

EH4 - HERT5, Hertford, South				
OSNGR:	533037,211884	Area: 4.89ha		Greenfield
Flood Zone Coverage:		FZ3b	FZ3a	FZ2
based on 2D Jflow modelling		2.56%	3.04%*	3.76%*
				FZ1
				90.64%*
Proposed Development Details:				
50 homes and green space on western portion of site				
Exception Test Required?				
Unlikely, as the majority of the site is on higher ground and located in Flood Zone 1.				
The Exception Test is needed if:				
"More Vulnerable" and "Essential Infrastructure" development is located in FZ3a and for "Highly Vulnerable" development located in FZ2.				
"Essential Infrastructure" development in FZ3b will also require the Exception Test.				
"Highly Vulnerable" development should not be permitted within FZ3a and FZ3b.				
"More Vulnerable" and "Less Vulnerable" development should not be permitted within FZ3b				
NPPF Guidance:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For development proposals on sites comprising one hectare or above in Flood Zone 1 the vulnerability of flooding from other sources as well as from river flooding should be incorporated into a FRA. • The potential to increase flood risk elsewhere through the addition of hard surfaces and the effect of the new development on surface water run-off should be considered. • Developers and local authorities should seek opportunities to reduce the overall level of flood risk in the area and beyond through the layout and form of the development and through appropriate sustainable drainage techniques. 				
Sources of Flood Risk:				
The vast majority of the site is located within Flood Zone 1 and is considered to be at low risk of fluvial flooding. Fluvial risk is located along the western boundary from a unnamed drain. Factoring in climate change at 25%, 30% and 70% does not result in significantly more of the site being affected by fluvial flooding. Surface water flooding is shown to generally affect the western boundary of the site, in line with topographic flow routes.				

Flood Zone Map



Contains Ordnance Survey data. © Crown copyright and database rights 2016

This site was not represented in the Environment Agency's Flood Zones, but OS mapping showed a drain running through the site, therefore 2D generalised modelling using Jflow software has been undertaken to obtain indicative flood extents using the 20-year extent as FZ3b, the 100-year extent as FZ3a, and the 1,000-year extent as FZ2. Developers may need to consider undertaking more detailed hydraulic modelling at the site as part of a site-specific FRA.




Climate Change Map



Contains Ordnance Survey data. © Crown copyright and database rights 2016

Climate change was modelled for the 2080s epoch, applying the following climate change factors to the 100-year flow: 25%, 35% and 70%.






The map above shows the 100-year + 70% climate change scenario, therefore representing a 'worst case'.

-  Potential Site Allocations
-  Flood Zone 3 with Climate Change
-  Council boundary


Surface Water Map



Contains Ordnance Survey data. © Crown copyright and database rights 2016

-  Potential Site Allocations
-  uFMfSW* 30-year Extent
-  uFMfSW* 1,000-year Extent
-  Council boundary
-  uFMfSW* 100-year Extent

Depth Map



Contains Ordnance Survey data. © Crown copyright and database rights 2016

This depth map is an output from Jflow 2D generalised modelling, and represents the 100-year event



Velocity Map




Contains Ordnance Survey data. © Crown copyright and database rights 2016

This velocity map is an output from Jflow 2D generalised modelling, and represents the 100-year event









Hazard Map



Contains Ordnance Survey data. © Crown copyright and database rights 2016

This hazard map is an output from Jflow 2D generalised modelling, and represents the 100-year event

 Potential Site Allocations	Hazard Rating	 Danger for some	 Danger for all
 Council boundary	 Very low hazard - caution	 Danger for most	

SuDS & the development site:		
SuDS Type	Suitability	Comments
Source Control		All forms of source control are likely to be suitable.
Infiltration		Infiltration likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests a low risk of ground water flooding however, site investigations should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.
Detention		Mapping suggests that the site slopes are suitable for all forms of detention.
Filtration		All filtration techniques are likely to be suitable.
Conveyance		All forms of conveyance are likely to be suitable. Where the slopes are >5% features should follow contours or utilise check dams to slow flows. If the site has contamination issues, a liner will be required.
<p>The site is not designated by the Environment Agency as previously being a landfill site.</p> <p>The site is located with a Source Protection Zone. As such infiltration techniques should only be used where there are suitable levels of treatment although it is possible that infiltration may not be permitted. Proposed SuDS should be discussed with relevant stakeholders (LPA, LLFA and EA) at an early stage to understand possible constraints.</p> <p>Drainage strategies should demonstrate that an appropriate number of treatment stages have been delivered. This depends on the factors such as the type of development, primary source of runoff and likelihood of contamination. Guidance should be sought from LLFA and other guidance documents such as the CIRIA SuDS Manual (C753).</p>		

Flood Defences:

There are no flood defences at this site.

Flood Warning:

There are currently no flood warning areas or flood alerts covering this site.

Access & Egress:

The main access and egress routes to the site appear to be via Mangrove Road and Mangrove Drive; neither of these routes are significantly affected by fluvial or surface water.

Climate Change:

Climate change mapping indicates the following impacts for the future:

- Increased storm intensities.
- The increase in Flood Zone 3a outline with differing climate change allowances is minimal within the site boundary.
- The floodplain of the unnamed drain appears to be fairly constrained within this area; with 70% climate change allowance the flood outline is similar to Flood Zone 2. It may, however, increase the depth, velocity and hazard of flooding in the area affected.
- Climate change may also increase the extent, depth and frequency of surface water flooding.

Implications for Development:

- Use of the Sequential Approach means, given the size of the site, development can be placed away from the Flood Zones, with the small area affected by the Flood Zones left undeveloped.
- Safe access and egress is not an issue for this site
- Development should also ensure that there is no increase in flood risk that may exacerbate flooding to routes
- Broadscale assessment of suitable SuDS has indicated a number of different types may be possible; given the size of the site, the type of SuDS system used is less likely to be limited by the amount of land available for development.
- The site is not known to benefit from any flood defences. Given the size and location of the site, it is unlikely the site could be used to implement strategic solutions to alleviate flood risk elsewhere in the catchment, though green corridors along the watercourse should be encouraged.

Guidance for Developers:

- At the planning application stage, a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment will be required if any development is located within Flood Zones 2 or 3 or greater than 1ha in size. Other sources of flooding should also be considered.
- Consultation with the Local Authority and the Environment Agency should be undertaken at an early stage, to determine requirements for a FRA and to establish an approach to consider climate change in line with latest guidance.
- The peak flows of the unnamed watercourse should be considered when considering drainage.
- Resilience measures will be required if buildings are situated in the flood risk area.
- Assessment for runoff should include allowance for climate change effects.
- New or re-development should adopt exemplar source control SuDS techniques to reduce the risk of frequent low impact flooding due to post-development runoff.
- New development must seek opportunities to reduce overall level of flood risk at the site, for example by:
 - o Reducing volume and rate of runoff
 - o Relocating development to zones with lower flood risk
 - o Creating space for flooding.
 - o Green infrastructure should be considered within the mitigation measures for surface water runoff from potential development and consider using Flood Zones 2 and 3 as public open space.
- Onsite attenuation schemes would need to be tested against the hydrographs for any unnamed watercourses to ensure flows are not exacerbated downstream within the catchment.
- Developers may need to undertake more detailed hydraulic modelling of the unnamed watercourse to confirm flood risk at the site. The Jflow outputs present an indication of flood risk in the absence of Environment Agency Flood Zones; however, this does not incorporate channel/structure topographic survey and assumes a channel capacity of QMED.