

Appendix A Sequential Test Tables, by Settlement

Brookmans Park

Site ref	Site name	% land within Flood Zone ¹				Proposed use	Flood Risk Vulnerability of proposed use	Flood Zone compatibility				Can Development be Allocated in a Lower Flood Risk Zone?	High risk of flooding from other sources?	Proposed Use Acceptable?	Sequential Test Passed?
		1	2	3a	3b			1	2	3a	3b				
BrP1	Upper Bell Lane Farm, Bell Bar	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No	Yes	Yes
BrP4	Land west of Brookmans Park	94.8%	5.2%	4.7%	4.4%	Dwelling houses; educational establishments	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	The site is predominantly in Flood Zone 1. Development can be restricted to Flood Zone 1, and if necessary Flood 1 and Zone 2, following a sequential approach to layout. As such, there is no need to consider alternative sites in Flood Zone 1.	No Notes: Surface water flow route runs north-south in the eastern area of the site. Ponding alongside Bradmore Lane and flows north into the adjacent field and onwards to Station Road. A sequential approach to layout and the use of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) could be used to suitably manage surface water flood risk to, within and from the site.	Yes (in Flood Zone 1 and 2)	Yes
BrP6	Land at Bluebridge Road	95.1%	4.9%	3.2%	2.5%	Dwelling houses; educational establishments	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	The site is predominantly in Flood Zone 1. Development can be restricted to Flood Zone 1, and if necessary Flood 1 and Zone 2, following a sequential approach to layout. As such, there is no need to consider alternative sites in Flood Zone 1.	No Notes: Surface water flood risk affects the northern area of the site, largely coinciding with areas of fluvial flood risk. A sequential approach to layout and the use of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) could be used to suitably manage surface water flood risk to, within and from the site.	Yes (in Flood Zone 1 and 2)	Yes
BrP12	Peplins Wood (Scenario 1)	96%	4%	3.5%	3.1%	Dwelling houses; educational establishments; care home	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	The site is predominantly in Flood Zone 1. Development can be restricted to Flood Zone 1, and if necessary Flood 1 and Zone 2, following a sequential approach to layout. As such, there is no need to consider alternative sites in Flood Zone 1.	No Notes: Surface water flood risk largely coincides with indicated areas of fluvial flood risk. A sequential approach to layout and the use of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) could be used to suitably manage surface water flood risk to, within and from the site.	Yes (in Flood Zone 1 and 2)	Yes
BrP13	West of Golf Club Road	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No	Yes	Yes
BrP14	East of Golf Club Road	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No	Yes	Yes

¹ % may not total 100% due to overlap of Flood Zone 2 and 3a/3b

Cuffley

Site ref	Site name	% land within Flood Zone ²				Proposed use	Flood Risk Vulnerability of proposed use	Flood Zone compatibility				Can Development be Allocated in a Lower Flood Risk Zone?	High risk of flooding from other sources?	Proposed Use Acceptable?	Sequential Test Passed?
		1	2	3a	3b			1	2	3a	3b				
No02	36 The Ridgeway	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No An ordinary watercourse runs through the site which may present a fluvial flood risk; however, it was not possible to model it in the SFRA. A site-specific FRA would be required to assess its fluvial flood risk, however, a sequential approach to layout that restricts development to Flood Zone 1 within the site is likely to be feasible.	Yes	Yes, although a site-specific FRA would be required to assess the risk posed from the Ordinary Watercourse
No10	Land west of St Martin de Porres Catholic Church	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No	Yes	Yes
Cuf1	The Meadway	99.9%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	The site is predominantly in Flood Zone 1. Development can be restricted to Flood Zone 1, and if necessary Flood 1 and Zone 2, following a sequential approach to layout. As such, there is no need to consider alternative sites in Flood Zone 1.	No	Yes (in Flood Zone 1 and 2)	Yes
Cuf4	Cuffley Hills Farm	99.5%	0.5%	0.4%	0.3%	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	The site is predominantly in Flood Zone 1. Development can be restricted to Flood Zone 1, and if necessary Flood 1 and Zone 2, following a sequential approach to layout. As such, there is no need to consider alternative sites in Flood Zone 1.	No	Yes (in Flood Zone 1 and 2)	Yes
Cuf5	Land at Northaw Road East	94.8%	5.2%	4.7%	3.8%	Dwelling houses; educational establishments	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	The site is predominantly in Flood Zone 1. Development can be restricted to Flood Zone 1, and if necessary Flood 1 and Zone 2, following a sequential approach to layout. As such, there is no need to consider alternative sites in Flood Zone 1.	No Notes: Surface water flow route runs east-west across part of the site. A sequential approach to layout and the use of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) could be used to suitably manage surface water flood risk to, within and from the site.	Yes (in Flood Zone 1 and 2)	Yes
Cuf6	East of Northaw Road East	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No Notes: Surface water flow route runs north-south in the centre of the site. A sequential approach to layout and the use of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) could be used to suitably manage surface water flood risk to, within and from the site.	Yes	Yes

² % may not total 100% due to overlap of Flood Zone 2 and 3a/3b

Cuf7	Wells Farm	84.1%	15.9%	6.4%	2.7%	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	The site is predominantly in Flood Zone 1. Development can be restricted to Flood Zone 1, and if necessary Flood 1 and Zone 2, following a sequential approach to layout. As such, there is no need to consider alternative sites in Flood Zone 1.	No Notes: Surface water flow route and ponding also coincides with areas of fluvial flood risk within the site. A sequential approach to layout and the use of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) could be used to suitably manage surface water flood risk to, within and from the site.	Yes (in Flood Zone 1 and 2)	Yes
Cuf10	Land adjacent to 1 The Ridgeway	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No Notes: Surface water flood risk largely coincides with indicated areas of fluvial flood risk. A sequential approach to layout and the use of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) could be used to suitably manage surface water flood risk to, within and from the site.	Yes (in Flood Zone 1 and 2)	Yes
Cuf12	Land at Northaw Road East (reduced)	98%	2%	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	The site is predominantly in Flood Zone 1. Development can be restricted to Flood Zone 1, and if necessary Flood 1 and Zone 2, following a sequential approach to layout. As such, there is no need to consider alternative sites in Flood Zone 1.	No	Yes (in Flood Zone 1 and 2)	Yes

Digswell

No sites pass Stage 1 and 2 of the HELAA. Therefore, there no sites that could be potentially allocated in the Local Plan.

Hatfield

Site ref	Site name	% land within Flood Zone ³				Proposed use	Vulnerability classification	Flood Zone compatibility				Can Development be Allocated in a Lower Flood Risk Zone?	High risk of flooding from other sources?	Proposed Use Acceptable?	Sequential Test Passed?
		1	2	3a	3b			1	2	3a	3b				
HC94	Hatfield Fire Station	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No An ordinary watercourse runs through the site which may present a fluvial flood risk; however, it was not possible to model it in the SFRA. A site-specific FRA would be required to assess its fluvial flood risk, however, a sequential approach to layout that restricts development to Flood Zone 1 within the site is likely to be feasible.	Yes	Yes, although a site-specific FRA would be required to assess the risk posed from the Ordinary Watercourse
HC100B	1-9 Town Centre	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No	Yes	Yes
HE23	L Khan Manufacturing, Wellfield Road	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No	Yes	Yes
HE80	Land at Onslow St Audreys School	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No	Yes	Yes
HS31	Garages at Hollyfields	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No	Yes	Yes
HS91 (HS19 in the SFRA)	Land to the rear of Filbert Close	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No	Yes	Yes
HW100	High View	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No	Yes	Yes
Hat1/13	Stanboroughbury Farm	100%	-	-	-	Gypsy and Traveller pitches	Highly vulnerable	Yes	ET	No	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No. An ordinary watercourse is present in the centre of the site which may present fluvial flood risk; however, it was not possible to model it in the SFRA. A sequential approach to layout that restricts development to Flood Zone 1 (or flood zones 1 and 2 for dwelling houses and B1 employment) within the site is feasible.	Yes	Yes, although a site-specific FRA would be required to assess the risk posed from the Ordinary Watercourse
						Dwelling houses; educational establishments	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1			
						B1 employment	Less vulnerable	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1			

³ % may not total 100% due to overlap of Flood Zone 2 and 3a/3b

Hat2	Land west of Hatfield	92.5%	7.5%	4.1%	0.5%	Dwelling houses; educational establishments	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	The site is predominantly in Flood Zone 1. Development can be restricted to Flood Zone 1, and if necessary Flood 1 and Zone 2, following a sequential approach to layout. As such, there is no need to consider alternative sites in Flood Zone 1.	No	Yes (in Flood Zone 1 and 2)	Yes
Hat5	Land north of Roehyde	93.8%	6.2%	2.1%	0%	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	The site is predominantly in Flood Zone 1. Development can be restricted to Flood Zone 1, and if necessary Flood 1 and Zone 2, following a sequential approach to layout. As such, there is no need to consider alternative sites in Flood Zone 1.	No	Yes (in Flood Zone 1 and 2)	Yes
Ha11	Land at Southway	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No	Yes	Yes
						B1-B8 employment	Less vulnerable	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1			
Hat19	Land west of Ellenbrook	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No	Yes	Yes

Little Heath

Site ref	Site name	% land within Flood Zone ⁴				Proposed use	Flood Risk Vulnerability of proposed use	Flood Zone compatibility				Can Development be Allocated in a Lower Flood Risk Zone?	High risk of flooding from other sources?	Proposed Use Acceptable?	Sequential Test Passed?
		1	2	3a	3b			1	2	3a	3b				
BrP7	Land south of Hawkshead Road	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No Notes: Surface water flow route runs west-east in the western area of the site toward Potters Bar Brook. A sequential approach to layout and the use of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) could be used to suitably manage surface water flood risk to, within and from the site.	Yes	Yes
LHe1	Land north of Hawkshead Road	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No	Yes	Yes

⁴ % may not total 100% due to overlap of Flood Zone 2 and 3a/3b

Oaklands and Mardley Heath

Site ref	Site name	% land within Flood Zone ⁵				Proposed use	Flood Risk Vulnerability of proposed use	Flood Zone compatibility				Can Development be Allocated in a Lower Flood Risk Zone?	High risk of flooding from other sources?	Proposed Use Acceptable?	Sequential Test Passed?
		1	2	3a	3b			1	2	3a	3b				
OMH5	2a-12 Great North Road	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No	Yes	Yes
OMH7	22 The Avenue	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No	Yes	Yes
OMH8	2 Great North Road	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No	Yes	Yes
GTLAA04	Four Oaks, Great North Road	100%	-	-	-	Gypsy and Traveller pitches	Highly vulnerable	Yes	ET	No	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No	Yes	Yes

⁵ % may not total 100% due to overlap of Flood Zone 2 and 3a/3b

Welham Green

Site ref	Site name	% land within Flood Zone ⁶				Proposed use	Flood Risk Vulnerability of proposed use	Flood Zone compatibility				Can Development be Allocated in a Lower Flood Risk Zone?	High risk of flooding from other sources?	Proposed Use Acceptable?	Sequential Test Passed?
		1	2	3a	3b			1	2	3a	3b				
WeG1	Units1-3, Welham Manor	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No	Yes	Yes
WeG3	South of Welham Manor	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No	Yes	Yes
WeG4a	Land at Marshmoor	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No	Yes	Yes
WeG4b	Land at Marshmoor	94.9%	5.1%	5%	5%	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	The site is predominantly in Flood Zone 1. Development can be restricted to Flood Zone 1, and if necessary Flood 1 and Zone 2, following a sequential approach to layout. As such, there is no need to consider alternative sites in Flood Zone 1.	Yes. The southern area of the site is subject to significant surface water flood risk, with approximately 10% of the site affected by the 1 in 100 year extent. This area is proposed for B1 employment uses (a less vulnerable classification). A sequential approach to layout and the use of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) could be used to suitably manage surface water flood risk to, within and from the site.	Yes (in Flood Zone 1 and 2)	Yes
						B1 employment	Less vulnerable	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	The site is predominantly in Flood Zone 1. Development can be restricted to Flood Zone 1, and if necessary Flood 1 and Zone 2, following a sequential approach to layout. As such, there is no need to consider alternative sites in Flood Zone 1.			
WeG6	Skimpans Farm, Bulls Lane	87.8%	12.2%	9.9%	6.9%	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	The site is predominantly in Flood Zone 1. Development can be restricted to Flood Zone 1, and if necessary Flood 1 and Zone 2, following a sequential approach to layout. As such, there is no need to consider alternative sites in Flood Zone 1.	No. Notes: Surface water flood risk largely coincides with areas of fluvial flood risk. A sequential approach to layout and the use of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) could be used to suitably manage surface water flood risk to, within and from the site.	Yes (in Flood Zone 1 and 2)	Yes
WeG10	Dixons Hill Road	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No. Notes: Surface water ponds along the eastern boundary. A sequential approach to layout and the use of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) could be used to suitably manage surface water flood risk to, within and from the site.	Yes	Yes
WeG12	Land at Pooleys Lane	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No	Yes	Yes
WeG15	Potterells Farm	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No	Yes	Yes

⁶ % may not total 100% due to overlap of Flood Zone 2 and 3a/3b

GTLAA01	Foxes Lane	100%	-	-	-	Gypsy and Traveller pitches	Highly vulnerable	Yes	ET	No	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	<p>No</p> <p>An Ordinary Watercourse is adjacent to the site which may present a fluvial flood risk.</p> <p>Site is subject to surface water flooding. A sequential approach to layout and the use of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) could be used to suitably manage surface water flood risk to, within and from the site, taking account of the greater vulnerability of the proposed use.</p>	Yes	<p>Yes, although a site-specific FRA would be required to assess the risk posed from the Ordinary Watercourse and surface water flood risk</p>
---------	------------	------	---	---	---	-----------------------------	-------------------	-----	----	----	----	------------------------------------	--	-----	--

Welwyn

Site ref	Site name	% land within Flood Zone ⁷				Proposed use	Flood Risk Vulnerability of proposed use	Flood Zone compatibility				Can Development be Allocated in a Lower Flood Risk Zone?	High risk of flooding from other sources?	Proposed Use Acceptable?	Sequential Test Passed?
		1	2	3a	3b			1	2	3a	3b				
Wel1	Land at Kimpton Road	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No Notes: Planned decommissioning of pumping station and cessation of abstraction in 2018 may affect hydrology in the area	Yes	Yes
Wel2	Land adjoining Welwyn Cemetery	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No Notes: Planned decommissioning of pumping station and cessation of abstraction in 2018 may affect hydrology in the area	Yes	Yes
Wel3	School Lane	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No	Yes	Yes
Wel4	Sandyhurst, The Bypass	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No	Yes	Yes
Wel11	The Vineyards	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No	Yes	Yes
Wel15	Fulling Mill Lane (south)	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No Notes: Planned decommissioning of pumping station and cessation of abstraction in 2018 may affect hydrology in the area	Yes	Yes

⁷ % may not total 100% due to overlap of Flood Zone 2 and 3a/3b

Welwyn Garden City

Site ref	Site name	% land within Flood Zone ⁸				Proposed use	Vulnerability classification	Flood Zone compatibility				Can Development be Allocated in a Lower Flood Risk Zone?	High risk of flooding from other sources?	Proposed Use Acceptable?	Sequential Test Passed?
		1	2	3a	3b			1	2	3a	3b				
Hal02	Land at Waterside	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No	Yes	Yes
Hal03	Ratcliff Tail Lift Site	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No	Yes	Yes
Han40	Town Centre North	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No	Yes	Yes
Han91	Land at Gosling Sports Park	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No	Yes	Yes
Hol19	Hyde Valley House	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No	Yes	Yes
How92	Woodside Centre, The Commons	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No	Yes	Yes
Pan01b	Land at Bericot Way (North)	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No	Yes	Yes
Pea02b	Broadwater Road (North)	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses; hotel; care home;	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No	Yes	Yes
						B1 employment; retail; fitness/leisure	Less vulnerable	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1			
Pea02c	Broadwater Road (West)	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No	Yes	Yes
						B1 employment	Less vulnerable	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1			
Pea08	80 Bridge Road East	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No	Yes	Yes
Pea24	St Michael's House, Holwell Road	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No	Yes	Yes
WGC1	Creswick	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	Yes: An ordinary watercourse runs through the site which may present a fluvial flood risk; however, it was not possible to model it in the SFRA.	Yes	Yes, although a site-specific FRA would be required to assess the risk posed from the Ordinary Watercourse
WGC4/7	Panshanger	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses; educational establishments	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No	Yes	Yes
WGC5	Land south east of Welwyn Garden City	98.1%	1.9%	1.6%	1.3%	Gypsy and Traveller Pitches	Highly vulnerable	Yes	ET	No	No	The site is predominantly in Flood Zone 1. Development can be restricted to Flood Zone 1 following a sequential approach to layout. As such, there is no need to consider alternative sites in Flood Zone 1.	No	Yes	Yes
						Dwelling houses; educational establishments	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	The site is predominantly in Flood Zone 1. Development can be restricted to Flood Zone 1, and if necessary Flood 1 and Zone 2, following a sequential approach to layout. As such, there is no need to consider alternative sites in Flood Zone 1.			

⁸ % may not total 100% due to overlap of Flood Zone 2 and 3a/3b

Woolmer Green

Site ref	Site name	% land within Flood Zone ⁹				Proposed use	Vulnerability classification	Flood Zone compatibility				Can Development be Allocated in a Lower Flood Risk Zone?	High risk of flooding from other sources?	Proposed Use Acceptable?	Sequential Test Passed?
		1	2	3a	3b			1	2	3a	3b				
WGr1	East of Great North Road	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No Notes: Surface water flow route runs north-south in the eastern area of the site, and ponds in the southern corner of the site. A sequential approach to layout and the use of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) could be used to suitably manage surface water flood risk to, within and from the site.	Yes	Yes
WGr2	South of Monread Lodge	100%	-	-	-	B1 employment	Less vulnerable	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No Notes: Surface water ponds in the centre of the site. The layout, design and the use of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) could be used to suitably manage surface water flood risk to, within and from the site.	Yes	Yes
WGr3	52 London Road	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No	Yes	Yes

⁹ % may not total 100% due to overlap of Flood Zone 2 and 3a/3b

Rural North

Site ref	Site name	% land within Flood Zone ¹⁰				Proposed use	Vulnerability classification	Flood Zone compatibility				Can Development be Allocated in a Lower Flood Risk Zone?	High risk of flooding from other sources?	Proposed Use Acceptable?	Sequential Test Passed?
		1	2	3a	3b			1	2	3a	3b				
Hat15	Symondshyde Farm	100%	-	-	-	Dwelling houses; educational establishments	More vulnerable	Yes	Yes	ET	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No Notes: Surface water flow route runs north-south through the eastern area of the site. A sequential approach to layout and the use of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) could be used to suitably manage surface water flood risk to, within and from the site.	Yes	Yes
GTLAA09	Land opposite Hatfield Avenue, Coopers Green Lane	100%	-	-	-	Gypsy and Traveller pitches	Highly vulnerable	Yes	ET	No	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	No	Yes	Yes

¹⁰ % may not total 100% due to overlap of Flood Zone 2 and 3a/3b

Rural South

Site ref	Site name	% land within Flood Zone ¹¹				Proposed use	Vulnerability classification	Flood Zone compatibility				Can Development be Allocated in a Lower Flood Risk Zone?	High risk of flooding from other sources?	Proposed Use Acceptable?	Sequential Test Passed?
		1	2	3a	3b			1	2	3a	3b				
GTLAA08	Land north of Barbraville, Hertford Road	100%	-	-	-	Gypsy and Traveller pitches	Highly vulnerable	Yes	ET	No	No	Entire site is within Flood Zone 1	<p>Yes: An ordinary watercourse runs through the site which may present a fluvial flood risk; however, this has not been modelled via the SFRA</p> <p>Surface water ponds along the western boundary of the site the site. A sequential approach to layout and the use of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) could be used to suitably manage surface water flood risk to, within and from the site, taking account of the greater vulnerability of the proposed use.</p>	Yes	Yes, although a site-specific FRA would be required to assess the risk posed from the Ordinary Watercourse and surface water flood risk

¹¹ % may not total 100% due to overlap of Flood Zone 2 and 3a/3b