding			first instance.
							Sewer – VERY LOW RISK	from all sources in			Then address
							(7 events in last 5 years)	the site allocations			and mitigate
								proposed in the Draft			the sources of
							Reservoir –	Elmbridge Local			flood risk on
							DRY DAY (100% of site)	Plan. It is not			site.
							WET DAY (42.4% of site)	possible to			
								accommodate the			Self-contained
								proposed			basement
								development at			dwellings and
								ESH16 in an area			basement
								with lower risk, as all			bedrooms are
								lower risk sites have			not permitted.
								already been			All other
								identified for other			basements,
								development or are			basement
								not available.			extensions
											and basement
											conversions
											should be
											avoided.

ESH17	Units C and	1.27	1	60 homes	More	6	SITE IS WITHIN A HIGH	Overall, the site is	No	Passed	Applicants
	D, Sandown				vulnerable		PRIORITY AREA	considered to be at			should consult
	Industrial							medium risk of			Surrey County
	Park, Mill						River – LOW RISK	flooding. There is an			Council to
	Road, Esher							increased risk of			understand
	,						Climate change – NO	groundwater flooding			how best to
							IMPACT	and the site is in a			work within
								high priority flooding			and address
							Surface water –	area. However the			the priority
							LOW RISK (0.2% of site)	site is at the lower			flood area.
								end of medium risk			
							Groundwater –	sites in the Borough			
							POTENTIAL AT SURFACE	and is entirely within			
							(100% of site)	Flood Zone 1.			
							(,				
							Sewer – LOW RISK	The Council has			
							(18 events in last 5 years)	identified all			
							(reasonably available			
							Reservoir –	sites that have a			
							DRY DAY (100% of site)	lower risk of flooding			
							WFT DAY (42.3% of site)	from all sources in			
								the site allocations			
								proposed in the Draft			
								Elmbridge Local			
								Plan It is not			
								possible to			
								accommodate the			
								proposed			
								development at			
								ESH17 in an area			
								with lower risk as all			
								lower risk sites have			
								already been			
								identified for other			
								development or are			

ESH18	Windsor Houses, 34- 40 High Street	0.08	1	Mixed use, including 8 homes	More vulnerable	10	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO RISK Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (7 - 9 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
ESH19	Hawkshill Place, Portsmouth Road, Esher	0.61	1	12 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (15.7% of site) MEDIUM RISK (5% of site) HIGH RISK (0.4% of site) Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (9 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water flooding, this is only over a very small portion of the site and overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
ESH20	81 High Street, Esher	0.10	1	8 homes	More vulnerable	9	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water flooding, this is only	No	Passed	

							Surface water – LOW RISK (6.7% of site) MEDIUM RISK (2% of site) Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (9 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	over a very small portion of the site and overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.			
ESH21	Esher Library and land adjoining, Church Street, Esher	0.20	1	15 homes and re- provision of existing community use	More vulnerable	10	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO RISK Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (9 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
ESH22	15 Clare Hill, Esher	1.35	1	55 homes	More vulnerable	10	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (5% of site) Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (9 events in last 5 years)	Relocation not required. Is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	

							Reservoir – NO RISK				
ESH23	St Andrews and Hillbrow House, Portsmouth Road, Esher	0.28	1	30 homes	More vulnerable	9	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (21.4% of site) MEDIUM RISK (4% of site) Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (9 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water flooding, this is only over a very small portion of the site and overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
ESH24	Civic Centre, High Street, Esher	2.71	1	400 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (19% of site) MEDIUM RISK (6% of site) HIGH RISK (2.4% of site) Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (9 events in last 5 years)	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water flooding, this is only over a very small portion of the site and overall, the site is located in an area at relatively low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future. The Council has identified all	No	Passed	

				reasonably available		
			Reservoir – NO RISK	sites that have a		
				lower risk of flooding		
				from all sources in		
				the site allocations		
				proposed in the Draft		
				Elmbridge Local		
				Elinohuge Local		
				Plan. It is not		
				possible to		
				accommodate the		
				proposed		
				development at		
				ESH23 in an area		
				with lower risk, as all		
				lower risk sites have		
				already been		
				identified for other		
				development or are		
				not available		

Hersham

Site ref.	Site name	Site area (ha)	Flood zone	Proposed development	Vulnerability	SFRA rank	Flood Risk from all sources now and in the future	Can development be steered towards an area at lower risk?	Exception test required?	Sequential test passed?	Requirements for applications
H1	63 Queens Road, Hersham	0.05	1	Mixed use, including 5 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO RISK Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (4 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of groundwater flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
H2	19 Old Esher Road, Hersham	0.06	1	5 homes	More vulnerable	9	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (1.2% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (5 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of groundwater flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	

H3	Hersham Shopping Centre, Molesey Road, Hersham	1.39	1	200 homes	More vulnerable	9	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (15% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL OF PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND LEVEL (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (5 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – WET DAY (3% of site)	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of groundwater and reservoir flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed
H4	Park House, Pratts Lane, Hersham	0.05	1	5 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO RISK Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (5 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of groundwater flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed
H5	Car park to the south of Mayfield Road, Hersham	0.46	1	9 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (29.7% of site)	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water and groundwater flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at	No	Passed

							MEDIUM RISK (4% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (4 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.			
H6	Hersham Day Centre and Village Hall, Queens Road, Hersham	0.40	1	Mixed use, including 15 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (4.9% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (2% of site) AND OF PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND (98% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (4 – 5 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of groundwater flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
H7	New Berry Lane car park, Hersham	0.11	1	7 homes	More vulnerable	9	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (15% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL OF PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND LEVEL (100% of site)	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of groundwater and reservoir flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	

							Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (5 events in last 5 years)				
							(24% of site)				
H8	Hersham sports and social club 128 Hersham Road Hersham	0.12	1	8 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (0.3% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (4 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – WET DAY (3 2% of site)	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of groundwater and reservoir flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
H9	Volkswagen Ltd Esher Road Hersham	0.12	1	27 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (9.7% of site) MEDIUM RISK (3% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (28% of site) AND OF PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND LEVEL (72% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (5 events in last 5 years)	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water, reservoir and groundwater flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	

							(94.2% of site)				
H10	The Royal George, 130-132 Hersham Road, Hersham	0.20	1	15 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (5.2% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (4 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – WET DAY (2% of site)	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of reservoir and groundwater flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
H11	Trinity Hall and 63-67 Molesey Road, Hersham	1.10	1	47 homes and re- provision of existing community use	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (6.1% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (94% of site) AND OF PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND LEVEL (6% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (5 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of groundwater flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	

H12	Car Park next to Waterloo Court	0.64	1	62 homes	More vulnerable	9	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (42.7% of site) MEDIUM RISK (5% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL OF PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND LEVEL (1% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (4 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water and groundwater flooding, this is only over a very small portion of the site, and overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
H13	All Saints Catholic Church Hall Queens Road, Hersham	0.08	1	Mixed use, including 8 homes	More vulnerable	9	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO RISK Groundwater – POTENTIAL OF PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND LEVEL (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (4 – 5 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of groundwater flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
H14	Hersham Technology Park (Air Products)	4.18	1	4,350 sq.m of employment floorspace	Less vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water –	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water and groundwater flooding, overall, the site is	No	Passed	

							LOW RISK (7.3% of site) MEDIUM RISK (1% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (62% of site) AND OF PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND LEVEL (38% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (4 - 5 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.			
H15	Hersham Library, Molesey Road, Hersham	0.24	1	13 homes and re- provision of existing library	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (67.7% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (58% of site) AND OF PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND LEVEL (42% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (4 - 5 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – WET DAY (99.2% of site)	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of groundwater and reservoir flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	

Molesey

Site ref.	Site name	Site area (ha)	Flood zone	Proposed development	Vulnerability	SFRA rank	Flood Risk from all sources now and in the future	Can development be steered towards an area at lower risk?	Exception test required?	Sequential test passed?	Requirements for applications
MOL1	2 Beauchamp Road, East Molesey	0.24	1	9 homes	More vulnerable	9	River – LOW RISK Climate change – LOWER THAMES 81% CLIMATE CHANGE – Thames Dominated (1% of site) Surface water – LOW RISK (18% of site) MEDIUM RISK (7% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL OF PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND LEVEL (100% of site) Sewer – LOW RISK (10 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water and groundwater flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
MOL2	133-135 Walton Road, East Molesey	0.11	2	Mixed use, including 8 homes	More vulnerable	4	River – MEDIUM RISK Climate change – LOWER THAMES 35% CLIMATE CHANGE – Thames Dominated (95% of site) LOWER THAMES 81% CLIMATE CHANGE – Thames Dominated (100% of site);	Overall, the site is considered to be at medium risk of flooding and is at the highest risk relative to other medium risk sites in the Borough. The Council has identified all reasonably available	No	Passed	As safe access/egress is unlikely to be achievable, safe refuge should be designed into the development above the Level 2 SFRA

			LOWER THAMES 81%	sites that have a		extreme flood
			CLIMATE CHANGE –	lower risk of flooding		event plus an
			Tributary Dominated (95%	from all sources in		allowance for
			of site)	the site allocations		climate
			,	proposed in the Draft		change that is
			LOWER THAMES 0.1%	Elmbridge Local		outside the
			AEP (95% of site)	Plan. It is not		flooded area.
				possible to		
			Surface water -	accommodate the		An increase in
			LOW RISK (29% of site)	proposed		built footprint
			· · · · · ·	development at		should not be
			Groundwater –	MOL2 in an area		proposed as it
			POTENTIAL AT	with lower risk, as all		is not possible
			SURFACE (100% of site)	lower risk sites have		to provide
				already been		floodplain
			Sewer – LOW RISK	identified for other		compensation
			(5 – 10 events in last 5	development or are		on site.
			vears)	not available.		
						A site-specific
			Reservoir –	The majority of the		FRA is
			DRY DAY (100% of site)	site (95%) is at risk		required to
			WET DAY (100% of site)	of flooding during the		demonstrate
				Lower Thames:		that the site
				Thames dominated		will be safe.
				and tributary		
				dominated design		Self-contained
				event (1% AEP plus		basement
				a 20% climate		dwellings and
				change allowance).		basement
				It will therefore not		bedrooms are
				be possible to deliver		not permitted.
				floodplain		All other
				compensation		basements,
				storage within the		basement
				site for any increase		extensions
				in built footprint.		and basement
				However, the		conversions
				existing built footprint		should be
				covers the vast		avoided.

majority of th	e site
and it is control	idered
	Sidered
that an increa	ase in
footprint is no	ot
peopled to de	liver the
	enver the
allocated	
development	on this
site	
Site.	
The Level 2 State Stat	SFRA
identified that	t safa
access/egres	ss to the
site may not	be
achievable I	n
consultation	with its
Emergency F	Planning
service, the (Council
	od that
the proposed	
development	can be
made safe av	ad the
access/egres	ss would
not place und	due
burden on lo	
emergency s	ervices.
The site is w	ithin an
	by a
	uy a
flood warning	j system
(064FWF32E	Sher
River Mole a	t Esher
and East Mo	iesey),
there is a res	t centre
at the Molese	ev
contro availa	ble to
residents in a	an
emergency;	and the

								emergency procedures, including an evacuation plan, detailed in its <u>Emergency Plan</u> and the <u>Surrey Local</u> <u>Resilience Forum</u> Multi-Agency Flood Plan (MAFP) Part Two – Elmbridge Borough Council, which is reviewed and updated annually, would be enacted in the event of flooding.			
MOL 3	Garage block west of 14 and north of 15 Brende Gardens, West Molesey	0.05	1 (98%) 2 (2%)	4 homes	More vulnerable	5	River – MEDIUM RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (0.2% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (9 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – DRY DAY (100% of site) WET DAY (100% of site)	Overall, the site is considered to be at medium risk of flooding and is at the higher end of medium risk sites in the Borough due to the presence of flood zone 2. However, this is only over a very small portion of the site (2%). The Council has identified all reasonably available sites that have a lower risk of flooding from all sources in the site allocations proposed in the Draft Elmbridge Local	No	Passed	As the site is affected by Flood Zone 2, a site-specific FRA is required. Applications should steer development away from the part/s of the site that are affected by Flood Zone 2 as far as possible in the first instance. Then address and mitigate the sources of

								Plan. It is not possible to accommodate the proposed development at MOL3 in an area with lower risk, as all lower risk sites have already been identified for other development or are not available.			flood risk on site. Self-contained basement dwellings and basement bedrooms are not permitted. All other basements, basement extensions and basement conversions should be avoided.
MOL4	East Molesey Car Park, Walton Road, East Molesey	0.39	1 (2%) 2 (98%)	23 homes	More vulnerable	4	River – MEDIUM RISK Climate change – LOWER THAMES 35% CLIMATE CHANGE – Thames Dominated (87.3% of site); LOWER THAMES 81% CLIMATE CHANGE – Thames Dominated (99.9% of site) LOWER THAMES 0.1% AEP – Thames Dominated (88.6% of site) LOWER THAMES 81% CLIMATE CHANGE – Tributary Dominated (87.3% of site) LOWER THAMES 0.1% AEP – Tributary Dominated (84.5% of site)	Overall, the site is considered to be at medium risk of flooding and is at highest risk relative to other medium risk sites in the Borough. The Council has identified all reasonably available sites that have a lower risk of flooding from all sources in the site allocations proposed in the Draft Elmbridge Local Plan. It is not possible to accommodate the proposed development at	No	Failed	87% of the site is at risk of flooding during the Lower Thames: Thames dominated and tributary dominated design event (1% AEP plus a 20% climate change allowance) and an increase in built footprint is not possible as flood compensation is unlikely to be able to be

							Surface water	MOL 4 in an area			provided on
							Surface water – LOW RISK (52.7% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (94% of site) AND OF PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND LEVEL (6.87% of site) Sewer – LOW RISK (10 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – DRY DAY (100% of site) WET DAY (100% of site)	MOL4 in an area with lower risk, as all lower risk sites have already been identified for other development or are not available. 87% of the site is at risk of flooding during the Lower Thames: Thames dominated and tributary dominated design event (1% AEP plus a 20% climate change allowance). It is therefore unlikely to be possible to deliver floodplain compensation storage within the site for any increase in built footprint			provided on site.
MOL5	Garages to the rear of Belvedere Gardens, West Molesey	0.09	1	4 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO RISK Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (9 events in last 5 years)	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of groundwater and reservoir flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	

						Reservoir – WET DAY (96.1% of site) DRY DAY (100% of site)				
MOL6	Garages to the rear of Island Farm Road, West Molesey	0.10	4 homes	More vulnerable	6	SITE IS WITHIN A HIGH PRIORITY AREA River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO RISK Groundwater – NO RISK Sewer – LOW RISK (9 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – DRY DAY (100% of site) WET DAY (79.4% of site)	Overall, the site is considered to be at medium risk of flooding as the site is in high priority flooding area. The site is at the lower end relative to other medium risk sites in the Borough and is entirely within Flood Zone 1. The Council has identified all reasonably available sites that have a lower risk of flooding from all sources in the site allocations proposed in the Draft Elmbridge Local Plan. It is not possible to accommodate the proposed development at MOL6 in an area with lower risk, as all lower risk sites have already been identified for other development or are not available.	No	Passed	Applicants should consult Surrey County Council to understand how best to work within and address the priority flood area.

MOL8	7 Seymour	0.24	1	5 homes	More	9	River – LOW RISK	Relocation not	No	Passed	The site is not
	Close and Land				vulnerable			required. Whilst			indicated to be
	to rear of 103-						Climate change – NO	there is a risk of			at risk of
	113 Seymour						IMPACT	surface water and			flooding from
	Close, East							groundwater			rivers during
	Molesey						Surface water –	flooding, overall, the			the design
	-						LOW RISK (11.7% of site)	site is located in an			event,
							MEDIUM RISK (6% of site)	area at low risk of			however the
								flooding from all			local area and
							Groundwater –	sources, now and in			access routes
							POTENTIAL OF	the future.			are at risk.
							PROPERTIES BELOW				Safe
							GROUND LEVEL (100%				access/egress
							of site)				(i.e. that is dry
											or Low hazard
							Sewer – LOW RISK				during the 1%
							(10 events in last 5 years)				AEP event
							Decement				Including
							Reservoir –				central climate
							WET DAY (100% of site)				change
							WEI DAT (100% OF Sile)				allowance) is
											the site A dry
											route is
											available west
											along
											Beauchamp
											Road, north
											along High
											Street, west
											along Walton
											Road, north
											along
											Rosemary
											Evenue and
											then west
											along Hurst
											Road. (Routes
											to the east

		1					from the site
		1					would include
							the part of
							Walton Road
							at Significant
							hazard and
							are therefore
							not suitable
							routes)
							Toules).
							The site is
							located within
							the 'Diver Mele
							the River wole
							at Esher and
							East Moreing
							Flood Warning
							Area. Given
							the risk of
							flooding from
							rivers in the
							wider area, it
							is
							recommended
							that
							Emergency
							Plans are
							developed for
							occupants of
							the site to set
							out the
							response in
							the event of
							flooding,
							including
							access routes
							and places of
			l				safety.

MOL9	11-27 Down	0.20	1 (49%)	7 homes	More	4	River – MEDIUM RISK	Overall, the site is	Νο	Passed	As the site is
	Street West	00	2 (51%)		vulnerable			considered to be at			affected by
	Molesev		2 (0170)		vanierabie		Climate change – NO	medium risk of			Flood Zone 2
	Molocoy						IMPACT	flooding and is at			a site-specific
								highest risk relative			FRA is
							Surface water –	to other medium risk			required
							I OW RISK (24.5% of site)	sites in the Borough			required.
								Sites in the Derough.			Applications
							Groundwater -	The Council has			should
							POTENTIAL AT	identified all			prioritise
							SURFACE (100% of site)	reasonably available			steering
								sites that have a			development
							Sewer - VERVIOW RISK	lower risk of flooding			toward the
							(9 events in last 5 vers)	from all sources in			area of the site
							(o events in last o years)	the site allocations			in Flood Zone
							Reservoir -	proposed in the Draft			1 as far as
							DRY DAY (100% of site)	Elmbridge Local			nossible in the
							WET DAY (100% of site)	Plan It is not			first instance
								nossible to			Then address
								accommodate the			and mitigate
								proposed			the sources of
								development at			flood risk on
								MOL9 in an area			site
								with lower risk as all			510.
								lower risk sites have			Self-contained
								already been			basement
								identified for other			dwellings and
								development or are			hasement
								not available			bedrooms are
								not available.			not permitted
											All other
											hasements
											basement
											extensions
											and basement
											conversions
											should be
											avoided
		1	1								avolueu.

MOL10	Vine Medical	0.11	2	Mixed use,	More	4	River – MEDIUM RISK	Overall, the site is	No	Failed	87% of the site
	Centre, 69			including 7	vulnerable			considered to be at			is at risk of
	Pemberton			homes			Climate change –	medium risk of			flooding during
	Road, East						LOWER THAMES 35%	flooding and is at			the Lower
	Molesey						CLIMATE CHANGE –	highest risk relative			Thames:
	-						Thames Dominated	to other medium risk			Thames
							(86.8% of site);	sites in the Borough.			dominated and
							LOWER THAMES 81%				tributary
							CLIMATE CHANGE	The Council has			dominated
							Thames Dominated (100%	identified all			design event
							of site);	reasonably available			(1% AEP plus
							LOWER THAMES 0.1%	sites that have a			a 20% climate
							AEP – Thames Dominated	lower risk of flooding			change
							(100% of site);	from all sources in			allowance)
							LOWER THAMES 81%	the site allocations			and an
							CLIMATE CHANGE	proposed in the Draft			increase in
							Tributary Dominated	Elmbridge Local			built footprint
							(86.8% of site);	Plan. It is not			is not possible
							LOWER THAMES 0.1%	possible to			as flood
							AEP – Tributary	accommodate the			compensation
							Dominated (52.8% of site)	proposed			is unlikely to
								development at			be able to be
							Surface water –	MOL10 in an area			provided on
							NORISK	with lower risk, as all			site.
								lower risk sites have			
							Groundwater –	already been			
								identified for other			
							SURFACE (100% of site)	development or are			
								not avallable.			
							Sewer – VERY LOW RISK	070/ of the site is st			
							(5 events in last 5 years)	87% of the site is at			
							Deserveir	risk of flooding			
							Reservoir –	There are the man			
							WET DAY (100% OF SITE)	dominated and			
							VVET DAT (100% OF SITE)	tributory dominated			
								design event (1%			
								AEP plus a 20%			
								climate change			

								allowance). It is therefore unlikely to be possible to deliver floodplain compensation storage within the site for any increase in built footprint.			
MOL11	Molesey Hospital, High Street	0.75	1	70 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (12.4% of site); MEDIUM RISK (7% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (38% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (9 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – WET DAY (98.5% of site) DRY DAY (100% of site)	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water, groundwater and reservoir flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future. The Council has identified all reasonably available sites that have a lower risk of flooding from all sources in the site allocations proposed in the Draft Elmbridge Local Plan. It is not possible to accommodate the proposed development at MOL11 in an area with lower risk, as all lower risk sites have already been	No	Passed	

								identified for other			
								development or are			
								not available.			
MOL12	Henrietta Parker Centre, Ray Road, West Molesey	0.51	1 (4%) 2 (96%)	13 homes and re- provision of existing community use	More vulnerable	4	River – MEDIUM RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (58.1% of site); MEDIUM RISK (15.8% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (9 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – DRY DAY (100% of site) WET DAY (100% of site)	Overall, the site is considered to be at medium risk of flooding and is at highest risk relative to other medium risk sites in the Borough. The Council has identified all reasonably available sites that have a lower risk of flooding from all sources in the site allocations proposed in the Draft Elmbridge Local Plan. It is not possible to accommodate the proposed development at MOL12 in an area with lower risk, as all lower risk sites have already been identified for other development or are not available.	No	Passed	As the site is affected by Flood Zone 2, a site-specific FRA is required. Self-contained basement dwellings and basement bedrooms are not permitted. All other basements, basement extensions and basement conversions should be avoided.
MOL13	Parking/garages at Grove Court Walton Road, East Molesey	0.11	1	7 homes	More vulnerable	9	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO IMPACT	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of groundwater and reservoir flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at	No	Passed	The site is not indicated to be at risk of flooding from rivers during the design event,

				low risk of flooding	however the
			Groundwater –	from all sources,	local area and
			POTENTIAL OF	now and in the	access routes
			PROPERTIES BELOW	future.	are at risk.
			GROUND LEVEL (100%		are at nora
			of site)		Sofo
			or site)		
					ducess/egress
			Sewer - LOW RISK		(i.e. that is dry
			(5 - 10 events in last 5		or Low hazard
			years)		during the 1%
					AEP event
			Reservoir –		including
			DRY DAY (99% of site)		central climate
			WET DAY (97.1% of site)		change
					allowance) is
					achievable for
					the site south
					along Esher
					Road This
					route is shown
					to be dry in the
					River Thames
					(Thames
					Dominated)
					model results,
					and Low
					hazard in the
					River Thames
					(Tributary
					Dominated)
					results.
					(Routes from
					the site to the
					west would
					include the
					part of Walton
					Road at
					Significant
					bazard
					nazalu

											(Thames Dominated scenario) and are therefore not suitable routes).
											The site is located within the 'River Mole at Esher and East Molesey' Flood Warning Area. Given the risk of flooding from rivers in the wider area, it is recommended that Emergency Plans are developed for occupants of the site to set out the response in the event of flooding, including access routes and places of safety.
MOL14	43 Palace Road, East Molesey	0.27	1 (16%) 2 (77%) 3b (7%)	18 homes	More vulnerable	1	River – HIGH RISK Climate change –	Overall, the site is considered to be at high risk of flooding as is at highest risk relative to other high-	Yes The details of the	Failed	83% of the site is at risk of flooding during the Lower Thames:

			LOWER THAMES 3.3%	risk sites in the	exception	Thames
			AEP – Thames Dominated	Borough due to the	test are	dominated
			(6.8% of site):	presence of flood	set out	design event
			LOWER THAMES 35%	zone 3b. However.	below.	(1% AEP plus
			CLIMATE CHANGE –	this only covers a		a 20% climate
			Thames Dominated	small portion of the		change
			(82.8% of site):	site (7%)		allowance)and
			LOWER THAMES 81%			an increase in
			CLIMATE CHANGE -	A sequential		built footprint
			Thames Dominated (100%	approach to the site		is not possible
			of site)	layout - locating the		as flood
				development in the		as noou
			AED Thomas Dominated	lower rick partian of		io uplikoly to
			AEF = Thankes Dominated	the site sutside of		is unlikely to
			(14.9% 01310),	flood zopo 2b would		be able to be
			AED Thomas Dominated	allow the proposed		provided on
			AEF = Indiffes Dominated	development to be		Sile.
				development to be		
			LOWER THAMES 81%	located on the site.		
			Surface water	The Council has		
			I OW PISK (0.4% of site)	identified all		
			LOW RISK (0.4% 01 Sile)			
			Groundwater	sites that have a		
				lower rick of flooding		
				from all sources in		
			GROUND LEVEL (100%	the site allocations		
			of site)	proposed in the Draft		
			or site)	Elmbridge Local		
			Sower VERVIOW RISK	Plan It is not		
			(5 events in last 5 years)	possible to		
			(Sevents In last Syears)	possible to		
			Posonuoir	accommodate the		
			DPV DAV (100% of site)	dovelopment at		
			WET DAY (100% of site)			
			WEI DAT (100 % OF SILE)			
				lower rick sites have		
				already been		
				identified for other		

								development or are not available. 83% of the site is at risk of flooding during the Lower Thames: Thames dominated design event (1% AEP plus a 20% climate change allowance). Development should be steered away from this area.			
MOL15	Pavilion Sports Club car park, Hurst Lane, East Molesey	0.34	2	9 homes	More vulnerable	4	River – MEDIUM RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO RISK Groundwater – POTENTIAL OF PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (5 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – DRY DAY (99.9% of site) WET DAY (99.3% of site)	Overall, the site is considered to be at medium risk of flooding and is at highest risk relative to other medium risk sites in the Borough. The Council has identified all reasonably available sites that have a lower risk of flooding from all sources in the site allocations proposed in the Draft Elmbridge Local Plan. It is not possible to accommodate the proposed development at MOL15 in an area with lower risk, as all lower risk sites have	No	Passed	Safe refuge should be designed into the development above the extreme flood event plus an allowance for climate change that is outside the flooded area. A site-specific FRA is required to demonstrate that the site will be safe. Self-contained basement dwellings and basement

already been	bedrooms are
identified for other	not permitted.
development or are	All other
not available.	basements.
	basement
	oxtonsions
	extensions and bacament
identified that safe	and basement
access/egress to the	conversions
site may not be	should be
achievable. In	avoided.
consultation with its	
Emergency Planning	
service, the Council	
has concluded that	
the proposed	
development can be	
made safe and the	
access/egress would	
not place undue	
burden on local	
emergency services.	
The site is within an	
area served by a	
flood warning system	
(064FWF32Esher	
River Mole at Esher	
and East Molesev):	
there is a rest control	
residents in an	
emergency; and the	
Council has effective	
emergency	
procedures,	
including an	
evacuation plan,	

								detailed in its <u>Emergency Plan</u> and the <u>Surrey Local</u> <u>Resilience Forum</u> Multi-Agency Flood Plan (MAFP) Part Two – Elmbridge Borough Council, which is reviewed and updated annually, would be enacted in the event of flooding.			
MOL16	Tesco Metro car park, Walton Road, East Molesey	0.21	2	11 homes	More vulnerable	4	River – MEDIUM RISK Climate change – LOWER THAMES 35% CLIMATE CHANGE – Thames Dominated (100% of site); LOWER THAMES 81% CLIMATE CHANGE - Thames Dominated (100% of site); LOWER THAMES 0.1% AEP – Thames Dominated (100% of site); LOWER THAMES 81% CLIMATE CHANGE - Tributary Dominated (100% of site); LOWER THAMES 81% CLIMATE CHANGE - Tributary Dominated (100% of site); LOWER THAMES 0.1% AEP – Tributary Dominated (100% of site) Surface water – LOW RISK (98.5% of site);	Overall, the site is considered to be at medium risk of flooding and is at highest risk relative to other medium risk sites in the Borough. The Council has identified all reasonably available sites that have a lower risk of flooding from all sources in the site allocations proposed in the Draft Elmbridge Local Plan. It is not possible to accommodate the proposed development at MOL16 in an area with lower risk, as all lower risk sites have already been	No	Failed	100% of the site is at risk of flooding during the Lower Thames: Thames dominated and tributary dominated design event (1% AEP plus a 20% climate change allowance) and an increase in built footprint is not possible as flood compensation cannot be provided on site.

							MEDIUM RISK (63.5% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – LOW RISK (10 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – DRY DAY (100% of site) WET DAY (100% of site)	identified for other development or are not available. The entire site (100%) is at risk of flooding during the Lower Thames: Thames dominated and tributary dominated design event (1% AEP plus a 20% climate change allowance). It will not be possible to deliver floodplain compensation storage within the site for any increase in built footprint. Therefore, proposed development should not increase the built footprint. Given the current use as a car park, this will limit the viable development on the site.			
MOL17	Water Works south of Hurst Road, West Molesey	0.31	1	14 homes	More vulnerable	9	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO IMPACT Groundwater – POTENTIAL OF	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of groundwater and reservoir flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources,	No	Passed	

							PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND LEVEL (100% of site) Sewer – LOW RISK (4 – 9 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – DRY DAY (100% of site) WET DAY (91.4% of site)	now and in the future.			
MOL18	Molesey Clinic and library, Walton Road, West Molesey	0.14	1	10 homes and re- provision of existing community use	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (22.1% of site); MEDIUM RISK (8% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (38% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (4 - 9 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – WET DAY (100% of site) DRY DAY (100% of site)	Whilst there is a risk of surface water, groundwater and reservoir flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
MOL19	5 Matham Road, East Molesey	0.41	1 (50.2%) 2 (48.6%) 3a (0.5%) 3b (0.7%)	23 homes	More vulnerable	1	River – HIGH RISK Climate change – LOWER THAMES 3.3% AEP – Tributary Dominated (0.7% of site); LOWER THAMES 35% CLIMATE CHANGE –	Overall, the site is considered to be at high risk of flooding and is at highest risk relative to other high- risk sites int he Borough due to the presence of flood	Yes <u>The</u> <u>details of</u> <u>the</u> <u>exception</u> <u>test are</u>	Passed	Development is not permitted in the part of the site affected by Flood Zone 3b. Applications

			Tributary Dominated (1.8% of site); LOWER THAMES 81%	zone 3b. However, this only covers a very small portion of	<u>set out</u> below.	must locate development away from this					
			CLIMATE CHANGE – Tributary Dominated	the site (2%).		area.					
			49.8x% of site) LOWER THAMES 0.5% AEP – Tributary Dominated (1.4% of site); LOWER THAMES 0.1% AEP – Tributary Dominated (49.8% of site)	A sequential approach to the site layout - locating the development in the lower risk portion of the site, outside of flood zone 3b, would allow the proposed		As the site is affected by Flood Zone 2 and 3b, a site- specific FRA is required. A site specific sequential and exception test					
			Surface water – LOW RISK (0.5% of site)	development to be located on the site.		will also be required to					
			Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (47% of site) AND OF PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND LEVEL (48% of site) Sewer – LOW RISK (10 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – DRY DAY (100% of site)	The Council has identified all reasonably available sites that have a lower risk of flooding from all sources in the site allocations proposed in the Draft Elmbridge Local Plan. It is not possible to accommodate the		demonstrate that the site can be delivered. These should use the higher central allowance in accordance with the EA's <u>FRA climate</u> change					
			WET DAY (100% of site)	accommodate the proposed development at MOL19 in an area with lower risk, as all lower risk sites have already been identified for other development or are not available.		allowances guidance. Applications should prioritise steering development toward the area of the site					
						in Flood Zone					
											1 as far as possible in the first instance. Then address and mitigate the sources of flood risk on site.
-------	--	------	---	------------------------	--------------------	---	--	---	----	--------	--
											Self-contained basement dwellings and basement bedrooms are not permitted. All other basements, basement extensions and basement conversions should be avoided.
MOL20	Joseph Palmer Centre, 319a Walton Road	0.50	1	60 care homes units	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (7.1% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (4 - 9 events in last 5 years)	Relocation not required Whilst there is a risk of groundwater and reservoir flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at relatively low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	

			Reservoir –		
			WET DAY (100% of site)		
			DRY DAY (100% of site)		

Weybridge

Site ref.	Site name	Site area (ha)	Flood zone	Proposed development	Vulnerability	SFRA rank	Flood Risk from all sources now and in the future	Can development be steered towards an area at lower risk?	Exception test required?	Sequential test passed?	Requirements for applications
WEY1	75 Oatlands Drive, Weybridge	0.22	1	9 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (49.5% of site); MEDIUM RISK (43% of site); HIGH RISK (38.2% of site) Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – LOW RISK (10 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
WEY2	9 and rear of 11 and 13 Hall Place Drive	0.32	1	7 homes	More vulnerable	9	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (68% of site); MEDIUM RISK (9% of site)	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water, groundwater and sewer flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources.	No	Passed	

							Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (14.14% of site) AND POTENTIAL OF PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND LEVEL (86% of site) Sewer – MEDIUM RISK (28 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	now and in the future.			
WEY3	24-26 Church Street, Weybridge	0.05	1	15 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO RISK Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (7 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation note required. Whilst there is a risk of groundwater flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
WEY4	Quadrant Courtyard, Weybridge	0.16	1	15 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (15.5% of site); MEDIUM RISK (1% of site)	Relocation note required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water groundwater and reservoir flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	

							Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (7 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – WET DAY (7.4% of site)				
WEY5	Weybridge Hospital and car park, 22 Church Street Weybridge	0.83	1	Mixed use, including 30 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (6.7% of site); MEDIUM RISK (3% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (7 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation note required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water and groundwater flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
WEY6	Weybridge Centre for the Community, Churchfield Place, Weybridge	0.06	1	8 homes and re-provision of existing community use	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (1.6% of site);	Relocation note required. Whilst there is a risk of groundwater flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	

							Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (7 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK				
WEY7	Oak House, 19 Queens Road, Weybridge	0.16	1	10 homes	More vulnerable	10	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO RISK Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – LOW RISK (10 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
WEY8	Garages to the west of 17 Grenside Road, Weybridge	0.07	1	5 homes	More vulnerable	9	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO RISK Groundwater – POTENTIAL OF PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND LEVEL (100% of site)	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of groundwater flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	

							Sewer – VERY LOW				
							RISK				
							(7 events in last 5 years)				
							Reservoir – NO RISK				
WEY9	Heath Lodge, St	0.14	1	6 homes	More	9	River – LOW RISK	Relocation not	No	Passed	
	Georges Avenue				vulnerable			required. Whilst			
							Climate change – NO	there is a risk of			
							IMPACT	surface water and			
							Curfe en uneter	sewer flooding,			
								overall, the site is			
							cito):	low rick of flooding			
							MEDILIM PISK 15% of	from all sources			
							site)	now and in the			
							5/(0)	future			
							Groundwater – LIMITED	rataro.			
							POTENTIAL (100% of				
							site)				
							Sewer – MEDIUM RISK				
							(28 events in last 5 years)				
							Reservoir – NO RISK				
WEY10	8 Sopwith Drive,	1.14	2 (27%)	1,404 sq.m	Less	2	River – HIGH RISK	Overall, the site is	No	Passed	As safe
	Brooklands		3a	commercial	vulnerable			considered to be at			access/egress
	Industrial Park		(73%)				Climate change –	high risk of flooding			may not be
							LOWER WEY 25%	due to the presence			achievable,
							CLIMATE CHANGE	of flood zone 3a.			safe refuge
							(97.4% of site);				should be
							LOWER WEY 35%	The Council has			designed into
							CLIMATE CHANGE	identified all			the
							(98.5% of site)	reasonably available			development
							Curfe ee weter	sites that have a			above the
								from all accurace in			extreme flood
							LUVV KISK (44.9% OF	the site allocations			event plus an
							MEDILIM PISK (10.0% of	proposed in the			climate
							sita).	Draft Elmbridge			change that is
							SIC),	Drait Eimbliuge			change that is

			LICH DISK (1 5% of aita);	Local Plan It is not		outoido tho
			$HIGHRISR(1.5\%\ OI\ Site),$	Local Flam. It is not		flooded area
			Groundwater – LINITED	accommodate the		A site-specific
			POTENTIAL (100% of	proposed		FRAIS
			site)	development at		required. To
				WEY10 in an area		demonstrate
			Sewer – MEDIUM RISK	with lower risk, as all		the
			(28 events in last 5 years)	lower risk sites have		development
				already been		will be safe.
			Reservoir –	identified for other		
			WET DAY (100% of site)	development or are		Proposed
				not available.		development
						should not
				As the proposed		increase the
				development is less		built footprint
				vulnerable to flood		
				risk it is deemed to		Applications
				he appropriate		nrioritise
				be appropriate.		locating
				A sequential		development
				A Sequential		in the partian
				approach to the site		in the portion
				layout - locating the		of the site
				development in the		outside of
				lower risk portion of		Flood Zone 3a
				the site, outside of		as far as
				flood zone 3a as far		possible in the
				as possible.		first instance.
						Then address
				The majority of the		and mitigate
				site (97%) is at risk		the sources of
				of flooding during		flood risk on
				the Lower Wey		site.
				design event (1%		
				AEP plus a 20%		As the site is
				climate change		proposed for
				allowance) and it will		Less
				not be possible to		Vulnerable
				deliver floodplain		development
				compensation		proposals
				climate change allowance) and it will not be possible to deliver floodplain compensation		proposed for Less Vulnerable development, proposals

				storage within the		should
				site for any increase		consider
				in built footprint.		options for
				However, the		flood
				existing built		resilience.
				footprint covers the		
				vast majority of the		Self-contained
				site and it is		basement
				considered that an		dwellings and
				increase in footprint		hasement
				is not needed to		basement
				deliver the allocated		pet permitted
				deriver the anocated		All othor
				development on this		All Other
				site.		basements,
				The Leviel 2 CEDA		basement
				The Level 2 SFRA		extensions
				Identified that safe		and basement
				access/egress to the		conversions
				site may not be		should be
				achievable. In		avoided.
				consultation with its		
				Emergency Planning		
				service, the Council		
				has concluded that		
				the proposed		
				development can be		
				made safe and the		
				lack of safe		
				access/egress would		
				not place undue		
				burden on local		
				emergency services.		
				<i>u</i> ,		
				The site is within an		
				area served by a		
				flood warning		
				system		
				(061FWF30XBvfleet		

								River Wey at Wisley and Byfleet); there is a rest centre at the Weybridge centre available to residents in an emergency; and the Council has effective emergency procedures, including an evacuation plan, detailed in its <u>Emergency Plan</u> and the <u>Surrey Local</u> <u>Resilience Forum</u> Multi-Agency Flood Plan (MAFP) Part Two – Elmbridge Borough Council, which is reviewed and updated annually, would be enacted in the event			
WEY11	9 Cricket Way, Weybridge	0.35	1	5 homes	More vulnerable	9	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO RISK Groundwater – POTENTIAL OF PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND LEVEL (100% of site) Sewer – LOW RISK	of flooding. Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of groundwater and sewer flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	

							(7 - 10 events in last 5				
							years)				
							Reservoir – NO RISK				
WEY12	Locke King	0.17	1	12 homes	More	8	River – LOW RISK	Relocation not	No	Passed	
	House, 2 Balfour				vulnerable			required. Whilst			
	Road,						Climate change – NO	there is a risk of			
	Weybridge						IMPACT	groundwater			
								flooding, overall, the			
							Surface water – NO RISK	site is located in an			
								area at low risk of			
							Groundwater –	flooding from all			
							POTENTIAL AT	sources, now and in			
							SURFACE (100% of site)	the future.			
							Sewer – VERY LOW				
							RISK (7 events in last 5				
							vears				
							Reservoir – NO RISK				
WEY13	York Road Car	0.12	1	8 homes	More	10	River – LOW RISK	Relocation not	No	Passed	
	Park, Weybridge				vulnerable			required. Is located			
							Climate change – NO	in an area at low risk			
							IMPACT	of flooding from all			
								sources, now and in			
							Surface water – NO RISK	the future.			
							Groundwater – LIMITED				
							POTENTIAL (100% of				
							site)				
							Sewer – LOW RISK				
							Sewer – LOW RISK (10 events in last 5 years)				
							Sewer – LOW RISK (10 events in last 5 years)				
							Sewer – LOW RISK <i>(10 events in last 5 years)</i> Reservoir – NO RISK				
							Sewer – LOW RISK <i>(10 events in last 5 years)</i> Reservoir – NO RISK				
WEY14	HFMC House,	0.08	1	6 homes	More	10	Sewer – LOW RISK (10 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK River – LOW RISK	Relocation not	No	Passed	
WEY14	HFMC House, New Road and	0.08	1	6 homes	More vulnerable	10	Sewer – LOW RISK (10 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK River – LOW RISK	Relocation not required. Is located	No	Passed	

	Road, Weybridge						Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO RISK Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – LOW RISK (10 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.			
WEY15	Floors above Waitrose, 62 High Street, Weybridge	0.17	1	9 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (7.5% of site); MEDIUM RISK (6% of site); HIGH RISK (5.9% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (7 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water and groundwater flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
WEY16	Weybridge Library, Church Street, Weybridge	0.14	1	Mixed use, including 30 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT	Relocation not required. Whilst there is arisk of surface water and groundwater	No	Passed	

							Surface water – NO RISK Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (7 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.			
WEY17	Garages to the rear of Broadwater House, Grenside Road, Weybridge	0.12	1	20 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (46% of site); MEDIUM RISK (19% of site); HIGH RISK (11.6% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (75% of site) AND OF PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND (25% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (7 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water and groundwater flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
WEY18	59-65 Baker St, Weybridge	0.14	1	Mixed use, including 14 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of	No	Passed	

					IMPACT Surface water –	flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of			
					LOW RISK (5.6% of site)	flooding from all			
					Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (49% of site) AND OF PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND (51% of site)	the future.			
					Sewer – VERY LOW				
					RISK (7 events in last 5 years)				
					Reservoir – NO RISK				
0.18 1 ((2 () 3 ()	1 89.3%) 2 (8.3%) 3a 2.4%)	5 homes	More vulnerable	3	River – HIGH RISK Climate change – LOWER WEY 25% CLIMATE CHANGE (4.3% of site); LOWER WEY 35% CLIMATE CHANGE (4.3% of site) Surface water – LOW RISK (0.2% of site); MEDIUM RISK (0.1% of site); HIGH RISK (6.6% of site) Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site)	Overall, the site is considered to be at high risk of flooding due to the presence of flood zone 3a. However, this only covers a very small portion of the site (2.4%) and the site is at relatively low risk compared to other high risk sites in the Borough. The Council has identified all reasonably available sites that have a lower risk of flooding from all sources in	Yes <u>The</u> <u>details of</u> <u>the</u> <u>exception</u> <u>test are</u> <u>set out</u> <u>below.</u>	Passed	As the site is affected by Flood Zone 2 and 3a, a site- specific FRA is required. Applications should prioritise locating development in the portion of the site within Flood one 1 as far as possible in the first instance. Then address and mitigate
C).18	0.18 1 (89.3%) 2 (8.3%) 3a (2.4%)	0.18 1 5 homes (89.3%) 2 (8.3%) 3a (2.4%)	1 5 homes More vulnerable 1 5 homes More vulnerable 2 (8.3%) 3a 2.4%)	N.18 1 5 homes More vulnerable 3 0.18 1 (89.3%) 2 (8.3%) 3a 3 (2.4%) 3	Definition (0.000 and) Groundwater - POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (49% of site) AND OF PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND (51% of site) Sewer - VERY LOW RISK (7 events in last 5 years) Reservoir - NO RISK (89.3%) 2 (8.3%) 3 (8.3%) 3a (2.4%) Climate change - LOWER WEY 25% CLIMATE CHANGE (4.3% of site) LOWER WEY 35% CLIMATE CHANGE (4.3% of site) Surface water - LOW RISK (0.2% of site) Surface water - LOW RISK (0.2% of site) Surface water - LOW RISK (0.2% of site) Groundwater - LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Groundwater - LOW RISK (6.6% of site) Sewer - MEDIUM RISK	1 5 homes More vulnerable 3 River – HIGH RISK of site) Overall, the site is considered to be at high risk of flooding (8.3%) 3a (2.4%) 5 homes More vulnerable 3 River – HIGH RISK Climate change – LOWER WEY 25% CLIMATE CHANGE (4.3% of site) Overall, the site is considered to be at high risk of flooding to the presence of flood zone 3a. (2.4%) 1 5 homes More vulnerable 3 River – HIGH RISK Climate change – LOWER WEY 25% CLIMATE CHANGE (4.3% of site) Overall, the site is considered to be at high risk of flooding to the presence of flood zone 3a. However, this only COWER WEY 25% CLIMATE CHANGE (4.3% of site) Overall, the site is considered to be at high risk of flooding portion of the site is at relatively low risk compared to other high risk sites in the Borough. Surface water – LOW RISK (0.2% of site); MEDIUM RISK (0.2% of site); HIGH RISK (6.6% of site) Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) The Council has identified all reasonably available sites that have a lower risk of flooding from all sources in the site allocations	D.18 1 5 homes More 3 River – VERY LOW RISK (7 events in last 5 years) D.18 1 5 homes More Vulnerable 3 River – HIGH RISK Overall, the site is considered to be at high risk of flooding to be at high risk of flooding to be at high risk of flooding the site is considered to be at high risk of flooding the site is considered to be at high risk of flooding the site is considered to be at high risk of flooding the site is considered to be at high risk of flooding the site is at relatively low risk compared to other high risk sites in the Borough. Yes (8.3%) 3 River – HIGH RISK Overall, the site is considered to be at high risk of flooding the site is at relatively low risk compared to other high risk sites in the Borough. The details of the site is at relatively low risk compared to other high risk sites in the Borough. 0.18 1 5 homes More Surface water – LOW RISK (0.1% of site); HIGH RISK (0.1% of	Definition (100% 00 mode) Booking inducts Groundwater - POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (49% of site) sources, now and in the future. ND OF PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND (51% of site) Sewer - VERY LOW RISK (7 events in last 5 years) Sewer - VERY LOW RISK (7 events in last 5 years) Yes 1.18 1 (89.3%) 2 (8.3%) 3 (2.4%) 5 homes More vulnerable 3 River - HIGH RISK Climate change - LOWER WEY 25% CLIMATE CHANGE (4.3% of site) Overall, the site is considered to be at high risk of flooding due to the presence of flood zone 3a. (2.4%) and the site is at relatively low risk compared to other high risk sites in the Borough. site) Yes Passed Surface water - LOW RISK (0.2% of site) Surface water - LOW RISK (0.2% of site) Overall, the site is considered to of flood zone 3a. However, this only covers a very small portion of the site is at relatively low risk compared to other high risk sites in the Borough. Site) Passed Surface water - LOW RISK (0.2% of site) In the corough. site) The Council has identified all reasonably available site at have a lower risk of flooding from all sources in the site allocations Set out

							(28 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – WET DAY (13.2% of site)	proposed in the Draft Elmbridge Local Plan. It is not possible to accommodate the proposed development at WEY19 in an area with lower risk, as all lower risk sites have already been identified for other development or are not available. A sequential approach to the site layout - locating the development in the lower risk portion of the site, should be taken to ensure development is steered away from areas in flood zone 3a and with			flood risk on site. Self-contained basement dwellings and basement bedrooms are not permitted. All other basements, basement extensions and basement conversions should be avoided.
								areas in flood zone 3a and with increased flood risk from other sources as far as possible.			
WEY20	Garages at Brockley Combe, Weybridge	0.23	1	7 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (44.3% of site); MEDIUM RISK (30% of site);	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	

							HIGH RISK (10.8% of site) Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – LOW RISK (10 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK				
WEY21	35-47 Monument Hill, Weybridge	0.57	1	Mixed use, including 20 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (11.3% of site); MEDIUM RISK (6% of site); HIGH RISK (1.8% of site) Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (53.59% of site) AND POTENTIAL OF PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND (46% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (7 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water and groundwater flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at a low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
WEY22	2-8 Princes Road, Weybridge	0.19	1	Mixed use, including 10 homes	More vulnerable	10	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO	Relocation not required. Is located in an area at low risk	No	Passed	
	1							or noouling from all			1

							Surface water – NO RISK Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – LOW RISK (10 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	sources, now and in the future.			
WEY23	Weybridge Bowling Club, 19 Springfield Lane, Weybridge	0.21	1	11 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (0.3% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (93% of site) AND OF PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND (7% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (7 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of groundwater flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
WEY24	181 Oatlands Drive, Weybridge	0.17	1	12 homes	More vulnerable	10	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	

							Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – LOW RISK (10 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK				
WEY25	The Old Warehouse, 37A Church Street, Weybridge	0.08	1	5 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO RISK Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (7 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of groundwater flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
WEY26	The Heights, Weybridge	20	1 (23.7%) 2 (33.7%) 3a (39.7%) 3b (2.9%)	9,500 sq.m of employment floorspace	Less vulnerable	1	River – HIGH RISK Climate change – LOWER WEY 3.3% AEP (2.9% of site); LOWER WEY 25% CLIMATE CHANGE (58.1% of site); LOWER WEY 35% CLIMATE CHANGE (60.8% of site) Surface water – LOW RISK (21% of site);	Overall, the site is considered to be at high risk of flooding and is at highest risk relative to other high-risk sites int eh Borough due to the presence of both flood zone 3a and 3b. Flood zone 3b only covers a very small proportion of the site (2.9%). A sequential	No	Passed	Development will typically not be permitted within Flood Zone 3b. Development will only be considered where the vulnerability of the development is not increased (and

			MEDIUM RISK (6.5% of	approach to the site		where possible
			site)	layout - locating the		reduced) and
			HIGH RISK (2.1% of site)	development in the		the number of
				lower risk portion of		occupants
			Groundwater – LIMTIED	the site outside of		does not
			POTENTIAL (19.2% of	flood zone 3b would		increase
			site): POTENTIAL AT	allow the proposed		morodoo.
			SURFACE (4 94% of site)	development to be		The site is
			AND OF PROPERTIES	located on the site		within 10 m of
			BELOW GROUND			the River Wev
			LEVEL (75.86% of site)	The Council has		Development
				identified all		will not be
			Sewer – MEDIUM RISK	reasonably available		permitted
			(28 events in last 5 years)	sites that have a		within a 10 m
				lower risk of flooding		buffer zone of
			Reservoir – NO RISK	from all sources in		the river.
				the site allocations		
				proposed in the		Applications
				Draft Elmbridge		should
				Local Plan. It is not		prioritise
				possible to		locating
				accommodate the		development
				proposed		within the
				development at		portion of the
				WEY26 in an area		site within
				with lower risk, as all		Flood Zone 1
				lower risk sites have		as far as
				already been		possible in the
				identified for other		first instance
				development or are		before looking
				not available.		at Flood Zone
						2 and if
				58% of the site is at		necessary 3a.
				risk of flooding		Then address
				during the Lower		and mitigate
				Wey design event		the sources of
				(1% AEP plus a 20%		flood risk on
				climate change		site.
				allowance).		1

				However a		Development
				significant proportion		should be
				of the site is already		steered away
				covered by built form		from the area
				and it may not be		at risk of
				necessary to		flooding during
				increase built		the Lower Wey
				footprint		design event
				lootpint.		(1% AFP plus
						a 20% climate
						change
						allowance)
						Any increase
						in built
						footprint within
						the design
						flood extent
						will need to be
						compensated
						for, on a level
						for level
						volume for
						volume basis
						within the site
						to the 1 in 100
						plus
						appropriate
						climate
						change
						allowance.
						(Applicants
						should refer to
						the Level 1
						SFRA for
						details of
						Floodplain
						Compensation
						Storage).
				1		1

					Safe
					access/egress
					may be
					achievable to
					the east of the
					site via
					Brooklands
					Road. Safe
					refuge should
					be designed
					into the
					development
					above the
					Level 2 SFRA
					extreme flood
					event plus an
					allowance for
					climate
					change that is
					outside the
					flooded area.
					A site-specific
					FRA is
					required to
					demonstrate
					the site will be
					safe.
					A site specific
					sequential and
					exception test
					will also be
					required to
					demonstrate
					that the site
					can be
					delivered.
					i nese shouid

											use the higher central allowance in accordance with the EA's <u>FRA climate</u> change allowances guidance. Self-contained basement dwellings and basement bedrooms are not permitted. All other basement extensions and basement conversions should be avoided. As the site is proposed for Less Vulnerable development, proposals should consider options for flood resilience.
WEY27	Oatlands car park, Oatlands Drive, Weybridge	0.16	1	8 homes	More vulnerable	10	River – LOW RISK	Relocation not required. Is located in an area at low risk	No	Passed	

							Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (12% of site) Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – LOW RISK (10 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.			
WEY28	179 Queens Road, Weybridge	0.41	1	9 homes	More vulnerable	9	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (18.3% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL OF PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND LEVEL (100% of site) Sewer – MEDIUM RISK (28 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of groundwater and sewer flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
WEY29	1 Princes Road, Weybridge	0.27	1	19 homes	More vulnerable	10	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	

										1	
							Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – LOW RISK (10 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK				
WEY30	NHS North West, 58 Church	0.26	1	Mixed use, including 19	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst	No	Passed	
	Street, Weybridge			homes			Climate change – NO IMPACT	there is a risk of groundwater			
							Surface water – LOW RISK (0.3% of site)	site is located in an area at low risk of			
							Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (73% of site) AND OF PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND LEVEL (27% of site)	sources, now and in the future.			
							Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (7 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK				
WEY31	Weybridge Delivery Office, Elmgrove Road	0.09	1	Mixed use, including 5 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (1.1% of site)	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of groundwater flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of	No	Passed	

							Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (7 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	sources, now and in the future.			
WEY32	Baker Street car park, Weybridge	0.12	1	Mixed use, including 7 homes	More vulnerable	9	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO RISK Groundwater – POTENTIAL OF PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND LEVEL (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (7 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of groundwater flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
WEY33	GlaxoSmithKline, St. Georges Avenue	2.59	1	100 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (20.7% of site); MEDIUM RISK (6% of site); HIGH RISK (1.5% of site)	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	

							Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site)				
							Sewer – MEDIUM RISK (28 events in last 5 years)				
WEY34	Woodlawn, Hanger Hill and 2 Churchfields Avenue, Weybridge	0.48	1	11 homes	More vulnerable	9	Reservoir – NO RISK River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (2.9% of site); MEDIUM RISK (2% of site) Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (100% of site) Sewer – LOW RISK (10 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water and groundwater flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
WEY35	Horizon Business Village, Brooklands Road, Weybridge	1.92	2 (14.5%) 3a (77.6%) 3b (7.9%)	6,000 sq.m of employment floorspace	Less vulnerable	1	River – HIGH RISK Climate change – LOWER WEY 3.3% AEP (7.9% of site); LOWER WEY 25% CLIMATE CHANGE (87.3% of site); LOWER WEY 35% CLIMATE CHANGE (95.9% of site) Surface water –	Overall, the site is considered to be at high risk of flooding and is at highest risk relative to other high-risk sites in the Borough due to the presence of flood zone 3a and 3b. Flood zone 3b only covers a small proportion of the site	No	Passed	Development will typically not be permitted within Flood Zone 3b. Development will only be considered where the vulnerability of the development

			LOW RISK (30.1% of	(7.9%). A sequential		is not
			site):	approach to the site		increased (and
			MEDIUM RISK (19.4% of	lavout - locating the		where possible
			site):	development in the		reduced) and
			HIGH RISK (14.7% of	lower risk portion of		the number of
			site):	the site, outside of		occupants
				flood zone 3b. would		does not
			Groundwater – LIMTIED	allow the proposed		increase
			POTENTIAL (100% of	development to be		
			site)	located on the site		Applications
						should
			Sewer – MEDIUM RISK	The Council has		prioritise
			(28 events in last 5 years)	identified all		locating
				reasonably available		development
			Reservoir – WET DAY	sites that have a		within the
			(99.9% of site)	lower risk of flooding		portion of the
			()	from all sources in		site within
				the site allocations		Flood Zone 2
				proposed in the		as far as
				Draft Elmbridge		possible in the
				Local Plan. It is not		first instance
				possible to		before looking
				accommodate the		at 3a. Then
				proposed		address and
				development at		mitigate the
				WEY35 in an area		sources of
				with lower risk, as all		flood risk on
				lower risk sites have		site.
				already been		
				identified for other		As safe
				development or are		access/egress
				not available.		is unlikely
						achievable on
				The majority of the		site, safe
				site (87%) is at risk		refuge should
				of flooding during		be designed
				the Lower Wey		into the
				design event (1%		development
				AEP plus a 20%		above the

			climate change		Lower Wey
			allowance) and it will		extreme flood
			not be possible to		event (0.1%
			deliver floodplain		AEP) plus an
			compensation		allowance for
			storage within the		climate
			site for any increase		change that is
			in built footprint.		outside the
			However, a		flooded area.
			significant proportion		
			of the site is already		A site-specific
			covered by built form		FRA is
			and it may not be		required to
			necessary to		demonstrate
			increase built		the
			footprint.		development
					will be safe.
			The Level 2 SFRA		
			identified that safe		A site specific
			access/egress to the		sequential and
			site may not be		exception test
			achievable. In		will also be
			consultation with its		required to
			Emergency Planning		demonstrate
			service, the Council		that the site
			has concluded that		can be
			the proposed		delivered.
			development can be		These should
			made safe and the		use the higher
			lack of safe		central
			access/egress would		allowance in
			not place undue		accordance
			burden on local		with the EA's
			emergency services.		FRA climate
			<u> </u>		change
			The site is within an		allowances
			area served by a		guidance.
			flood warning		-

								system (061FWF30XByfleet River Wey at Wisley and Byfleet); there is a rest centre at the Weybridge centre available to residents in an emergency; and the Council has effective emergency procedures, including an evacuation plan, detailed in its <u>Emergency Plan</u> and the <u>Surrey Local</u> <u>Resilience Forum</u> Multi-Agency Flood Plan (MAFP) Part Two – Elmbridge Borough Council, which is reviewed and updated annually, would be enacted in the event of flooding.			Proposed development should not increase the built footprint. Self-contained basement dwellings and basement bedrooms are not permitted. All other basements, basement extensions and basement conversions should be avoided due to the increased risk of flooding. As the site is proposed for Less Vulnerable development, proposals should consider options for flood resilience.
WEY36	1-8 Dovecote Close, Weybridge	0.47	1	7 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of groundwater and	No	Passed	

							Surface water – LOW RISK (6.7% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (7 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – WET DAY (8.8% of site)	reservoir flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.			
WEY37	Foxholes, Weybridge	4.10	1	78 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (26.2% of site); MEDIUM RISK (6% of site); HIGH RISK (2.3% of site) Groundwater – LIMITED POTENTIAL (99.92% of site) Sewer – MEDIUM RISK (28 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water and sewer flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	

Walton-on-Thames

Site ref.	Site name	Site area (ha)	Flood zone	Proposed development	Vulnerability	SFRA rank	Flood Risk from all sources now and in the future	Can development be steered towards an area at lower	Exception test required?	Sequential test passed?	Requirements for applications
WOT1	12-16a High Street, Walton- on-Thames	0.10	1	Mixed use, including 24 homes	More vulnerable	9	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (1.2% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL OF PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND LEVEL (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (7 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	risk? Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of groundwater flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
WOT2	Leylands House, Molesey Road, Walton- on-Thames	0.31	1 (28%) 2 (72%)	56 homes	More vulnerable	4	River – MEDIUM RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO RISK Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – HIGH RISK (43 events in last 5 years)	Overall, the site is considered to be at medium risk of flooding and is at highest risk relative to other medium risk sites in the Borough. The Council has identified all reasonably available sites that have a lower risk of flooding	No	Passed	As the site is affected by Flood Zone 2, a site-specific FRA is required. Applications should prioritise locating development within the

							Reservoir – DRY DAY (100% of site) WET DAY (100% of site)	from all sources in the site allocations proposed in the Draft Elmbridge Local Plan. It is not possible to accommodate the proposed development at WOT2 in an area with lower risk, as all lower risk sites have already been identified for other development or are not available.			portion of the site that is within Flood Zone 1 as far as possible in the first instance. Then address and mitigate the sources of flood risk on site. Self-contained basement dwellings and basement bedrooms are not permitted. All other basements, basement extensions and basement conversions should be avoided.
WOT3	Garages to the rear of 84-92 and 94-96 Rodney Road, Walton-on- Thames	0.06	1	4 homes	More vulnerable	6	SITE IS WITHIN A HIGH PRIORITY AREA River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (0.1% of site); MEDIUM RISK (0.1% of site)	Overall, the site is considered to be at medium risk of flooding as the site is in high priority flooding area. However, is at the lower end relative to other medium risk sites in the Borough and is entirely within Flood Zone 1.	No	Passed	Applicants should consult Surrey County Council to understand how best to work within and address the priority flood area.

	1										
							Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – HIGH RISK (43 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – DRY DAY (100% of site) WET DAY (100% of site)	The Council has identified all reasonably available sites that have a lower risk of flooding from all sources in the site allocations proposed in the Draft Elmbridge Local Plan. It is not possible to accommodate the proposed development at WOT3 in an area with lower risk, as all lower risk sites have already been identified for other development or are not available.			
WOT4	9-21a High Street, Walton- on-Thames	0.24	1	Mixed use, including 71 homes	More vulnerable	9	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (6.5% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL OF PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND LEVEL (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (7 – 8 events in last 5 years)	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of groundwater flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	

							Reservoir – NO RISK				
WOT5	63-69 High Street, Walton- on-Thames	0.13	1	Mixed use, including 28 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO RISK Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (7 - 8 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of groundwater flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
WOT6	Garages to the rear of 17-27 Field Common Lane, Walton- On-Thames	0.08	2	3 homes	More vulnerable	4	River – MEDIUM RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO RISK Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – HIGH RISK (43 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – DRY DAY (100% of site) WET DAY (100% of site)	Overall, the site is considered to be at medium risk of flooding and is at highest risk relative to other medium risk sites in the Borough. The Council has identified all reasonably available sites that have a lower risk of flooding from all sources in the site allocations proposed in the Draft Elmbridge Local Plan. It is not possible to accommodate the	No	Passed	As the site is affected by Flood Zone 2, a site-specific FRA is required. Self-contained basement dwellings and basement bedrooms are not permitted. All other basements, basement extensions and basement

								proposed development at WOT6 in an area with lower risk, as all lower risk sites have already been identified for other development or are not available.			conversions should be avoided.
WOT7	Walton Park Car Park, Walton Park	0.33	1	17 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO RISK Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – HIGH RISK (43 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – DRY DAY (100% of site) WET DAY (4.5% of site)	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of groundwater and reservoir flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
WOT8	16-18 Sandy Lane	0.11	1 (50%) 2 (50%)	7 homes	More vulnerable	4	River – MEDIUM RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (39.4% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK	Overall, the site is considered to be at medium risk of flooding and is at highest risk relative to other medium risk sites in the Borough. The Council has identified all reasonably available sites that have a lower risk of flooding	No	Passed	As the site is affected by Flood Zone 2, a site-specific FRA is required. Applications should prioritise locating development within the

							(8 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – DRY DAY (100% of site) WET DAY (100% of site)	from all sources in the site allocations proposed in the Draft Elmbridge Local Plan. It is not possible to accommodate the proposed development at WOT8 in an area with lower risk, as all lower risk sites have already been identified for other development or are not available.			portion of the site within Flood Zone 1 as far as possible in the first instance. Then address and mitigate the sources of flood risk on site. Self-contained basement dwellings and basement dwellings and basement bedrooms are not permitted. All other basements, basement extensions and basement conversions should be avoided.
WOT9	Garages adjacent to 1 Tumbling Bay, Walton-On- Thames	0.05	1	2 homes	More vulnerable	9	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO RISK Groundwater – POTENTIAL OF PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND LEVEL (100% of site)	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of groundwater and reservoir flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
							Sewer – VERY LOW RISK				
-------	----------------	------	---	----------	------------	---	---	------------------------	----	--------	--
							(8 events in last 5 years)				
							Poconvoir				
							DDV DAV (4000) of site)				
							DRY DAY (100% OF SILE)				
							WEI DAY (100% of site)				
WOT10	Garages at	0.14	1	4 homes	More	8	River – LOW RISK	Relocation not	No	Passed	
	Sunnyside,				vulnerable			required. Whilst			
	Walton-on-						Climate change – NO	there is a risk of			
	Thames						IMPACT	groundwater and			
								reservoir flooding,			
							Surface water –	overall, the site is			
							LOW RISK (63.2% of site)	located in an area at			
							(30.270 0. 0.10)	low risk of flooding			
							Groundwater –	from all sources			
								now and in the			
							SUPEACE (100% of site)	futuro			
							SURFACE (100 % UI SILE)	lutule.			
							Sewer - VERY LOW RISK				
							(8 events in last 5 years)				
							Reservoir –				
							DRY DAY (100% of site)				
							WET DAY (100% of site)				
WOT11	The Playhouse,	0.21	1	20 homes	More	8	River – LOW RISK	Relocation not	No	Passed	
	Hurst Grove,				vulnerable			required. Whilst			
	Walton-on-						Climate change – NO	there is a risk of			
	Thames						IMPACT	surface water and			
								groundwater			
							Surface water –	flooding, overall, the			
							I OW RISK (41.3% of site)	site is located in an			
							MEDILIM RISK (12% of	area at low risk of			
							site):	flooding from all			
							$ \begin{array}{c} Silver, \\ \Box I \cap \Box D \cap K & (0, 40) \text{of eite} \end{array} $				
							חטח גואג (<i>U.4% טו site)</i>	sources, now and In			
							One we deve to a	the luture.			
							Groundwater –				
							POTENTIAL OF				
							PROPERTIES BELOW				
							GROUND (100% of site)				

							Sewer – VERY LOW RISK				
							(7 events in last 5 years)				
							Reservoir – NO RISK				
WOT12	147 Sidney	0.10	1	8 homes	More	6	SITE IS WITHIN A HIGH	Overall, the site is	No	Passed	Applicants
	Road				vulnerable		PRIORITY AREA	considered to be at			should consult
								medium risk of			Surrey County
							River – LOW RISK	flooding as the site is			Council to
								in high priority			understand
							Climate change – NO	flooding area.			how best to
							IMPACT	However, is at the			work within
								lower end relative to			and address
							Surface water –	other medium risk			the priority
							LOW RISK (33.8% of site)	sites in the Borough			flood area.
								and is entirely within			
							Groundwater –	Flood Zone 1.			
							POTENTIAL AT				
							SURFACE (100% of site)	The Council has			
								identified all			
							Sewer – HIGH RISK	reasonably available			
							(43 events in last 5 years)	sites that have a			
							D	lower risk of flooding			
							Reservoir –	from all sources in			
							DRY DAY (100% of site)	the site allocations			
							WEI DAY (88.7% OF Site)	Finder Local			
								Elmbridge Local			
								Plan. It is not			
								pussible iU			
								proposed			
								development at			
								WOT12 in an area			
								with lower risk as all			
								lower risk sites have			
								already been			
								identified for other			
								development or are			
								not available.			

WOT13	Halfway Car	0.23	1	8 homes	More	8	River – LOW RISK	Relocation not	No	Passed	
	Park. Hersham				vulnerable			required. Whilst	_		
	Road, Walton-						Climate change – NO	there is a risk of			
	on-Thames						IMPACT	surface water.			
								groundwater, sewer			
							Surface water –	and reservoir			
							LOW RISK (64.2% of site):	flooding, overall, the			
							MEDIUM RISK (10% of	site is located in an			
							site):	area at low risk of			
							HIGH RISK (1.4% of site)	flooding from all			
								sources, now and in			
							Groundwater –	the future.			
							POTENTIAL AT				
							SURFACE (100% of site)				
							Sewer - HIGH RISK				
							(7 - 43 events in last 5)				
							(/ 40 evente in last e				
							years				
							Reservoir –				
							DRY DAY (99.7% of site)				
							WET DAY (100% of site)				
WOT14	20 Sandy Lane,	0.10	1 (45%)	7 homes	More	4	River – MEDIUM RISK	Overall, the site is	No	Passed	As the site
	Walton-on-		2 (55%)		vulnerable			considered to be at			affected by
	Thames		. ,				Climate change – NO	medium risk of			Flood Zone 2,
							IMPACT	flooding and is at			a site-specific
								highest risk relative			FRA is
							Surface water –	to other medium risk			required.
							LOW RISK (44.4% of site);	sites in the Borough.			
							MEDIUM RISK (0.3% of				Applications
							site)	The Council has			should
								identified all			prioritise
							Groundwater –	reasonably available			locating
							POTENTIAL AT	sites that have a			development
							SURFACE (100% of site)	lower risk of flooding			within the
							. , , ,	from all sources in			portion of the
							Sewer – VERY LOW RISK	the site allocations			site within
							(8 events in last 5 years)	proposed in the Draft			Flood Zone 1
								Elmbridge Local			as far as

							Reservoir – DRY DAY (100% of site) WET DAY (100% of site)	Plan. It is not possible to accommodate the proposed development at WOT14 in an area with lower risk, as all lower risk sites have already been identified for other development or are not available.			possible in the first instance. Then address and mitigate the sources of flood risk on site. Self-contained basement dwellings and basement bedrooms are not permitted. All other basements, basement extensions and basement conversions should be avoided
WOT15	Bradshaw House Bishops Hill and Walton Centre for the Community, Manor Road, Walton-On- Thames	0.47	1	18 care home units	More vulnerable	9	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (6.2% of site) Groundwater –LIMITED POTENTIAL (1.45% of site) AND POTENTIAL OF PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND LEVEL (99% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (8 events in last 5 years)	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of groundwater flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	

							Reservoir – NO RISK				
WOT16	Elm Grove, 1 Hersham Road, Walton-on- Thames	1.01	1	Mixed use, including 70 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (30.9% of site); MEDIUM RISK (16% of site); HIGH RISK (9.5% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (7 – 8 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water and groundwater flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
WOT17	Rylton House, Hersham Road, Walton-On- Thames	0.23	1	8 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (61.1% of site); MEDIUM RISK (15% of site); HIGH RISK (1.7% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water and groundwater flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	

							(7 events in last 5 years)				
							Reservoir – NO RISK				
WOT18	Cornerstone Church, 38 Station Avenue, Walton- On- Thames	0.17	1	30 homes	More vulnerable	9	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (6.9% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL OF PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND LEVEL (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (7 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of groundwater flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
WOT19	Walton Comrades Club, 7 Franklyn Road, Walton- On-Thames	0.14	1	16 homes	More vulnerable	9	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO RISK Groundwater – POTENTIAL OF PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND LEVEL (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (8 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – DRY DAY (100% of site)	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of groundwater and reservoir flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	

							WET DAY (100% of site)				
WOT20	P G S Court, Halfway Green, Walton-on- Thames	0.67	1	Mixed use, including 23 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO RISK Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (7 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – WET DAY (0.2% of site)	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of groundwater and reservoir flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
WOT21	Fire/Ambulance station, Hersham Road, Walton-On- Thames	0.52	1	Mixed use, including 21 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (36.2% of site); MEDIUM RISK (4% of site); HIGH RISK (0.4% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (7 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – DRY DAY (8.4% of site) WET DAY (15.7% of site)	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water, groundwater and reservoir flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	

WOT22	Land to the rear of 60-70 Sandy Lane, Walton- on-Thames	0.16	1	8 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (60.9% of site); MEDIUM RISK (6% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (8 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – DRY DAY (100% of site) WET DAY (100% of site)	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water, groundwater and reservoir flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
WOT23	Unit Rear of and 12-14 Sandy Lane, Walton-On- Thames	0.11	1 (97%) 2 (3%)	9 homes	More vulnerable	5	River – MEDIUM RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (0.6% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (8 events in last 5 years)	Overall, the site is considered to be at medium risk of flooding and is at the higher end of medium risk sites in the Borough due to the presence of flood zone 2. However, this is only over a very small portion of the site (3%). The Council has identified all	No	Passed	As the site is affected by Flood Zone 2, a site-specific FRA is required. Applications should prioritise locating development within the portion of site within Flood

							Reservoir – DRY DAY (100% of site) WET DAY (100% of site)	reasonably available sites that have a lower risk of flooding from all sources in the site allocations proposed in the Draft Elmbridge Local Plan. It is not possible to accommodate the proposed development at WOT23 in an area with lower risk, as all lower risk sites have already been identified for other development or are not available.			Zone 1as far as possible in the first instance. Then address and mitigate the sources of flood risk on site. Self-contained basement dwellings and basement bedrooms are not permitted. All other basements, basement extensions and basement conversions should be avoided.
WOT24	Garages off Copenhagen Way, Walton- on-Thames	0.14	1	7 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (1.2% of site); HIGH RISK (0.1% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (7 events in last 5 years)	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water and groundwater flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	

							Reservoir – NO RISK				
WOT25	Regnolruf Court, Church Street, Walton- on-Thames	0.23	1	7 homes	More vulnerable More vulnerable	9	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (5.4% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL OF PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND LEVEL (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (8 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of groundwater flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
WOT26	Fernleigh Day Centre, Fernleigh Close, Walton- On-Thames	0.61	1	19 homes and re- provision of existing community use	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (21.9% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (7 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of groundwater flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
WOT27	Garages to the rear of 8 Sidney	0.07	1	8 homes	More vulnerable	9	River – LOW RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst	No	Passed	

	Road, Walton- on- Thames						Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO RISK Groundwater – POTENTIAL OF PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND LEVEL (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (8 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	there is a risk of groundwater flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.			
WOT28	Garages at Collingwood Place, Walton- on-Thames	0.19	1	9 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (16.8% of site); MEDIUM RISK (1% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (7 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required Whilst there is a risk of surface water and groundwater flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
WOT29	Garages at Home Farm Gardens, Walton-on- Thames	0.11	1	6 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT	Relocation not required Whilst there is a risk of surface water groundwater, sewer and reservoir	No	Passed	

							Surface water – LOW RISK (3.8% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – MEDIUM RISK (43 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – DRY DAY (100% of site) WET DAY (10.3% of site)	flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.			
WOT30	Case House, 85-89 High Street, Walton On Thames	0.32	1	28 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (18.8% of site); MEDIUM RISK (2% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (7 - 8 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water and groundwater flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
WOT31	Station Avenue Car Park, Station Avenue, Walton-on- Thames	0.59	1	50 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (20.8% of site);	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water and groundwater flooding, overall, the site is located in an	No	Passed	

							MEDIUM RISK (9% of site); HIGH RISK (3.3% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (7 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.			
WOT32	1 Cleveland Close, Walton- On-Thames	0.10	1	8 homes	More vulnerable	8	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – NO RISK Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (7 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – DRY DAY (0.3% of site) WET DAY (3.4% of site)	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of groundwater and reservoir flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
WOT33	Manor Road Car Park, Manor Road, Walton-on- Thames	0.29	1	31 homes	More vulnerable	9	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (8.7% of site); MEDIUM RISK (6% of site)	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of surface water and groundwater flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all	No	Passed	

							Groundwater –LIMITED POTENTIAL (1% of site) POTENTIAL OF PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND LEVEL (99% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (8 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	sources, now and in the future.			
WOT34	Courtlands & 1- 5 Terrace Road, Walton-on- Thames	0.44	1	63 homes	More vulnerable	9	River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (3.2% of site) Groundwater –LIMITED POTENTIAL (41.48% of site) POTENTIAL OF PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND LEVEL (59% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (8 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK	Relocation not required. Whilst there is a risk of groundwater flooding, overall, the site is located in an area at low risk of flooding from all sources, now and in the future.	No	Passed	
WOT35	The Heath Centre, Rodney Road, Walton- on-Thames	1.20	1	Mixed use, including 36 homes	More vulnerable	6	SITE IS WITHIN A HIGH PRIORITY AREA River – LOW RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water –	Overall, the site is considered to be at medium risk of flooding as the site is in high priority flooding area. However, it is at the lower end relative to other medium risk	No	Passed	Applicants should consult Surrey County Council to understand how best to work within and address

							LOW RISK (10% of site);	sites in the Borough			the priority
							MEDIUM RISK (2.5% of	and is entirely within			flood area.
							site);	Flood Zone 1.			
							HIGH RISK (1.5% of site)				
								The Council has			
							Groundwater –	identified all			
							POTENTIAL AT	reasonably available			
							SURFACE (100% of site)	sites that have a			
								lower risk of flooding			
							Sewer – HIGH RISK	from all sources in			
							(43 events in last 5 years)	the site allocations			
								proposed in the Draft			
							Reservoir –	Elmbridge Local			
							DRY DAY (100% of site)	Plan. It is not			
							WET DAY (19.4% of site)	possible to			
								accommodate the			
								proposed			
								development at			
								WOT35 in an area			
								with lower risk, as all			
								lower risk sites have			
								already been			
								identified for other			
								development or are			
								not available.			
WOT36	Bridge Motor	0.29	1	35 homes	More	8	River – LOW RISK	Relocation not	No	Passed	
	Works, New				vulnerable			required. Whilst			
	Zealand						Climate change – NO	there is a risk of			
	Avenue,						IMPACT	surface water and			
	Walton-On-							groundwater, overall,			
	Ihames						Surface water –	the site is located in			
							LOW RISK (3.1% of site);	an area at low risk of			
							MEDIUM RISK (1% of	flooding from all			
							site);	sources, now and in			
							HIGH RISK (0.6% of site)	the future.			
							Groundwater –				
							POTENTIAL OF				

							PROPERTIES BELOW GROUND (100% of site) Sewer – VERY LOW RISK (7 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – NO RISK				
WOT37	35 to 38 and land north of Mellor Close, Walton-on- Thames	0.20	1 (55%) 2 (45%)	5 homes	More vulnerable	5	River – MEDIUM RISK Climate change – NO IMPACT Surface water – LOW RISK (2.1% of site) Groundwater – POTENTIAL AT SURFACE (100% of site) Sewer – HIGH LOW RISK (43 events in last 5 years) Reservoir – DRY DAY (100% of site) WET DAY (100% of site)	Overall, the site is considered to be at medium risk of flooding but is at the higher end of medium risk sites in the Borough due to the presence of flood zone 2. The Council has identified all reasonably available sites that have a lower risk of flooding from all sources in the site allocations proposed in the Draft Elmbridge Local Plan. It is not possible to accommodate the proposed development at WOT37 in an area with lower risk, as all lower risk sites have already been identified for other development or are not available.	No	Passed	As the site is affected by Flood Zone 2, a site-specific FRA is required. Applications should prioritise locating development within the portion of the site in Flood Zone 1 as far as possible in the first instance. Then address and mitigate the sources of flood risk on site. Self-contained basement dwellings and basement bedrooms are not permitted. All other

					basements,
					basement
					extensions
					and basement
					conversions
					should be
					avoided.

Exception Test

D5: 89-90 Woodfield Road, Thames Ditton

Part one:

The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the site set out in the Council's <u>Land Availability</u> <u>Assessment, 2022</u> demonstrates that the proposed development would represent the re-use of suitable brownfield land that is in a sustainable location for residential development, with established good transport links. There is access to local bus stops 650m from the site, as well as trains from Hinchley Wood station, a state school and health centre 800m from the site.

The proposed development also scores positively against a wide range of the Council's SA objectives, including contributing to increasing the supply of homes in the Borough; development of previously developed land (PDL); and development in a location within 1.5 km of employment opportunities within Thames Ditton local centre.

In addition, any scheme on the site will be required to provide an overall reduction in flood risk to the wider community through the provision of, or financial contribution to, flood risk management infrastructure; restrict surface water runoff rates to greenfield rates as far as possible; demonstrate sustainable approaches to the management of surface water making use of SuDS and incorporate soft landscaping, planting, and permeable surfacing.

Although there are a number of wider benefits of the proposed site allocation identified against the Council's Sustainability Assessment framework objectives. Due to the lack of safe access and egress to the site and advice from the Council's Emergency Planning service that the development may not be able to be made safe, it is considered that the wider sustainability benefits of the proposed development to not outweigh flood risk on the site.

Part two:

Over half (55%) of the site is located in Flood Zone 2, with 45% affected by Flood Zone 3a. Although a sequential approach can be taken to the site layout - locating the development in the lowest risk portion of the site, to ensure development is steered away from areas in flood zone 3a as far as possible, it is unlikely that the allocated development could avoid it entirely and there would be development in an area at high risk of flooding.

Safe access and egress is not likely to be achievable and the Council's emergency planning service has concluded that the proposed development may not be able to be made safe and would place undue burden on local emergency services.

The majority of the site (97%) is at risk of flooding during the River Rythe design event (1% AEP plus a 20% climate change allowance) and it will not be possible to deliver floodplain compensation storage within the site for any increase in built footprint and development will be required not to increase the built footprint. However, the existing

built footprint covers the vast majority of the site and it is considered that an increase in footprint is not needed to deliver the allocated development on this site.

A site-specific FRA, sequential test and exception test will be required to demonstrate that the development will be safe now and, in the future, and in particular must address the need for safe refuge to be designed into the development above the Level 2 SFRA extreme flood event plus an allowance for climate change that is outside the flooded area.

In addition, proposals will be required to demonstrate that all sources of flooding can be addressed and mitigated using the measures detailed in the Level 1 SFRA.

Conclusion

The Council considers that in this case the site is deemed to have failed both parts one and two of the Exception Test due to the lack of safe access/egress and advice from the Council's Emergency Planning service.

ESH15: River Mole Business Park, Mill Road, Esher

Part one:

The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the site set out in the Council's <u>Land Availability</u> <u>Assessment, 2022</u> demonstrates that the proposed development would represent the re-use of suitable brownfield land that is in a sustainable and suitable location for residential development, with established good transport links. There is access to local bus stops, a state school and health centre 800m from the site.

The proposed development also scores positively against a wide range of the Council's SA objectives, including contributing to increasing the supply of homes in the Borough; development of PDL; and development within 1.5 km of employment opportunities within Esher district centre that outweigh the negative impact of flood risk on the site.

In addition, any scheme on the site will be required to provide an overall reduction in flood risk to the wider community through the provision of, or financial contribution to, flood risk management infrastructure; restrict surface water runoff rates to greenfield rates as far as possible; demonstrate sustainable approaches to the management of surface water making use of SuDS and incorporate soft landscaping, planting, and permeable surfacing.

Given the wider benefits of the proposed site allocation identified against the Council's Sustainability Assessment framework objectives and the improvements to flood risk that will be required, it is considered that the wider sustainability benefits of the proposed development outweigh flood risk on the site.

Part two:

The majority of the site (97.4%) is located within Flood Zone 1, with only 2.2%, 0.3% and 0.1% affected by Flood Zone 2, 3a and 3b respectively. A sequential approach

can be taken to the site layout – prioritising locating the development in the portion of site within Flood Zone 1 avoiding Flood Zone 3b, 3a entirely and likely Flood Zone 2 as well.

In any case development will typically not be permitted within Flood Zone 3b. Development will only be considered where the vulnerability of the development is not increased (and where possible reduced) and the number of occupants does not increase.

The boundary of site is within 10 m of the River Mole. Development will not be permitted within a 10 m buffer zone of the river.

Safe access/egress is likely to be achievable via Mill Road. However, safe refuge will be required to be designed into the development above the Level 2 SFRA extreme flood event plus an allowance for climate change that is outside the flooded area.

A site-specific FRA, sequential test and exception test will be required to demonstrate that the development will be safe now and, in the future. In addition, proposals will be required to demonstrate that all sources of flooding can be addressed and mitigated using the measures detailed in the Level 1 SFRA.

Conclusion

The Council considers that if the considerations detailed above are addressed the development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and could contribute to reducing flood risk overall. As such, the site is deemed to have passed both part one and two of the Exception Test.

MOL19: 5 Matham Road, East Molesey

Part one:

The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the site set out in the Council's <u>Land Availability</u> <u>Assessment, 2022</u> demonstrates that the proposed development would represent the re-use of suitable brownfield land that is in a sustainable and suitable location for residential development, with established good transport links. There is access to public transport and a full range of local services in East Molesey district centre 120m from the site.

The proposed development also scores positively against a wide range of the Council's SA objectives, including contributing to increasing the supply of homes in the Borough and development of PDL that outweigh the negative impact of flood risk on the site. As such, it is considered that the wider sustainability benefits of the proposed development outweigh flood risk on the site.

In addition, any scheme on the site will be required to provide an overall reduction in flood risk to the wider community through the provision of, or financial contribution to, flood risk management infrastructure; restrict surface water runoff rates to greenfield rates as far as possible; demonstrate sustainable approaches to the management of

surface water making use of SuDS and incorporate soft landscaping, planting, and permeable surfacing.

Given the wider benefits of the proposed site allocation identified against the Council's Sustainability Assessment framework objectives and the improvements to flood risk that will be required, it is considered that the wider sustainability benefits of the proposed development outweigh flood risk on the site.

Part two:

The majority of the site is located within Flood Zone 1 (50.2%) and 2 (48.6%), with only 0.5% and 0.7% affected by Flood Zone 3a and 3b respectively. A sequential approach can be taken to the site layout – prioritising locating the development in the portion of site within Flood Zone 1, then Flood Zone 2 and avoid Flood Zone 3a and 3b entirely.

In any case development will typically not be permitted within Flood Zone 3b. Development will only be considered where the vulnerability of the development is not increased (and where possible reduced) and the number of occupants does not increase.

The site is also at low risk of surface water flooding (this only affected 0.5% of the site), low risk of sewer flooding (10 recorded events in the last 5 years), and there is potential for groundwater flooding at and below the surface with 47% and 48% of the site affected respectively. Again, a sequential approach can be taken to the site layout – prioritising locating the development in the portion of site not affected by these other sources of flooding.

Safe access/egress is likely to be achievable to the west of the site. However, access to the site lies within the 1 in 100 plus 35% climate change model extent in the Thames (Datchet to Teddington) 2023 model and safe refuge will be required to be designed into the development above the Level 2 SFRA extreme flood event plus an allowance for climate change that is outside the flooded area.

A site-specific FRA, sequential test and exception test will be required to demonstrate that the development will be safe now and, in the future. In addition, proposals will be required to demonstrate that all sources of flooding can be addressed and mitigated using the measures detailed in the Level 1 SFRA.

Conclusion

The Council considers that if the considerations detailed above are addressed the development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and could contribute to reducing flood risk overall. As such, the site is deemed to have passed both part one and two of the Exception Test.

WEY19: Shell Petrol Filling Station, 95 Brooklands Road, Weybridge

Part one:

The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the site set out in the Council's <u>Land Availability</u> <u>Assessment, 2022</u> demonstrates that the proposed development would represent the re-use of suitable brownfield land that is in a sustainable and suitable location for residential development, with established good transport links, with access to local bus stops in close proximity.

The proposed development also scores positively against a wide range of the Council's SA objectives, including contributing to increasing the supply of homes in the Borough; development of PDL; and development within 1 km of a range of employment opportunities within a major service centre and strategic employment land at Brooklands that outweigh the negative impact of flood risk on the site. As such, it is considered that the wider sustainability benefits of the proposed development outweigh flood risk on the site.

In addition, any scheme on the site will be required to provide an overall reduction in flood risk to the wider community through the provision of, or financial contribution to, flood risk management infrastructure; restrict surface water runoff rates to greenfield rates as far as possible; demonstrate sustainable approaches to the management of surface water making use of SuDS and incorporate soft landscaping, planting, and permeable surfacing.

Given the wider benefits of the proposed site allocation identified against the Council's Sustainability Assessment framework objectives and the improvements to flood risk that will be required, it is considered that the wider sustainability benefits of the proposed development outweigh flood risk on the site.

Part two:

The majority of the site (89.3%) is located within Flood Zone 1, with only 8.3% and 2.4% affected by Flood Zone 2 and 3a respectively. A sequential approach can be taken to the site layout – prioritising locating the development in the portion of site within Flood Zone 1, avoiding Flood Zone 3a entirely and likely Flood Zone 2 as well.

The site is also at risk of surface water flooding, with 0.2% of the site at low risk, 0.1% of the site at medium risk and 6.6% of the site at high risk, medium sewer flooding (28 recorded events in the last 5 years), and there is limited potential for groundwater flooding over 100% of the site. Again, a sequential approach can be taken to the site layout – prioritising locating the development in the portion of site not affected by these other sources of flooding. Again, a sequential approach can be taken to the site layout – prioritising locating the development in the portion of site not affected by these other sources of flooding, in particular surface water flooding.

Safe access/egress is likely to be achievable to the east of the site via Brooklands Road. However, safe refuge will be required to be designed into the development above the Level 2 SFRA extreme flood event plus an allowance for climate change that is outside the flooded area.

A site-specific FRA, sequential test and exception test will be required to demonstrate that the development will be safe now and, in the future. In addition, proposals will be

required to demonstrate that all sources of flooding can be addressed and mitigated using the measures detailed in the Level 1 SFRA.

Conclusion

The Council considers that if the considerations detailed above are addressed the development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and could contribute to reducing flood risk overall. As such, the site is deemed to have passed both part one and two of the Exception Test.

5. Conclusion

- 5.1 This Sequential Test report demonstrates how the 199 sites allocated in the Draft Elmbridge Local Plan have been assessed following the sequential, riskbased approach to ensure that development is steered towards areas at lowest risk of flooding, taking all sources of flood risk and climate change into account in accordance with national policy and guidance set out in the NPPF and PPG.
- 5.2 Overall, 193 of the 199 site allocations proposed in the Local Plan were found to pass the Sequential and Exception tests, with just 6 sites failing the tests.
- 5.3 162 of the 199 sites are located in Flood Zone 1 and were found to be at low risk of flooding from all sources of flooding i.e. surface water flooding, groundwater flooding, sewer flooding and reservoir failure, including when climate change allowances are taken into account, now and in the future. As such, it is considered that these sites are suitable for development and have passed the Sequential Test.
- 5.4 The remaining thirty-seven sites are located in, or affected by Flood Zone 2, 3a or 3b and were found to be at medium or high risk of flooding. Of these, twenty-seven were affected by Flood Zone 2, three by Zone 3a and seven by Zone 3b. As set out in the tables above, the Council has exhausted its supply of sites at lower risk of flooding before looking to these relatively higher risk sites in accordance with the Sequential approach and there are no known alternative, reasonably available sites at lower risk of flooding that accord with its proposed spatial strategy to which these could be relocated.
- 5.5 The seven sites affected by Flood Zone 3b only intersect the functional floodplain in small areas, ranging from 0.1% 7.9% of the sites. As such, a sequential approach to the site layout steering development away from land within Flood Zone 3b, will allow these to continue to be allocated and they are therefore still considered to be suitable for development.
- 5.6 Thirty three of the thirty-seven sites at medium or high risk of flooding, those affected by Flood Zone 2 and those affected by Zone 3a but allocated for less vulnerable development, are considered to be suitable development and did not require the Exception Test. As such these sites are deemed to have passed the Sequential Test.
- 5.7 Four sites affected by Flood Zone 3a and/or 3b were deemed to require the Exception Test D5, ESH15, MOL19, WEY19. The supporting information provided in the Exception Test demonstrates that ESH15, MOL19 and WEY19 satisfy both parts of the Exception Test. As such, these allocations are also

considered to be suitable development that pass the Sequential Test. However, D5 does not, and it therefore fails the Sequential Test.

- 5.8 The Level 2 SFRA found that 11 sites were, or may not be, able to accommodate flood compensation storage that would be needed to enable an increase in built footprint. The 11 sites affected by this issue are listed under paragraph 3.2.5 of the SFRA. Sites D16, MOL4, MOL10, MOL14 and MOL16 fail the Sequential Test as they are existing car parks and would not be able to accommodate the increase in built footprint required to deliver the site allocations proposed in the Local Plan. However, sites D11, MOL2, WEY10, WEY26 and WEY35 pass the Sequential Test as they are already covered entirely or significantly by existing built footprint and an increase in built footprint would not be required to deliver the site allocation proposed in the Local Plan. The Council will require a site-specific flood risk assessment to be submitted that demonstrates the development on these sites will be safe now and in the future.
- 5.9 The Level 2 SFRA also found that safe access and/or egress may not be achievable on 10 of the site allocations proposed in the Local Plan. This impacts a number of the same sites affected by the increase in built footprint issue D5, D11, MOL2, MOL4, MOL10, MOL14, MOL15, MOL16, WEY10 and WEY35. Safe refuge located outside of the site will be required to be designed into the development of these sites as outlined in the Level 2 SFRA.
- 5.10 MOL4, MOL10, MOL14 and MOL16 already failed the Sequential Test as they cannot accommodate an increase in built footprint. These were not considered further. The Council consulted its Emergency Planning service to determine if the remaining sites affected by the safe access/egress issue could be made safe and that there was capacity within the Council's emergency planning procedures and resources to accommodate the development. Through this process it was found that emergency planning services could accommodate the proposed development at D11, MOL2, MOL15, WEY10 and WEY35 and were satisfied that these could be made safe. The Council will again require a site-specific flood risk assessment to be submitted on the sites that demonstrates the development will be safe now and in the future.
- 5.11 Advice from Emergency Planning services found that it may not be achievable to ensure the site allocation proposed at D5 can be made safe and it would place undue burden on local emergency services. It has therefore failed the Sequential and Exception Test.
- 5.12 Although this assessment concludes that 193 of the 199 Draft Elmbridge Local Plan site allocations pass the Sequential Test, a site-specific FRA, Sequential and Exception Test, as well as other assessments of flood risk may be required

at application stage. This should assess all forms of flood risk, including the impact of climate change need. Where this is required, these assessments should demonstrate that the proposed development will be safe for its lifetime, without increasing flood risk elsewhere and where possible will reduce flood risk overall.

5.13 The information presented in this assessment does not preclude the potential for mitigation requirements that require careful consideration at the planning application stage to integrate into development proposals, nor does it guarantee that solutions can be found on individual sites that can be considered safe in accordance with part 2 of the Exception Test.