

Flood risk source / information source	Relevant sections of this SFRA	Result	Level of concern	Recommendations	Sequential and Exception Tests
Fluvial / Coastal (Flood Zones)	5 - Understanding flood risk in Scarborough and Ryedale	Significant proportion (e.g. greater than 50%) of site in Flood Zones (2 and 3)	High	Residential development on a site in this zone is unlikely to be appropriate unless the site is in an area benefitting from defence and can be made safe for the intended lifespan.	Sites in these categories should be explicitly addressed in a Sequential Test and may require preparation of further evidence to substantiate that Exception Test can be satisfied. Evidence from a Level 2 SFRA is required to demonstrate that the principle of development is supported.
		A proportion (e.g. less than 50%) of site in Flood Zones (2 and 3)	Medium	Residential development may be appropriate, sequential approach should be applied to avoid developing in flood zones as far as reasonable. Parts of the site within flood zone 1 should also be reviewed against the criteria described below.	
		Site located in Flood Zone 1	Medium	Residential development is probably appropriate in this zone, however catchments <3km ² in area are not covered by the Environment Agency Flood Zones and there may be a risk of flooding from small watercourses and/or other sources. These should be considered in conjunction with the DRN data and data on other sources of flooding. The surface water data in particular often highlights areas at risk of flooding from these smaller watercourses.	
Fluvial / Coastal - Climate change	4 - Impacts of climate change 5 - Understanding flood risk in Scarborough Borough and Ryedale	Significant proportion (e.g. greater than 50%) of site at risk of flooding from the future 1% AEP event (future 0.5% AEP event for coastal)	High	Residential development is unlikely to be appropriate unless the site is in an area benefitting from defence. Consideration should be given to the Standard of Protection of existing defences in relation to future climate change and any other measures necessary to provide appropriate standards of protection to proposed development.	Sites in these categories should be explicitly addressed in a Sequential Test and may require preparation of further evidence to substantiate that Exception Test can be satisfied. Evidence from a Level 2 SFRA is required to demonstrate that the principle of development is supported.
		A proportion (e.g. less than 50%) of site at risk of flooding from the future 1% AEP event (future 0.5% AEP event for coastal)	Medium	Residential development may be appropriate, sequential approach should be applied to avoid developing in the areas at risk of flooding as much as reasonable. Consideration should be given to the Standard of Protection of any defences in relation to future climate change and the commitment to deliver the required standards.	
		Site not at risk of flooding from the future 1% AEP event (future 0.5% AEP event for coastal)	Medium	Residential development is probably appropriate in this risk area, however this will depend on the present-day fluvial risk - refer to fluvial flood zone recommendations	

Flood risk source/ information source	Relevant sections of this SFRA	Result	Level of concern	Recommendations	Sequential and Exception Tests
Fluvial - Climate change proxy	4 - Impacts of climate change 5 - Understanding flood risk in Scarborough Borough and Ryedale	Significant proportion (e.g. greater than 50%) of site at risk of flooding from the 0.1% AEP event when used as a proxy for climate change	High	Residential development is unlikely to be appropriate unless the site is in an area benefitting from defence. Consideration should be given to the Standard of Protection of existing defences in relation to future climate change and any other measures necessary to provide appropriate standards of protection to proposed development.	Sites in these categories should be explicitly addressed in a Sequential Test and may require preparation of further evidence to substantiate that Exception Test can be satisfied. Evidence from a Level 2 SFRA (including detailed modelling of the impact of climate change) is required to demonstrate that the principle of development is supported.
		A proportion (e.g. less than 50%) of site at risk of flooding from the 0.1% AEP event when used as a proxy for climate change	Medium	Residential development may be appropriate, sequential approach should be applied to avoid developing in the areas at risk of flooding as much as reasonable. Consideration should be given to the Standard of Protection of any defences in relation to future climate change and the commitment to deliver the required standards.	
		Site not at risk of flooding from the 0.1% AEP event when used as a proxy for climate change	Low	Residential development is likely to be appropriate based on this criterion.	
Surface Water	5 - Understanding flood risk in Scarborough Borough and Ryedale	Significant proportion (e.g. >50%) of site is affected by surface water flooding (across all three surface water events)	High	Development on a site in this risk area is unlikely to be appropriate unless measures (including drainage) are in place to control overland flow.	Evidence may be required from a Level 2 SFRA to demonstrate that the principle of development is supported
		A proportion (e.g. <50%) of site is affected by surface water flooding (across all three surface water events)	Medium	Development may be appropriate and consultations should be held with the Lead Local Flood Authority.	
		No risk of surface water flooding	Low	Development is likely to be appropriate based on this criterion.	

Flood risk source/ information source	Relevant sections of this SFRA	Result	Level of concern	Recommendations	Sequential and Exception Tests
Surface Water - Climate change	4 - Impacts of climate change 5 - Understanding flood risk in Scarborough Borough and Ryedale	Significant proportion (e.g. greater than 50%) of site at risk of surface water flooding from the future 1% AEP event	High	Development on a site in this risk area is unlikely to be appropriate unless measures (including drainage) are in place to control overland flow.	Evidence may be required from a Level 2 SFRA to demonstrate that the principle of development is supported
		A proportion (e.g. less than 50%) of site at risk of surface water flooding from the future 1% AEP event	Medium	Development may be appropriate and consultations should be held with the Lead Local Flood Authority.	
		Site not at risk of surface water flooding from the future 1% AEP event	Low	Development may be appropriate in this risk area, however this will depend on the present-day flood risk - refer to surface water recommendations.	
Surface Water - Climate change proxy	4 - Impacts of climate change 5 - Understanding flood risk in Scarborough and Ryedale	Significant proportion (e.g. greater than 50%) of site at risk of surface water flooding from the 0.1% AEP event when used as a proxy for climate change	High	Development on a site in this risk area is unlikely to be appropriate unless measures (including drainage) are in place to control overland flow.	Evidence may be required from a Level 2 SFRA (including detailed modelling of the risk from climate change) to demonstrate that the principle of development is supported
		A proportion (e.g. less than 50%) of site at risk of surface water flooding from the 0.1% AEP event when used as a proxy for climate change	Medium	Development may be appropriate and consultations should be held with the Lead Local Flood Authority.	
		Site not at risk of surface water flooding from the 0.1% AEP event when used as a proxy for climate change	Low	Development is likely to be appropriate in this risk area.	
Groundwater	5 - Understanding flood risk in Scarborough Borough and Ryedale	Historic records of groundwater flooding within or near a site	Medium	The effect of this will depend on the location and historic evidence of known problems - a site-specific FRA should consider overland flow paths once groundwater has emerged. It is unlikely that infiltration SuDS will be appropriate and groundwater monitoring should be recommended.	
		Risk of flooding from groundwater is not negligible	Medium	Development might be appropriate but a site-specific FRA should consider groundwater risk. A high likelihood may mean infiltration SuDS are not appropriate and groundwater monitoring should be recommended.	
		Negligible risk of flooding from groundwater	Low	Development is likely to be appropriate in this risk area, however as groundwater datasets are generally produced nationally it is recommended that ground investigations are carried out and reported on within a site-specific FRA where this is required (known to be a problem locally).	
Reservoir inundation	5 - Understanding flood risk in Scarborough Borough and Ryedale	Maximum risk of flooding from reservoir inundation (is greater than 2m depth or 2m/s velocity)	High	Development on a site in this risk area might not be appropriate - this will be heavily dependent on the state of repair of the dam and the long term commitment to its management and maintenance. If development is considered, the local authority Emergency Planning team should be consulted to confirm that proposals can be safely implemented.	Level 2 SFRA required to provide evidence that the principle of development is supported
		Maximum risk of flooding from reservoir inundation (is less than 2 m depth or 2 m/s velocity)	Medium	Risk of flooding from reservoirs should not rule out development as the likelihood of reservoir breach is low, however risk should still be considered by the developer at site-specific FRA stage and an emergency plan is likely to be required. The local authority Emergency Planning team should be consulted.	
		No risk of reservoir inundation	Low	Development is likely to be appropriate in this risk area.	

Flood risk source/ information source	Relevant sections of this SFRA	Result	Level of concern	Recommendations	Sequential and Exception Tests
Historic flood map	5 - Understanding flood risk in Scarborough Borough and Ryedale	Any part of site within historic flood extents	Medium	Sites located in areas that have historically flooded might be appropriate for development; however, further investigation will be required regarding the severity and frequency of the historic flooding and accuracy of the historic flood extent. This should be used alongside other information in the Level 1 SFRA to decide whether the site is appropriate for allocation. Technical work will be required to inform this at the site-specific FRA stage.	
		No risk of historic flooding	Low	Development is likely to be appropriate based on this criterion.	
Detailed River Network	Appendix A - Interactive Flood Risk Mapping	Any part of site within 20m of a watercourse (from the Detailed River Network dataset)	Medium	Sites located within 20m of the DRN line might be appropriate for development. Where the DRN goes through or adjacent to a site, the Flood Zones and surface water map should also be considered to further determine the effect on development. Where the DRN is located away from a site and land slopes down towards the site, development may be less appropriate than a site where land slopes down towards the watercourse and away from the site.	
		Site not within 20m of a watercourse (from the Detailed River Network dataset)	Low / Medium	Development is likely to be appropriate in this risk area, however not all watercourses are mapped on the Detailed River Network dataset, smaller drains may not be mapped and may need to be considered along with flood risk from other sources.	
Areas benefitting from defence	6 - Flood alleviation schemes and assets	Any part of the site is within an area benefiting from defence	Advisory	Development in this risk area is normally appropriate in principle, however, the performance of formal defences and residual flood risk will need to be considered and consideration given to the commitment and contributions required to maintain the appropriate standard of protection.	Level 2 SFRA required to provide evidence that the principle of development is supported
		The site is not in an area benefiting from defence	Low	Development is likely to be appropriate in this risk area if there is no risk of flooding from other sources on the site. See other recommendations if there is any risk of flooding.	

Flood risk source/ information source	Relevant sections of this SFRA	Result	Level of concern	Recommendations	Sequential and Exception Tests
Cumulative impacts	7 - Cumulative impact of development and strategic solutions	High - Any part of the site is within a High Cumulative Impact Zone	Medium	Development could be considered as appropriate, however, specific planning policy recommendations may need to be formulated. Drainage and flood risk reduction opportunities will probably need to be considered further within these catchments that may have financial and/or land take implications for the site and allay concerns of existing communities potentially at risk.	Level 2 SFRA may be required to provide evidence that the principle of development is supported
		Medium - Any part of the site is within a Medium Cumulative Impact Zone (unless the site is also within a High Zone)	Low / Medium	Development is likely to be appropriate in these risk areas, however if a Medium score has been identified based on a high amount of development then specific planning policy recommendations may need to be formulated. Drainage and flood risk reduction opportunities may need to be considered further within these catchments that may have financial and/or land take implications for the site.	
		Low - Any site not partially or fully within either High or Medium Cumulative Impact Zones	Low	Development is likely to be appropriate in this risk area.	