

Source of Flooding	High Risk	Medium Risk	Low Risk	Present Day	
Fluvial	Greater than 1 in 100 year (FZ3)	Between 1 in 100 and 1 in 1000 year (FZ2)	Less than 1 in 1000 year	EA's Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3 use a risk-based approach. Functional Floodplain (FZ3b) is displayed using the best available model data: 2019 Sherbourne ISIS TUFLOW model Where model data is not available, Fluvial Floodzone 3a is used as a Proxy for FZ3b.	EA's Flood Zones 1 Climate change upl screening process. shown to be at risk whether the site is following a Level 2 larger numbers of s Climate Change up - where climate ch FZ3b, the 1% AEP - where climate ch FZ3a the 0.1% AEP - No climate change into the future and noting the commer Level 2 assessment
Coastal	Greater than 1 in 200 year (FZ3)	Between 1 in 200 and 1 in 1000 year (FZ2)	Less than 1 in 1000 year	Not relevant for Warwickshire and Coventry Authorities.	Not relevant for Wa
Surface Water	Greater than 1 in 1000 year (Zone A)		Less than 1 in 1000 year (Zone B)	Different assumptions are used to derive surface water risk than is the case for fluvial and tidal flood zones. The RoFSW dataset potentially does not provide the confidence or certainty required to define areas of high medium and low flood risk that are comparable with the risk zones for river and sea flooding. Therefore, a precautionary approach should be taken so development is located in areas of low flood risk. This approach will require that sites where proposed development is located in a high risk surface water zone are assessed in more detail in the Level 2 SFRA.	Different assumption is the case for fluvia potentially does not to define areas of h comparable with th Therefore, a precau development is loca will require that situ a high risk surface Level 2 SFRA. Climate Change da scenarios 3.3% AEI CC+25%; and 1% Surface water flooc assessed using the AEP dataset of the Climate Change.

Future

, 2 and 3 use a risk-based approach.

lifts should be assessed as part of the Where significant parts of sites area's are k in the 1000 year (0.1%AEP), a review of sequentially appropriate may be required assessment. This may result in slightly sites requiring assessment at Level 2.

JBA

blifts use the best available data: hange datasets are not avaiable to define event should be used.

hange datasets are not available to define P event should be used.

ge datasets are available to define Low Risk the current 0.1% AEP event should be used, nt above about re-screening following any t.

arwickhire and Coventry Authorities.

ons are used to derive surface water risk than ial and tidal flood zones. The RoFSW dataset of provide the confidence or certainty required high medium and low flood risk that are he risk zones for river and sea flooding. utionary approach should be taken so cated in areas of low flood risk. This approach tes where proposed development is located in water zone are assessed in more detail in the

Atasets exist for the following events and P CC+25%; 3.3% AEP CC+35%; 1% AEP AEP CC+40%.

d risk into the future should be sequentially e maximum extent of either the existing 0.1% 1% AEP extent inlcuding 40% uplift for



Source of Flooding	High Risk	Medium Risk	Low Risk	Present Day	
Groundwater	All sites assumed to be potentially susceptible to grondwater flooding			Datasets potentially do not have the confidence or certainty required to provide mapping that enables a comparative assessment to be made of the risk of flooding of land from groundwater. Therefore, a precautionary approach should be taken and all potential allocation sites will be assessed for groundwater flood risk in the Level 2 SFRA and the implications for sequential selection of alternative locations considered at this stage.	Datasets potentially required to provide assessment to be m groundwater. Then taken and all poten groundwater flood n for sequential select this stage.
Sewer	All sites assumed to be at high risk of sewer flooding. Additional information required via the Level 2 assessment			Datasets potentially do not have the confidence or certainty required to provide mapping that enables a comparative assessment to be made of the risk of flooding of land from sewers. Therefore, a precautionary approach should be taken and all potential allocation sites will be assessed for sewer flood risk via the Level 2 SFRA where data is available and the implications for sequential selection of alternative locations considered at this stage.	Datasets potentially required to provide assessment to be m sewers. Therefore, and all potential all risk via the Level 2 implications for seq considered at this s
Reservoir	Sites where reservoir flooding is predicted to make fluvial flooding worse for development in high hazard zone to be assessed in a Level 2 SFRA.			Datasets potentially do not have the confidence or certainty required to provide mapping that enables a comparative assessment to be made of the risk of flooding of land from reservoirs. In addition, the reservoir flood map identifies the consequence of a reservoir breach rather than risk, so applying high, medium and low 'risk' is not possible using this dataset. Therefore, a precautionary approach should be taken and sites where reservoir flooding is predicted to make fluvial flooding worse for development or where development is proposed in a high hazard zone will be assessed in Level 2 SFRA and the implications for sequential selection of alternative locations considered at that stage.	Datasets potentially required to provide assessment to be m reservoirs. In addit consequence of a re high, medium and l Therefore, a precau where reservoir floc worse for developm high hazard zone w implications for seq considered at that s

Future

y do not have the confidence or certainty mapping that enables a comparative nade of the risk of flooding of land from refore, a precautionary approach should be stial allocation sites will be assessed for risk in the Level 2 SFRA and the implications ction of alternative locations considered at

y do not have the confidence or certainty mapping that enables a comparative nade of the risk of flooding of land from a precautionary approach should be taken location sites will be assessed for sewer flood SFRA where data is available and the quential selection of alternative locations stage.

y do not have the confidence or certainty mapping that enables a comparative nade of the risk of flooding of land from tion, the reservoir flood map identifies the eservoir breach rather than risk, so applying low 'risk' is not possible using this dataset. utionary approach should be taken and sites oding is predicted to make fluvial flooding nent or where development is proposed in a vill be assessed in Level 2 SFRA and the quential selection of alternative locations stage.