Watford Borough Level 2 SFRA

JBA

Final Report

June 2020 www.jbaconsulting.com

Watford Borough Council

Town Hall, Hempstead Road, Watford, WD17 3EX



JBA Project Manager

Fiona Hartland 8A Castle Street Wallingford Oxfordshire OX10 8DL

Revision History

| Revision Ref/Date | Amendments | Issued to |
|-------------------|--|--------------|
| 31/03/2020 (v1.0) | Draft Report | Phil Dodshon |
| | | Jack Green |
| | | Amy Wolanski |
| 29/06/2020 (v2.0) | Final Report (incorporating edits | Phil Dodshon |
| | from Watford BC and the Environment Agency) | Jack Green |
| | | Amy Wolanski |

Contract

This report describes work commissioned by Jack Green from Watford Borough Council by an email dated 14 January 2020. Emily Jones and Fiona Hartland of JBA Consulting carried out this work.

| Prepared by | Emily Jones BSc |
|-------------|--|
| | Assistant Analyst |
| | Fiona Hartland MSci Analyst |
| Reviewed by | Paul Eccleston BA CertWEM CEnv MCIWEM C.WEM |
| | Technical Director |

Purpose

This document has been prepared as a Final Report for Watford Borough Council. JBA Consulting accepts no responsibility or liability for any use that is made of this document other than by the Client for the purposes for which it was originally commissioned and prepared.

JBA Consulting has no liability regarding the use of this report except to Watford Borough Council.

Copyright

© Jeremy Benn Associates Limited 2020.

JBA



Carbon Footprint

A printed copy of the main text in this document will result in a carbon footprint of 140g if 100% post-consumer recycled paper is used and 178g if primary-source paper is used. These figures assume the report is printed in black and white on A4 paper and in duplex. JBA is aiming to reduce its per capita carbon emissions.

Executive summary

Level 2 SFRA objectives

The objectives of this Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) update are to:

- Using available data, provide information and maps presenting flood risk from all sources for potential allocation sites in the Watford Local Plan.
- Inform the Sequential Test (whereby new development is steered towards areas at lowest risk of flooding).
- Serve as guidance for developers to complete the Exception Test if applicable i.e. if development has to take place in Flood Zone 2 (medium risk) or Zone 3 (high risk) (See Section 7).
- Provide an assessment of residual flood risk and climate change.
- Where flood risk information is unavailable or limited, conduct appropriate hydraulic modelling where possible to determine the flood risks to potential site allocations.
- Take into account the most recent national and local policy and guidance documents, update information on the requirements for site-specific FRAs, considerations for suitable surface water management methods and opportunities to reduce flood risk to existing communities through new development.

The Level Two assessment includes detailed assessments of the potential site allocations.

These include:

- An assessment of the highest risk flooding mechanism (or way in which flooding occurs) and most likely flooding sources (or type of flooding) for each site.
- An assessment of all sources of flooding including fluvial flooding, surface water flooding, groundwater flooding, reservoir flooding, mapping of the functional floodplain and the potential increase in fluvial and surface water flood risk due to climate change.
- An assessment of existing flood warnings at the sites, including whether there is safe access and egress during an extreme event.
- Advice and recommendations on the likely suitability of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) for managing surface water runoff.

As part of the Level 2 SFRA, detailed site summary tables have been produced for the potential allocation sites in Watford Borough. To accompany each site summary table, there are a series of maps, containing all of the mapped flood risk outputs.

Contents

| Introduction | 1 | |
|--|--|--|
| SFRA Objectives | 1 | |
| How to use the Level 2 SFRA | 2 | |
| Identification of Level 2 sites | 2 | |
| What flood risk information has been used? | 4 | |
| Data sources | 4 | |
| Flood Zones | 4 | |
| Environment Agency detailed hydraulic models | 4 | |
| Residual Risk from Breach and Blockages | 5 | |
| Culvert blockage | 6 | |
| Fluvial defence breach | 7 | |
| Assessment of climate change | 10 | |
| Government guidance on climate change | 10 | |
| Climate change and fluvial modelling | 10 | |
| Climate change and surface water | 12 | |
| How have cumulative impacts been assessed? | 13 | |
| Principle | 13 | |
| Methodology | 13 | |
| Planning Policy Considerations for Catchments | 13 | |
| Colne (from Confluence with Ver to Gade) | 14 | |
| Gade (from confluence with Bulbourne to Chess) | 14 | |
| Level 2 flood risk summaries | 15 | |
| Site level assessments | 15 | |
| Implications for development and requirements for the Exception Test | 16 | |
| Sites within Flood Zone 2 and 3 and the Exception Test | 16 | |
| Sites at risk from flooding from ordinary watercourses | 17 | |
| Sites at risk of significant surface water flooding | 17 | |
| Sites at risk of significant groundwater flooding | 18 | |
| Opportunities for flood betterment | 19 | |
| Future use of SFRA data | 19 | |
| Site screening | | I |
| Level 2 site summary sheets and maps | | 11 |
| Residual Risk Maps – Blockage Scenarios | | Ш |
| Residual Risk Maps – Breach Scenarios | | IV |
| | Introduction SFRA Objectives How to use the Level 2 SFRA Identification of Level 2 sites What flood risk information has been used? Data sources Flood Zones Environment Agency detailed hydraulic models Residual Risk from Breach and Blockages Culvert blockage Fluvial defence breach Assessment of climate change Government guidance on climate change Climate change and fluvial modelling Climate change and surface water How have cumulative impacts been assessed? Principle Methodology Planning Policy Considerations for Catchments Colne (from Confluence with Ver to Gade) Gade (from confluence with Bulbourne to Chess) Level 2 flood risk summaries Site level assessments Implications for development and requirements for the Exception Test Sites at risk from flooding from ordinary watercourses Sites at risk of significant groundwater flooding Opportunities for flood betterment Future use of SFRA data Site screening Level 2 site summary sheets and maps Residual Risk Maps – Blockage Scenarios | Introduction1SFRA Objectives1How to use the Level 2 SFRA2Identification of Level 2 sites2What flood risk information has been used?4Data sources4Flood Zones4Environment Agency detailed hydraulic models4Residual Risk from Breach and Blockages5Culvert blockage6Fluvial defence breach7Assessment of climate change10Government guidance on climate change10Climate change and fluvial modelling10Climate change and surface water12How have cumulative impacts been assessed?13Principle13Methodology13Planning Policy Considerations for Catchments13Colne (from Confluence with Ver to Gade)14Gade (from confluence with Ver to Gade)14Level 2 flood risk summaries15Site level assessments15Implications for development and requirements for the Exception Test16Sites at risk for significant surface water flooding17Sites at risk of significant surface water flooding17Sites at risk of significant surface water flooding19Opportunities for flood betterment19Puture use of SFRA data19Site screening19Level 2 site summary sheets and maps19Residual Risk Maps – Blockage Scenarios19Residual Risk Maps – Breach Scenarios19 |

JBA consulting

List of Figures

| Figure 3-1: Location of structure blockage scenario at site MX10. Figure 3-2: Location of defence breach scenario at site MX14 Figure 4-1: Source of Flood Zone 3a plus climate change extents in the Level 2 SFRA | 7 9 11 |
|--|--------------|
| List of Tables | |
| Table 3-1: Hydraulic models in Watford Borough used within Level 2 SFRA | 5 |
| Table 3-2: Summary of blockage scenarios modelled as part of Level 2 SFRA | 6 |
| Table 3-3: Summary of breach scenarios modelled as part of Level 2 SFRA | 8 |
| Table 4-1: Climate change allowances | 10 |
| Table 4-2: Climate change allowances for peak intensity rainfall | 12 |
| Table 7-1: Sites in Flood Zones 2 and 3, where >50% of the site area is in Flood Zone | |
| 1. | 16 |
| Table 7-2: Sites with significant proportions of the site at fluvial flood risk | 16 |
| Table 7-3: Sites with significant proportions of the site at surface water flood risk | 18 |
| Table 7-4: Sites with significant proportions of the site at groundwater flood risk | 18 |

| Term | Definition |
|--|--|
| AAP | Area Action Plan |
| AEP | Annual Exceedance Probability |
| Blockage scenario | A model scenario used to assess the impact of debris collecting at the entrance of a bridge or culvert (pipe) during a flood event, and prevent water from flowing through the structure. See Section 3.4.1. |
| Breach scenario | A model scenario used to assess the impact of a river defence (e.g. a flood wall or embankment) failing during a flood event. See Section 3.4.2. |
| СС | Climate change - Long term variations in global temperature and weather patterns caused by natural and human actions. |
| CIRIA | Construction Industry Research and Information Association |
| Conveyance feature | A term used to describe a feature of a sustainable drainage system which is designed to convey (move) water through the system (e.g. a swale or rill) |
| Defence failure | Occurs when a river defence structure (e.g. a flood wall or embankment) in poor condition, collapses during a flood event. This generally causes flooding to areas which were previously defended by the structure. See section 6.1. |
| Defence overtopping Occurs when water levels become too high within a river channel, and exceed the height of a defence (e a flood wall or embankment). This generally causes flooding to areas which were previously defended by the structure. See section 6.1. | |

Glossary and Abbreviations

| Term | Definition | |
|--------------------------|---|---|
| Defra | Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs | |
| EA | Environment Agency | |
| Exception Test | A planning principle applied to sites at higher flood risk, where lower risk sites cannot be developed. For the Exception Test to be passed, it must be shown the site is safe to develop, and that the sustainability benefits outweigh the flood risk. See Section 7. | |
| Flood risk betterment | A term used to describe a requirement for development to reduce the flood risk to the site itself, and/or the risk to downstream communities. See section 6.1. | |
| Flood defence | Infrastructure used to protect an area against floods as floodwalls and embankments; they are designed to a specific standard of protection (design standard). | |
| Flood mechanism | The means by which people or property are affected by a flood source. | |
| Flood Risk Area | An area determined as having a significant risk of flooding in accordance with guidance published by Defra and WAG (Welsh Assembly Government). | |
| FSA | Flood Storage Area | |
| Flood source | The type of flooding (e.g. fluvial, surface water, groundwater). | |
| Fluvial Flooding | Flooding resulting from water levels exceeding the bank level of a main river | |
| FRA | Flood Risk Assessment - A site specific assessment of all forms of flood risk to the site and the impact of development of the site to flood risk in the area. | |
| Functional floodplain | Areas alongside rivers where water flows onto, and is stored, during times of flood. It is classified as 'Flood Zone 3b', within Strategic Flood Risk Assessments. See Sections 6.1 and 7.5. | |
| На | Hectare | |
| Infiltration feature | A term used to describe a feature of a sustainable drainage system which is designed to allow water to soak (infiltrate) into the ground (e.g. a soakaway or infiltration basin) | |
| JBA | Jeremy Benn Associates | |
| LLFA | Lead Local Flood Authority - Local Authority responsible for taking the lead on local flood risk management | K |
| LPA | Local Planning Authority | |
| Main River | A watercourse shown as such on the Main River Map, and for which the Environment Agency has responsibilities and powers. However, the Environment | |

JBA

| Term | Definition |
|-------------------------|---|
| | Agency are not responsible for all maintenance on Main Rivers, as the Environment Agency have permissive powers, but the riparian owner has the responsibility. |
| NPPF | National Planning Policy Framework |
| Ordinary Watercourse | All watercourses that are not designated Main River. Local Authorities or, where they exist, IDBs have similar permissive powers as the Environment Agency in relation to flood defence work. However, the riparian owner has the responsibility of maintenance. |
| PPG | National Planning Policy Guidance |
| Resilience Measures | Measures designed to reduce the impact of water that enters property and businesses; could include measures such as raising electrical appliances. |
| Return Period | Is an estimate of the interval of time between events of a certain intensity or size, in this instance it refers to flood events. It is a statistical measurement denoting the average recurrence interval over an extended period of time. |
| Residual risk | The risk that remains after measures have been taken to alleviate flooding. |
| Risk | In flood risk management, risk is defined as a product of the probability or likelihood of a flood occurring, and the consequence of the flood. |
| RoFSW | Risk of Flooding from Surface Water map. Environment Agency national map showing risk of flooding from surface water. |
| Sequential Test | A planning principle which identifies potential development sites at lowest flood risk, before those at higher risk. See Section 7. |
| Sewer flooding | Flooding caused by a blockage or overflowing in a sewer or urban drainage system. |
| SFRA | Strategic Flood Risk Assessment |
| SoP | Standard of Protection - Defences are provided to reduce the risk of flooding from a river and within the flood and defence field standards are usually described in terms of a flood event return period. For example, a flood embankment could be described as providing a 1 in 100-year standard of protection. |
| SPZ | Source Protection Zone - The Environment Agency have defined Source Protection Zones (SPZs) for groundwater sources such as wells, boreholes and springs used for public drinking water supply. These |

JBA consulting

Definition Term zones show the risk of contamination from any activities that might cause pollution in the area. The closer the activity, the greater the risk. The maps show three main zones (inner, outer and total catchment) and a fourth zone of special interest, which is occasionally applied, to a groundwater source. Sustainable Drainage Systems - Methods of management practices and control structures that are SuDS designed to drain surface water in a more sustainable manner than some conventional techniques Flooding from surface water runoff as a result of high intensity rainfall when water is ponding or flowing over Surface the ground surface before it enters the underground water drainage network or watercourse, or cannot enter it flooding because the network is full to capacity, thus causing what is known as pluvial flooding. Surface Rainfall which has been concentrated into a continuous water flow flow of water, by the levels of the ground surface. path Surface The flow of rainwater across the ground surface during water runoff a storm event. WFD Water Framework Directive

JBA

1 Introduction

Watford Borough Council (the Council) is currently preparing a New Local Plan, which seeks to set out the vision for Watford, to identify how much development will take place, and to guide where homes and jobs can be sustainably delivered. The plan period will extend from 2020 to 2036. To date, the Council has completed the Issues and Options consultation which identified key issues that face the borough, which have been incorporated into the First Draft Local Plan. Consultation on the First Draft Watford Local Plan ended in November 2019 and adoption is planned for May 2021.

This Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) follows the South West Hertfordshire Level 1 SFRA, produced in 2018 as a joint study between Dacorum Borough Council, St. Albans City and District Council, Three Rivers District Council and Watford Borough Council in line with the approach set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (2019). The SFRA will also provide input to assist with the consideration of individual proposals for planning decisions, however more detailed investigations will be required to support development of the sites.

This approach is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) and in particular Section 14: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change.

The SFRA Levels 1 and 2 are prepared in accordance with best practice as set out in the National Planning Practice Guidance "How to prepare a strategic flood risk assessment"¹ (last updated 12 August 2019).

1.1 SFRA Objectives

Planning Practice Guidance advocates a tiered approach to risk assessment and identifies the following two levels of SFRA:

- Level One: where flooding is not a major issue and where development pressures are low. The assessment should be sufficiently detailed to allow application of the Sequential Test.
- Level Two: where land outside Flood Zones 2 and 3 cannot appropriately accommodate all the necessary development, creating the need to apply the Exception Test. In these circumstances, the assessment should consider the detailed nature of the flood characteristics within a Flood Zone and assessment of other sources of flooding.

The Level 1 SFRA identified that Level 2 SFRA assessments were required at a number of sites in Watford. Level 2 assessments should be undertaken at all sites which have been **identified as 'at risk' and which may be carried forward in the** Local Plan. The aim of the Level 2 assessments is to provide evidence to help determine whether or not the Exception Test as set out in Planning Guidance could be passed, i.e. development could be achieved safely, for sites that have been found to be at flood risk by the Level 1 assessment.

¹ Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, Environment Agency (2019) How to prepare a strategic flood risk assessment. Available at: <u>https://www.gov.uk/guidance/local-pannag-authorities-strategic-flood-risk-assessment</u>



1.2 How to use the Level 2 SFRA

The Level 2 report gives a short non-technical summary of how the Level 2 sites were selected, the detailed flood risk data that was used to carry out individual site-level assessments for each of the Level 2 sites, and how climate change was assessed. Further technical detail is given in the Appendices.

The following information is contained within the appendices:

- Appendix A Site screening: a high level screening of flood risks to all sites received as part of the Local Plan process (regardless of their feasibility for allocation within the Local Plan). Provides an update to the site screening carried out as part of South West Hertfordshire Level 1 SFRA (2019) and used to inform application of the Sequential Test.
- Appendix B Level 2 site summary sheets and maps: assessment and mapping of sites at medium to high flood risk with potential for allocation within the Local Plan. Further details of the content are provided in Section 6.
- Appendix C Residual Risk Maps Blockage: maps showing the predicted flood extents, depths and hazards to a site when a critical culvert or bridge becomes blocked.
- Appendix D Residual Risk Maps Breach: maps showing the predicted flood extents, depths and hazards to a site when a critical flood defence fails.

The main output of the Level 2 Assessment is the individual site summary sheets (Appendix B), which offer high level flood risk assessments and conclusions for each site.

2 I dentification of Level 2 sites

The Level 1 SFRA and subsequent work carried out a screening of 58 sites in Watford Borough, against available flood risk information including:

- Flood Map for Planning (Rivers and Sea) Flood Zone 2 and 3
- Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (RoFSW)
- Flood Risk from Reservoirs mapping
- JBA Groundwater flood map
- Historic Flood Map

The 58 screened sites were identified from a range of sources, including sites put forward during the Call for Sites process, sites on the Council's Brownfield Register and previously considered sites.

A detailed assessment of flood risk to the 58 identified sites found:

- 51 of these were entirely located within Flood Zone 1 and therefore considered to be at a low risk of fluvial flooding;
- 7 sites contained areas of Flood Zone 2;
- 7 were identified as containing areas of Flood Zone 2 and Flood Zone 3a.
- 22 sites contained greater that 1% of the 100-year RoFSW extent (and five of these sites had an area of greater than 20% at risk.);
- 17 had a total site area of greater than 20% at risk from the 1 in 1,000-year surface water flood map.
- 7 sites were identified as within the Environment Agency's historic flood outline.

Of the 58 sites screened, 13 sites were taken forward for Level 2 assessment. These sites are shown in

Figure 2-1.



The primary flood sources for the sites (and reason they have been assessed at Level 2) are as follows:

- 7 sites are partly located within the current Flood Zones 3b, 3a and 2;
- 3 sites are located entirely in Flood Zone 1, however have greater than 10% of their area within the RoFSW 1 in 100-year (1%) flood risk extent;
- 6 of the sites are located entirely in Flood Zone 1, however have greater than 10% of their area within an area of high groundwater flood risk; and
- 7 sites have greater than 10% of their area at risk of flooding from reservoirs.

River Gade **MX06** ssiohu River WATFORD Colne MX12 **HS25 MX14** West Watford **HS28 MX16 MX18** MX17 EM02 **EM03 HS33** Oxhey Potters Bar Epping mersham tford . Barnet Bre orth - Finchley Holywel Ilford • Dage LONDON 0 1 Km 0.25 0.5 Richmond Dart Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2020) and public sector information licenced underthe Open Governme ell d underthe Oper nent Licence v3 0 Legend Watford Borough Level 2 Strategic Flood Watford Borough Boundary - Main River JBA consulting **Risk Assessment** Level 2 SFRA Sites Grand Union Canal

Figure 2-1: Location of 13 sites assessed within Level 2 SFRA.

3 What flood risk information has been used?

3.1 Data sources

The Level 2 SFRA draws upon all the information and data sources that were compiled as part of the Level 1 assessment, examining them in more detail on a site-by-site basis. These sources include:

- EA Main Rivers GIS layer and OS OpenRivers GIS layer;
- EA Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map (RoFSW);
- Surface water flood modelling of 1 in 100-year + 40% climate change event;
- EA detailed hydraulic models (summarised in Table 3-1);
- EA Recorded Flood Outline;
- EA Spatial Flood Defences layer;
- EA Risk of Flooding from Reservoirs map; and
- JBA Groundwater Flood Map.

3.2 Flood Zones

The Flood Zones defined within the South West Hertfordshire Level 1 SFRA have been used for assessment within the Level 2 SFRA.

3.3 Environment Agency detailed hydraulic models

The Environment Agency flood risk mapping programme has produced detailed hydraulic models covering the following watercourses:

- Upper Colne
- River Gade and Bulbourne

Their outputs are incorporated into the existing Flood Zones, but they also provide additional information on flood probability, rates of onset, depths, velocities and hazards.

The scope of the SFRA does not allow for re-survey and re-modelling of these river catchments. However, models for the watercourses were obtained and re-run for the latest climate change scenarios.



| Model | Year created | Model Type | Data source used in Flood Zone 3b | Data source used in Flood Zone 3a + CC | Comments | Confidence in modelled results |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|--|---|---|---|
| Upper Colne | 2010 | 1D-2D | 1 in 20 modelled outline | Flood Zone 2 | Model was unstable during re- runs for larger climate change allowances. Results not used and FZ2 to act as conservative replacement. | Moderate – both channel and floodplain represented. Higher confidence in lower return periods, but unstable at higher flows |
| River Gade River Bulbourne | 2016 | 1D-2D | 1 in 20 modelled outline | 1 in 100 + 70% modelled outline | Flood extents include the Grand Union Canal. Flood walls at Nash Mill represented. | Higher – recent model with both channel and floodplain represented |

Table 3-1: Hydraulic models in Watford Borough used within Level 2 SFRA

3.4 Residual Risk from Breach and Blockages

'Residual risk' refers to the risks that remain in circumstances after measures have been taken to alleviate flooding. It is important that these risks are quantified to confirm that the consequences can be safely managed. It is the responsibility of the site developer to fully assess flood risk to an individual site, to propose measures to mitigate the flood risk and demonstrate that any residual risks can be safely managed.

This Level 2 SFRA does not assess the probability of failure, other than noting that such events are very rare. However, in accordance with NPPF, all sources of flooding need to be considered. If a breach or blockage event were to occur, then the consequences to people and property could be high.

For two of the 13 sites assessed as part of the Level 2 SFRA, structures have been identified which may pose a residual risk in the event of blockage to a culvert or breach of a defence. The culvert or defence may not be located directly within the site, but may be within close proximity. The identified sites are:

- MX12 Land at Tesco Lower High Street
- MX14 Colne Valley Retail Park

To fully assess the potential risk to the proposed development site, additional model runs were completed. These ran for the 1 in 100-year return period. Once complete, flood outlines were compared to Flood Zone 3a to understand if there is an increase in flood risk.

The methodology for breach and blockage scenarios is outlined in the following sections.



3.4.1 Culvert blockage

Culverts and structures susceptible to blockage, located within or close to the allocated sites, were identified using Ordnance Survey mapping, the Environment Agency Culverts and Spatial Defences layers, and available hydraulic models.

As part of the Level 2 SFRA, medium (50%) medium-high (75%) and high (90%) blockages were applied to the identified structure on Site MX12, and the scenarios were run for a 1% AEP (1 in 100-year) event, to assess the impact of bridge blockage on flood risk to the potential allocation site. A 100% blockage scenario was tested, but did not complete due to instability issues in the model.

The results are described within the Site Summary Sheets in Appendix B, with maps of the blockage results provided in Appendix C.

A summary of the scenarios and results is shown in Table 3-2, with a location plan shown in Figure 3-1.

| Site | MX12 | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| Site Address | Land at Tesco, Lower High Street | | |
| Hydraulic Model | Upper Coln | e | |
| Structure | Bridge | | |
| Structure | Bridge on A | 411, at south of site | |
| Location (and model nodes) | (UCL68_28 | 25u, UCL68_2825d) | |
| Impact to site? (1% AEP event) | Medium (50%) blockage | Flooding is predicted to increase beyond the 1% AEP extent in the north of the site, particularly in the north east and north western corners of the site. Peak flood depths ranging from 0.06 – 0.38m in the north west corner of the site, and 0.03 – 0.64m across the majority of the flooded area in the north of the site. The highest flood depths of 2.1 - 2.5m are expected on the north east corner of the site. | |
| | Medium- high (75%) blockage | Flooding is predicted to increase significantly across the central and southern areas of the site, to cover the majority of the site. A significant increase in flood extent also occurs downstream, at site MX14. | |
| | | Peak flood depths for the 1% AEP event across the south and centre of the site range from 0.02 – 0.44m, with the shallowest depths predicted in the south west of the site. In the north of the site, peak flood depths largely range between 0.2 – 1.15m, reaching a high of 3.0m on the northern access roads for the site. | |
| | High (90%) blockage | A further increase in flood extent is seen in the centre and south west of the site. An additional increase in flood extent is seen downstream of the site. | |
| | | Peak flood depths range between 0.02 – 0.6m across the south and centre of the site. In the north of the site, flood depths largely range between 0.3 – 1.48m, with the greatest depths of up to 3.2m predicted on the access road at the north of the site. | |

Table 3-2: Summary of blockage scenarios modelled as part of Level 2 SFRA



Figure 3-1: Location of blockage modelled at site MX12.

3.4.2 Fluvial defence breach

The Environment Agency's 'Breach of Defences Guidance'² document was used to inform the width of the breaches represented within the hydraulic model.

An overview of where the breach was represented at Site MX14 is shown in Table 3-3, with a location plan shown in Figure 3-2.

For the MX14 site, the breach locations for both models are situated next to a reinforced concrete defence, and so the width of the breach was set to 20m. To trigger the defence breach within the model, a **'variable** Z-Shape layer' was applied, to define the shape of the breach. Variable Z-Shapes allow the ground levels within the model to transition over time, from the defended ground level, to the final ground levels, after the defence has been breached. This transition is set to begin at peak flow in the watercourse, to simulate a worst-case scenario for the volumes of water flowing through the breached defence. Therefore, breach levels are lowered to ground levels behind the defence.

² Environment Agency (2017) Modelling and Forecasting Technical Guidance Note: Breach of Defences Technical Guidance (Inland and Coastal). Available on request from Environment Agency.

CSD-JBAU-XX-XX-RP-Z-0001-S2-Watford Level 2 SFRA Summary Report.docx



The results of the breach modelling are described within the Site Summary Sheets in Appendix B, with maps of the breach results provided in Appendix D.

| MX14 |
|---|
| Colne Valley Retail Park |
| Upper Colne |
| Raised poured concrete bank protection, filled in with brickwork where there are gaps. Defended height varies from 0.4m to 1.5m along the defence. |
| Western boundary of site - left bank of River Colne |
| (UCL68_2702) |
| 54.78mAOD |
| A breach of the bank protection results in a significant increase in flood extent within the site during the 1% AEP event, extending to cover the majority of the site. The northern and south western borders of the site remain at low risk of fluvial flooding. |
| Maximum flood depths within the site are predicted to range between 0.05 – 0.57m during the 1% AEP event, with the deepest flood waters predicted to form in the lowest-lying central and northern areas of the site. |
| |





Figure 3-2: Location of modelled defence breach at site MX14



4 Assessment of climate change

4.1 Government guidance on climate change

Updated government guidance on assessing the impact of climate change on flooding in line with the UKCP09 Climate Change Projections was released in February 2016 and updated in 2017³.

The guidance sets out a range of climate change allowances that should be considered when assessing the future risk to a proposed development. The climate change allowances are dependent on location in the country (by river basin) and lifetime and vulnerability classification of the development (epoch). It also provides several bands (termed 'central', 'higher central' and 'upper end') to test depending on the vulnerability of the development and the Flood Zone within which it is located.

The UKCP18 Climate Change Projections were released in December 2018. However, current Environment Agency guidance⁴ is still based on the UKCP09 (February 2016) climate change allowances for peak river flow. Therefore, the recommended UKCP09 projections have been used to represent climate change within the Level 2 SFRA.

4.2 Climate change and fluvial modelling

Following the government guidance (Section 5.1), the key epoch considered is 2070-2115 as this reflects the lifetime of residential **development; and the key vulnerability is 'more vulnerable' as this rep**resents a conservative classification incorporating all vulnerabilities. The key allowances to consider for Flood Zone 3a are therefore the Higher Central and Upper End (35% and 70% in Thames river basin) as shown in Table 4-1.

| River basin district | Allowance category | Total potential change anticipated for the `2020s' (2015 to 2039) | Total potential change anticipated for the '2050s' (2040 to 2069) | Total potential change anticipated for the `2080s' (2070 to 2115) |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|--|---|--|
| Thames | Upper end | 25% | 35% | 70% |
| | Higher central | 15% | 25% | 35% |
| | Central | 10% | 15% | 25% |

Table 4-1: Climate change allowances

In order to assess the impact of these climate change scenarios on the 1 in 100-year flood risk (Flood Zone 3a) at development sites, in accordance with the NPPF, we used the following hierarchy of modelling information as agreed with the Council and the Environment Agency:

- Re-run of existing detailed models with the Higher Central and Upper End climate change flows scenarios.
- Flood Zone 2 as a proxy.

3 Environment Agency (2016) Flood risk assessments: climate change allowances. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessments-climate-change-allowances

4 Environment Agency (2019) Using 'Flood risk assessments: climate change allowances' following publication of new climate projections in UKCP18.



Applying additional flows into hydraulic models above what they were originally optimised for can cause instability and adding 35% or 70% onto the 1 in 100-year flow often causes the model to fail before it can output full results for a flood event. This means that maximum flood extents cannot be generated from the model results.

Flood extents for the 35% and 70% climate change scenarios were available for the Gade and Bulbourne model. The Upper Colne model was run for the 25% climate change allowance, however failed to run for the 35% and 70% allowances, due to model instabilities. It was considered to be beyond the scope of the SFRA to stabilise the model, and therefore Flood Zone 2 was used as a proxy for climate change.

Figure 4-1 shows the coverage of hydraulic models in Watford Borough and the source of information used to generate climate change extents.

The source of climate change information and the impact on flood risk to the individual sites, is also **noted on the summary sheets under '**Climate Change – **Implications for the Site'**.

Figure 4-1: Source of Flood Zone 3a plus climate change extents in the Level 2 SFRA





4.3 Climate change and surface water

Peak rainfall intensity allowance is used to understand the risk posed by increased rainfall on land and urban drainage systems.

Climate change is predicted to increase rainfall intensity in the future by a range of between 20% and 40% (the recommended national precautionary sensitivity range for 2070 to 2115).

Table 4-2 shows the climate change allowances for the various epochs. The same allowances are applied across all of England. For the purpose of strategic planning, the 'Upper End' band is considered for the 2050s and 2080s epoch, as this reflects the timeline of development.

Table 4-2: Climate change allowances for peak intensity rainfall

| | Total potential change anticipated for the 2020s (2015 - 2039) | Total potential change anticipated for the 2050s (2040 - 2069) | Total potential change anticipated for the 2080s (2070 - 2115) |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| Upper End | 10% | 20% | 40% |
| Central | 5% | 10% | 20% |

The Level 2 assessment of present-day surface water flood risk is based on the Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (RoFSW) map. The impact of climate change on surface water flood risk has been assessed by applying a **40% uplift ('Upper End' for 20**70 to 2115) to the 1 in 100-year Risk of Flooding from Surface Water mapping.

The climate change uplift extended and connected existing surface water flow paths generated during a 1 in 100-year event, and expanded areas of surface water ponding on low-lying ground, particularly against railway embankments and on the fluvial floodplain.

The latest climate change allowances should be considered as part of any site-specific assessment.



5 How have cumulative impacts been assessed?

5.1 Principle

Cumulative impacts are defined as the effects of past, current and future activities on the environment. Under the 2019 NPPF, strategic policies and their supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessments (SFRAs), are required to 'consider cumulative impacts in, or affecting, local areas susceptible to flooding' (para. 156).

When allocating land for development, consideration should be given to the potential cumulative impact on flood risk within a catchment. Development increases the impermeable area within a catchment, which if not properly managed, can cause loss of floodplain storage, increased volumes and velocities of surface water runoff, and result in heightened downstream flood risk. Whilst individual developments should only have a minimal impact on the hydrology and flood risk of an area, the cumulative effect of multiple developments may be more severe.

The cumulative impact should be considered throughout the planning process, from the allocation of sites within the Local Plan, to the planning application and development design stages. Once preferred options are identified, their cumulative impact can be considered in more detail within a Level 2 SFRA, where necessary. In addition, site-specific FRAs must consider the cumulative impact of the proposed development on flood risk within the wider catchment area.

In consultation with the Environment Agency, conditions set by the Council should support the implementation of SuDS and appropriate flood mitigation measures. As a minimum, development should have a neutral impact on flood risk, and lead to no net loss in functional floodplain. Where possible it should improve existing issues, to ensure that flood risk is not exacerbated either within, or outside of, the Council's administrative area.

5.2 Methodology

The impacts of cumulative development on flood risk were assessed as part of the South West Hertfordshire Level 1 SFRA.

A series of inputs, including recorded flood history, predicted flood risk, existing development commitments and potential future development pressures, were used to calculate impact of any future development on areas susceptible to flooding.

Where catchments were identified as sensitive to the cumulative impact of development, the assessment concluded with potential strategic planning policy suggestions to manage the risk.

Full details of the methodology used can be found in Appendix D of the South West Hertfordshire Level 1 SFRA, 'Catchment-level Assessment of Cumulative Impacts of Flood risk'.

5.3 Planning Policy Considerations for Catchments

As part of the South West Hertfordshire Level 1 SFRA, planning policy considerations have been identified for the following catchments where cumulative development is likely to have the greatest impact on flood risk to communities:

- Colne (from Confluence with Ver to Gade)
- Gade (from confluence with Bulbourne to Chess)

The policy considerations for each of these catchments have been reviewed within the Level 2 SFRA, in the context of potential development pressures within Watford Borough.

Within the Level 2 SFRA Site Summary Sheets in Appendix A, recommendations are provided for sites within catchments identified as at medium and high sensitivity to the cumulative impacts of development.



5.3.1 Colne (from Confluence with Ver to Gade)

Key Flood Risk Issues

- Significant fluvial flood risk from the River Colne, Hartsbourne Stream and Oxhey Brook.
- Surface water flow paths which follow the topography and are impeded by embankments for major transport infrastructure.
- Groundwater flood risk.

Planning Policy Considerations

- As Hertfordshire County Council, the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) may not be consulted on minor development sites, planning policy should ensure that these sites limit discharge rates and volumes to greenfield rates, in line with Hertfordshire County Council's policy for major development sites.
- To provide wider flood risk benefits to the mid-Colne catchment, development sites in the upper catchment, such as north of Watford and around Abbots Langley, should include the provision of long-term storage. This would control the release of surface water volumes from the site during and immediately after storm events, help to reduce and delay the peak flows on the River Colne reaching South Watford and Oxhey.

5.3.2 Gade (from confluence with Bulbourne to Chess)

Key Flood Risk Issues

• Significant surface water flow paths flow towards the River Gade, following the natural topography. High number of surface water flooding incidents reported in Croxley Green.

Planning Policy Considerations

- Opportunities should be taken to implement SuDS schemes which reduce runoff to greenfield runoff rates or less, and hold back surface water for longer periods during storm events.
- A strategic, catchment-based approach to managing surface water should also be taken, particularly in the northwest of the catchment, by interrupting known surface water flow paths and creating ponds or basins to store water.



6 Level 2 flood risk summaries

6.1 Site level assessments

The flood risk summary sheets in Appendix A give flood risk information for each Level 2 site in order to determine whether the Exception Test will be required and/or the development will be viable. These include:

- Basic site information (area, type of site, % of site in each Flood Zone).
- Description of sources and mechanisms of flooding.
- Flood Zone (1% and 0.1% annual probability events) and functional floodplain extent maps, flood hazard map, flood depth map, flood velocity map, climate change impact maps. Where a site is not covered by detailed modelling, information on flood hazard, depth and velocity will not be available.
- Information on rate of onset and duration of flooding.
- Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (RoFSW) map.
- Assessment of flood defences.
- A high-level assessment of how sites might be affected during events where there is failure of flood risk management measures (breach or failure), or they are overwhelmed by events that exceed their envisaged design capacity (overtopping).
- An assessment of flood warning coverage.
- An assessment of emergency planning procedures and how safe access and egress will be managed.
- An assessment of the effect of land use and structures on flood risk both within the potential local plan site and for other development nearby.
- Recommendations on the requirements for drainage control and impact mitigation, including an assessment of likely SuDS suitability and flood betterment opportunities.
- Site-specific development control advice (including for example sequential site design, access and egress, requirements for SuDS, recommendations for drainage control and impact mitigation).
- Sensitivity of the wider catchment to the cumulative impact of development on flood risk, as assessed within the South West Hertfordshire Level 1 SFRA.
- Information on the requirements for the Exception Test, flood risk assessments and site design.

These summary sheets form the main output of the Level 2 SFRA.



7 Implications for development and requirements for the Exception Test

7.1 Sites within Flood Zone 2 and 3 and the Exception Test

It should be noted that the 'Sequential Test' refers to the procedure of sequentially selecting sites with the lowest possible flood risk, as part of the Local Plan process. Once sites have been selected for inclusion within the Local Plan, and plans to develop the site take shape, **the 'Sequential Approach' should also be applied** to the site design, to ensure that vulnerable land uses are located in areas of lower flood risk.

Guidance is clear that the Sequential Test must be applied first and only if passed should the site consideration extend to Level 2. Only once the Sequential Test is passed should the Exception Test be applied.

Of the 13 sites considered in the Level 2 assessment, there are seven sites where part of the site falls within Flood Zones 2 and 3. For two of the sites examined, less than 50% of the site area is located within Flood Zones 2. Therefore, it is expected that it will be possible to preserve Flood Zones 2 and 3 (subject to a detailed flood risk assessment) as public green space or other open land category, with built development restricted to Flood Zone 1.

For these sites, the Exception Test will only be required if built development is proposed in Flood Zone 2 or 3 and will be dependent upon their vulnerability.

Table 7-1: Sites in Flood Zones 2 and 3, where >50% of the site area is in Flood Zone 1.

| Site Code | Site Name | % of site in Flood Zone 1 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|
| HS33 | Wiggenhall Road Depot | 88% |
| EM02 | Land to the south of Wiggenhall | 70% |

Flood risk assessments must carry out detailed assessments where appropriate to define the Flood Zones and model the effect of climate change. Climate change assessments should be undertaken using the relevant allowances⁵ for the type of development and level of risk and in discussion with the EA. The requirements for flood risk assessments are set out in the Level 1 SFRA. Further detail is given on the relevant summary sheets.

The remaining five sites were found to have significant proportions (greater than 50%) of the site at fluvial flood risk, meaning that built development may need to be located within Flood Zone 2 and/or 3, if the Council wishes to take these sites forward. The sites are shown in Table 7-2.

Table 7-2: Sites with significant proportions of the site at fluvial flood risk

| Site Code | Site Name | % of site in Flood Zone 2 and 3 |
|--------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| HS25 | Land and buildings at 247 Lower High Street | 100% |
| MX17 | Land at Riverwell | 54% |
| MX12 | Land at Tesco Lower High Street | 90% |
| MX14 | Colne Valley Retail Park | 96% |

5 Environment Agency (2016) Flood risk assessments: climate change allowances. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessments-climate-change-allowances

| Site | Site Name | |
|------|--------------------------|--------------|
| Code | | Flood Zone 2 |
| | | and 3 |
| MX18 | Colne Bridge Retail Park | 90% |

In this case the above sites will require application of the Exception Test depending on the vulnerability of the development⁶:

- If More Vulnerable and Essential Infrastructure is located in FZ3a.
- If Highly Vulnerable development is located in FZ2.
- If Essential Infrastructure is located in FZ3b

Development will not be permitted in the following scenarios:

- Highly Vulnerable infrastructure within FZ3a and FZ3b.
- More Vulnerable and Less Vulnerable Infrastructure within FZ3b.

The site and building design will need to ensure that the development is safe and resilient to the modelled flood risk, and any residual risk in defended areas. A flood mitigation and adaptation approach is likely to be required. Development should be designed using a sequential approach, with built development / higher vulnerabilities located towards areas of lower risk and hazard. Areas of the sites within the functional floodplain, Flood Zone 3b, and areas of higher hazard should be preserved for appropriate uses, such as public open space or essential infrastructure (subject to the Sequential and Exception Tests). Further detail is given on the relevant summary sheets.

7.2 Sites at risk from flooding from ordinary watercourses

There are several sites which fall entirely in Flood Zone 1, but which contain an ordinary watercourse or drainage feature.

These sites must still pass the Sequential Test, taking account of the non-fluvial source of flooding, but will not require the Exception Test. In this case, the area at risk is likely to be limited and as long as it is taken into account in the site design, it should not affect the viability of development. Flood risk assessments must carry out detailed modelling where appropriate to define the Flood Zones and model the effect of climate change. The requirements for flood risk assessments are set out in the Level 1 SFRA. Further detail is given on the relevant summary sheets.

Liaison with Hertfordshire County Council is advised for sites within Flood Zone 1 that contain an ordinary watercourse.

7.3 Sites at risk of significant surface water flooding

All developments over 1ha must carry out a flood risk assessment to assess surface water drainage and other sources of flooding. There are five sites where greater than 10% of the site area is within the RoFSW 1% AEP (1 in 100-year) risk area. The sites are shown in Table 7-3.

JBA

⁶ Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (2014) Planning Practice Guidance. Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability classification. Paragraph: 066 Reference ID: 7-066-20140306. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-and-coastal-change#Table-2-Flood-Risk-Vulnerability-Classification

CSD-JBAU-XX-XX-RP-Z-0001-S2-Watford Level 2 SFRA Summary Report.docx

| Site Code | Site Name | % of site in 1% AEP (1 in 100-year) surface water flood risk |
|--------------|----------------------------------|---|
| MX06 | Land at Watford Junction Station | 21% |
| MX17 | Land at Riverwell | 12% |
| HS11 | Land at 420-420a St Albans Road | 46% |
| MX14 | Colne Valley Retail Park | 12% |
| MX18 | Colne Bridge Retail Park | 37% |

Table 7-3: Sites with significant proportions of the site at surface water flood risk

These sites will still need to pass the Sequential Test, taking account of the non-fluvial sources of flooding. The Exception Test is not required under the NPPF, but it must be shown that the development will be safe for its lifetime and the risk can be managed through a sequential approach to design.

Flood risk assessments should consider carrying out surface water modelling to define the level of surface water risk, and the risk areas / flow paths, including the effects of climate **change. Drainage designs should 'design for exceedance' and accommodate existing surface** water flow routes. Building design (threshold levels etc.) should ensure that development is safe from flooding. The requirements for surface water strategies and flood risk assessment are set out in the Level 1 SFRA. Further detail is given on the relevant summary sheets.

Liaison with the Hertfordshire County Council is advised for sites within Flood Zone 1 that contain significant surface water flood risk.

7.4 Sites at risk of significant groundwater flooding

There are 10 sites where greater than 10% of the site area is within Zone 4 of the JBA Groundwater Flood Map. The higher risk categories are defined as:

- Zone 3 Within this zone there is a risk of groundwater flooding to surface and subsurface assets. There is the possibility of groundwater emerging at the surface locally.
- Zone 4 Within this zone there is a risk of groundwater flooding to both surface and subsurface assets. Groundwater may emerge at significant rates and has the capacity to flow overland and/or pond within any topographic low spots.

The sites are shown in Table 7-4.

Table 7-4: Sites with significant proportions of the site at groundwater flood risk

| Site Code | Site Name | % of site in JBA Groundwater Map Zone 4 |
|--------------|--|--|
| HS25 | Land and buildings at 247 Lower High Street | 100% |
| HS31 | Chalk Hill Car Park | 15% |
| MX17 | Land at Riverwell | 23% |
| MX12 | Land at Tesco Lower High Street | 27% |
| HS33 | Wiggenhall Road Depot | 48% |

JBA consulting

| Site Code | Site Name | % of site in JBA Groundwater |
|--------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|
| | | Map Zone 4 |
| EM03 | Gateway Zone | 100% |
| MX14 | Colne Valley Retail Park | 98% |
| MX18 | Colne Bridge Retail Park | 100% |
| MX16 | Land East of Ascot Road | 28% |

These sites will still need to pass the Sequential Test, taking into account the non-fluvial source of flooding, but will not require the Exception Test.

Flood risk assessments should consider conducting further analysis of groundwater within the site to define the level of groundwater flood risk. Site design, including any SuDS features, should be resilient to groundwater flooding and building design (threshold levels etc.) should ensure the development is safe from flooding. Liaison with Hertfordshire County Council (LLFA) is advised for sites within Flood Zone 1 that contain significant groundwater flood risk.

7.5 Opportunities for flood betterment

Many of these developments must provide flood betterment alongside sustainable development. Such opportunities should be discussed with the LLFA and Environment Agency as appropriate at an early planning stage. These include:

- All developments should take the opportunity to implement exemplar SuDS design, delivering multiple benefits for the development (water quality, biodiversity, amenity, green infrastructure).
- Opportunities for developer contributions to flood mitigation options under consideration by organisations such as Hertfordshire County Council or the Environment Agency.
- All existing watercourses on sites should remain as open channels. Consultation with the Environment Agency confirmed that the Agency will object to the culverting of watercourses, and will expect any existing culverts within a site to **be opened up, or 'daylighted'**. In addition, any other structures encountered on the site which may restrict flow of water should be removed, (subject to approval of any necessary watercourse, heritage and environmental consents) to allow better management of flood risk, provide amenity space and improve habitats.
- Any proposed river crossings on the sites must ensure they are clear span in design and allow sufficient clearance of flood flows, to prevent future risk of blockage and backing up.
- Opportunities for mitigation of surface water flow routes to improve flood risk on adjoining land particularly to public buildings such as hospitals and schools.

Opportunities have been highlighted on the relevant site summary sheets in Appendix A.

8 Future use of SFRA data

The Level 2 SFRA has examined each of the sites deemed to be at flood risk in more detail. The aim of the Level 2 assessments is to determine whether or not the Exception Test could be passed, i.e. development could be achieved safely, for sites that have been found to be at flood risk by the Level 1 assessment. The limitations of the available detailed modelling have been highlighted, and detailed flood risk assessments will be required on all of these sites to ensure that they are designed safely.

It is important to recognise that the SFRA has been developed using the best available information at the time of preparation. This relates both to the current risk of flooding from rivers, and the potential impacts of future climate change. In particular the Environment **Agency's detailed river models** may be updated as part of their ongoing flood risk mapping programme.

The SFRA should be periodically updated when new information on flood risk, flood warning or new planning guidance or legislation becomes available. New information on flood risk may be provided by the Council, Hertfordshire County Council (in its role as LLFA), the Highways Authority, Thames Water and the Environment Agency. It is recommended that the SFRA is reviewed internally on an annual basis, allowing a cycle of review, followed by checking with the above bodies for any new information to allow a periodic update.

Appendices A Site screening

CSD-JBAU-XX-XX-RP-Z-0001-S2-Watford Level 2 SFRA Summary Report.docx

JBA consulting



B Level 2 site summary sheets and maps



CSD-JBAU-XX-XX-RP-Z-0001-S2-Watford Level 2 SFRA Summary Report.docx

JBA consulting



D Residual Risk Maps – Breach Scenarios

JBA consulting

Offices at

Coleshill Doncaster Dublin Edinburgh Exeter Glasgow Haywards Heath Isle of Man Limerick Newcastle upon Tyne Newport Peterborough Saltaire Skipton Tadcaster Thirsk Wallingford Warrington

Registered Office South Barn Broughton Hall SKIPTON North Yorkshire BD23 3AE United Kingdom

+44(0)1756 799919 info@jbaconsulting.com www.jbaconsulting.com Follow us: 🎔 in

Jeremy Benn Associates Limited

Registered in England 3246693

JBA Group Ltd is certified to: ISO 9001:2015 ISO 14001:2015 OHSAS 18001:2007









| | Site Code | e Name | Site (Ha) | FZ3b (Ha | i) FZ3b (| (%) FZ3a (| (Ha) F | FZ3a (%) only | FZ3a (%) total | FZ2 (Ha) | FZ2 (%) only | FZ2 (%) total | FZ1 (%) | FZ3a+CC 35% (Ha) | FZ3a+CC 35% (%) | FZ3a+CC 70% (Ha) | FZ3a+CC 70% (%) | HFM (Ha) | HFM (%) | RES (Ha) | RES (%) | SW30 (Ha) | SW30 (%) | SW100 (Ha) | SW100 (%) | SW1000 (Ha) | SW1000 (%) | SW100 + 40%CC (Ha) | SW100 + 0%CC (%) | Groundwater Cat 1 (>5m below ground in 1 in 100-year) | GW Cat 1 (%) | Groundwater Cat 2 (0.5 - 5m below ground in 1 in 100- year) | GW Cat 2 (%) | Groundwater Cat 3 (0.025 - 0.5m below ground in 1 in 100-year) | GW Cat 3 (%) | Groundwater Cat 4 (<0.025m below ground in 1 in 100- year) | GW Cat 4 T (%) | otal groundwater in Cat 3 or 4 (%) | Canal Risk <=100m Embankment |
|--|-----------|---|-----------|----------|-----------|------------|--------|------------------|-------------------|----------|--------------|------------------|---------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|----------|---------|----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|--------------------------|---------------------|---|-----------------|--|-----------------|--|-----------------|---|-------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| | HS18 | Land at 80 Cassio Road | 0.08 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | .0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.08 | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | No |
| | MX11 | Wellstones Car Park | 0.23 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | .0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.23 | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | No |
| | HS24 | Land at Waterfields Shopping Park | 1.88 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | .0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.38 | 20% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.07 | 4% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 1.88 | 100% | 0.01 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | No |
| | HS20 | Derby Road Skate Park | 0.27 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | .0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.01 | 4% | 0.01 | 2% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.27 | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | No |
| | HS35 | Land and Garages at Riverside Road | 0.10 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | .0 | 4% | 4% | 0.10 | 96% | 100% | 0% | 0.10 | 100% | 0.10 | 100% | 0.00 | 1% | 0.10 | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 2% | 0.01 | 11% | 0.00 | 4% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.10 | 100% | 100% | No |
| | HS05 | The Badger PH | 0.15 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | .0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.06 | 44% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.15 | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | No |
| | HS13 | 16-18 St. Albans Road | 0.21 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | .0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 1% | 0.00 | 1% | 0.00 | 1% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.21 | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | No |
| | EM01 | 11-19 Cassiobury House Station Road | 0.24 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | .0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.03 | 13% | 0.01 | 4% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.24 | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | No |
| | HS19 | 120-122 Exchange Road | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | .0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.05 | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | No |
| Bale Bale Bale Bale Bale <td>HS34</td> <td>Bushey Station</td> <td>0.31</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.0</td> <td>.0</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>100%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>1%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>No</td> | HS34 | Bushey Station | 0.31 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | .0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 1% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | No |
| | HS25 | Land and buildings at 247 Lower High Street | 0.14 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.1 | 1 | 90% | 90% | 0.14 | 10% | 100% | 0% | 0.14 | 100% | 0.14 | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.14 | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 1% | 0.11 | /4% | 0.08 | 59% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.14 | 100% | 100% | No |
| | MX03 | Lemarie Centre | 0.10 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | .0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.01 | 13% | 0.01 | 11% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.10 | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | No |
| | MX07 | Land at Colonial Way/Clive Way | 1.98 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | .0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.02 | 1% | 0.27 | 13% | 0.09 | 5% | 0.00 | 0% | 1.98 | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | No |
| Dist Dist <td>MX05</td> <td>Land and Buildings at 94-114 St Albans Road</td> <td>2.4/</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>100%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.04</td> <td>1%</td> <td>0.23</td> <td>9%</td> <td>0.70</td> <td>28%</td> <td>0.44</td> <td>18%</td> <td>0.02</td> <td>1%</td> <td>2.45</td> <td>99%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>No</td> | MX05 | Land and Buildings at 94-114 St Albans Road | 2.4/ | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | 0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.04 | 1% | 0.23 | 9% | 0.70 | 28% | 0.44 | 18% | 0.02 | 1% | 2.45 | 99% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | No |
| | HSU2 | Land and buildings at 275 Sneepcot Lane | 0.35 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | 0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.35 | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | NO |
| New Network of A New Network of A New Network of A </td <td>101000</td> <td>Centrepoint community centre</td> <td>0.13</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>100%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>U%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.15</td> <td>0.69/</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>NO</td> | 101000 | Centrepoint community centre | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | 0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | U% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.15 | 0.69/ | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | NO |
| C C C C C C C < | H522 | Car Park Vicarage Road_Excitatige Road | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | 0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 4/0 | 0.00 | 5/0 619/ | 0.00 | 0/6 | 0.00 | 5/0 600/ | 0.00 | 4/0 | 0.03 | 00/ | 0.00 | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 100% | NO |
| Desc of Ascoord | HS31 | Chalk Hill Car Park | 0.10 | 0.00 | 0% | | 0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.04 | 41/0 | 0.00 | 294 | 0.08 | 17% | 0.07 | 5% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.10 | 100% | 0.00 | 15% | 100% | No |
| Mathemation Mathemation Mathemation Mathematio | H\$16 | Corper of Park Avenue and Rickmansworth Road | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | 0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | No |
| Mathematical Matrix Matrix Matrix Matrix Matrix </td <td>H\$20</td> <td>Croxley View land south of Morrisons</td> <td>3 20</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>100%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.03</td> <td>1%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>9%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>4%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>3.08</td> <td>96%</td> <td>0.11</td> <td>4%</td> <td>0.01</td> <td>0%</td> <td>4%</td> <td>No</td> | H\$20 | Croxley View land south of Morrisons | 3 20 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | 0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.03 | 1% | 0.00 | 9% | 0.00 | 4% | 0.00 | 0% | 3.08 | 96% | 0.11 | 4% | 0.01 | 0% | 4% | No |
| 100 <td>MX06</td> <td>Land at Watford Junction Station</td> <td>7.46</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>100%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.70</td> <td>9%</td> <td>1.54</td> <td>21%</td> <td>3.73</td> <td>50%</td> <td>2.34</td> <td>31%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>7.45</td> <td>100%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>No</td> | MX06 | Land at Watford Junction Station | 7.46 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | 0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.70 | 9% | 1.54 | 21% | 3.73 | 50% | 2.34 | 31% | 0.00 | 0% | 7.45 | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | No |
| Mathematic Mathematic Mathematic Mathematic Mathematic </td <td>H508</td> <td>Meriden Former School Site</td> <td>1.74</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>100%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.01</td> <td>1%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>1.74</td> <td>100%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>No</td> | H508 | Meriden Former School Site | 1.74 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | 0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.01 | 1% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 1.74 | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | No |
| | MX17 | Land at Riverwell | 11.98 | 0.32 | 3% | 2.7 | 7 | 20% | 23% | 6.44 | 34% | 54% | 46% | 6.44 | 54% | 6.44 | 54% | 0.87 | 7% | 6.79 | 57% | 0.78 | 6% | 1.41 | 12% | 2.82 | 24% | 2.01 | 17% | 0.00 | 0% | 4.82 | 40% | 4.36 | 36% | 2.80 | 23% | 59% | No |
| | HS23 | Crown Passage Car Park | 0.09 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | 0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.09 | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | No |
| Matrix Mat | HS15 | Land to the Rear of 125-127 The Parade | 0.26 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | .0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.01 | 4% | 0.25 | 96% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | No |
| See 1 See 1 <th< td=""><td>MX12</td><td>Land at Tesco Lower High Street</td><td>7.61</td><td>0.57</td><td>7%</td><td>2.9</td><td>.9</td><td>30%</td><td>38%</td><td>6.83</td><td>60%</td><td>90%</td><td>10%</td><td>6.83</td><td>90%</td><td>6.83</td><td>90%</td><td>1.65</td><td>22%</td><td>7.55</td><td>99%</td><td>0.19</td><td>2%</td><td>0.64</td><td>8%</td><td>3.11</td><td>41%</td><td>1.34</td><td>18%</td><td>0.00</td><td>0%</td><td>0.20</td><td>3%</td><td>5.39</td><td>71%</td><td>2.02</td><td>27%</td><td>98%</td><td>No</td></th<> | MX12 | Land at Tesco Lower High Street | 7.61 | 0.57 | 7% | 2.9 | .9 | 30% | 38% | 6.83 | 60% | 90% | 10% | 6.83 | 90% | 6.83 | 90% | 1.65 | 22% | 7.55 | 99% | 0.19 | 2% | 0.64 | 8% | 3.11 | 41% | 1.34 | 18% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.20 | 3% | 5.39 | 71% | 2.02 | 27% | 98% | No |
| Mode Mode Mode Mode Mod | HS09 | Bill Everett Centre | 1.07 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | .0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.04 | 4% | 0.02 | 2% | 1.07 | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | No |
| | MX01 | Woodside Community Centre | 0.20 | 0.00 | 0% | 5 0.0 | .0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.20 | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | No |
| bit bit bit bit bit bit <td>HS17</td> <td>Land and Buildings at 87 Cassio Road</td> <td>0.11</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.0</td> <td>.0</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>100%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.11</td> <td>100%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>No</td> | HS17 | Land and Buildings at 87 Cassio Road | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | .0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.11 | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | No |
| H31 Wages H4 H5 H5 H5 H5 H5 H5 H5 H5 H5 H5 H5 | HSO4 | Land and buildings at 5 Sheepcot Lane | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | .0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.17 | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | No |
| 1330 14.4dectam Addectam Adde | HS33 | Wiggenhall Road Depot | 1.49 | 0.00 | 0% | 5 O.O | .0 | 1% | 1% | 0.17 | 11% | 12% | 88% | 0.17 | 12% | 0.17 | 12% | 0.17 | 12% | 0.22 | 15% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.03 | 2% | 0.12 | 8% | 0.06 | 4% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.77 | 52% | 0.72 | 48% | 100% | No |
| blick und and changes descriptions of all all descriptions off off off <td>HS30</td> <td>41 Aldenham Road</td> <td>0.05</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.0</td> <td>.0</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>100%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>No</td> | HS30 | 41 Aldenham Road | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | .0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | No |
| i>i | HS06 | Land and Garages adjacent to 1-7 Heronslea | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | .0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.11 | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | No |
| 1353 135 <t< td=""><td>HS14</td><td>Land and Garages between 139 and 149 Queens Road</td><td>0.05</td><td>0.00</td><td>0%</td><td>0.0</td><td>.0</td><td>0%</td><td>0%</td><td>0.00</td><td>0%</td><td>0%</td><td>100%</td><td>0.00</td><td>0%</td><td>0.00</td><td>0%</td><td>0.00</td><td>0%</td><td>0.00</td><td>0%</td><td>0.05</td><td>90%</td><td>0.05</td><td>100%</td><td>0.05</td><td>100%</td><td>0.05</td><td>100%</td><td>0.00</td><td>0%</td><td>0.05</td><td>100%</td><td>0.00</td><td>0%</td><td>0.00</td><td>0%</td><td>0%</td><td>No</td></t<> | HS14 | Land and Garages between 139 and 149 Queens Road | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | .0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.05 | 90% | 0.05 | 100% | 0.05 | 100% | 0.05 | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.05 | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | No |
| bits land betweent and 2 betweent andex andex andex and 2 betweent andex and 2 betweent andex andex a | HS28 | Land and Garages to the rear of 2-24 Elfirda Road | 0.08 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | .0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 1% | 0.05 | 63% | 0.04 | 52% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.05 | 66% | 0.03 | 35% | 0.00 | 0% | 35% | No |
| 1033 Lind and Garges adjoint 1 Linivia Anzana 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 | HS26 | Land between 41 and 61 Brightwell Road | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | .0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.01 | 19% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.05 | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | No |
| Hiss Congreted Contragers | HS03 | Land and Garages adjacent to 1 Lavinia Avenue | 0.08 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | .0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.08 | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | No |
| MA13 Land 44-56 Vacrage Road OL13 OL00 ON5 OL00 ON5 OL00 ON5 | HS36 | Kingsfield Court Garages | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | .0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.05 | 96% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | No |
| Inspand Inspand Out Out Out Out | MX13 | Land 44-56 Vicarage Road | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | .0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.12 | 96% | 0.00 | 4% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | No |
| Hish Land Garlages High-Garle Line Out Obs Obs </td <td>HS10</td> <td>Longspring Car Park</td> <td>0.27</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.0</td> <td>.0</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>100%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>2%</td> <td>0.07</td> <td>24%</td> <td>0.02</td> <td>7%</td> <td>0.26</td> <td>95%</td> <td>0.01</td> <td>5%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>No</td> | HS10 | Longspring Car Park | 0.27 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | .0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 2% | 0.07 | 24% | 0.02 | 7% | 0.26 | 95% | 0.01 | 5% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | No |
| bitM cisterway cone 1.7.4 0.00 0.7.6 0.00 | HS01 | Land Garages at Lych Gate | 0.10 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | 0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.10 | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 100% | No |
| chung chung <td>EM03</td> <td>Gateway Zone</td> <td>1./1</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>100%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.06</td> <td>4%</td> <td>0.45</td> <td>26%</td> <td>0.19</td> <td>11%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>1./1</td> <td>100%</td> <td>100%</td> <td>No</td> | EM03 | Gateway Zone | 1./1 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | 0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.06 | 4% | 0.45 | 26% | 0.19 | 11% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 1./1 | 100% | 100% | No |
| 111 111 111 100 0.0 | EM04 | Land between 14-18 Greennill Crescent | 0.09 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | 0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.09 | 98% | 0.00 | 2% | 0.00 | 0% | 2% | NO |
| Instal and antigendings at IP and tange with read Cold Cold <t< td=""><td>HS11</td><td>Land at 420-420a St Albans Road</td><td>0.11</td><td>0.00</td><td>0%</td><td></td><td>0</td><td>0%</td><td>0%</td><td>0.00</td><td>0%</td><td>0%</td><td>100%</td><td>0.00</td><td>0%</td><td>0.00</td><td>0%</td><td>0.00</td><td>0%</td><td>0.00</td><td>0%</td><td>0.01</td><td>9%</td><td>0.05</td><td>40%</td><td>0.08</td><td>/1%</td><td>0.00</td><td>10/</td><td>0.00</td><td>0%</td><td>0.11</td><td>079/</td><td>0.00</td><td>0%</td><td>0.00</td><td>0%</td><td>29/</td><td>NO</td></t<> | HS11 | Land at 420-420a St Albans Road | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0% | | 0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.01 | 9% | 0.05 | 40% | 0.08 | /1% | 0.00 | 10/ | 0.00 | 0% | 0.11 | 079/ | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 29/ | NO |
| 1112 1114 1114 1114 1 | H521 | Land and Buildings at 170-160 Rickmansworth Road | 0.10 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | 0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.01 | 0% | 0.00 | 1/0 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.13 | 100% | 0.00 | 3% | 0.00 | 0% | 3/0 | No |
| MX14 Cole Valle Valle Vice | H312 | 22.27 The Parado | 0.09 | 0.00 | 0% | | 0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 7% | 0.00 | 596 | 0.00 | 78% | 0.09 | 22% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | No |
| MA14 Colle bridge relation At C.04 C.05 C.04 C.05 C.04 C.05 C.04 C.05 C.04 C.05 C.04 C.05 C.05 <thc.< td=""><td>NAV14</td><td>23-37 The Parade</td><td>2.64</td><td>0.00</td><td>10/0</td><td>0.0</td><td>2</td><td>179/</td><td>129/</td><td>2.54</td><td>0/6</td><td>0/0</td><td>100/0</td><td>2.54</td><td>0.6%</td><td>2.54</td><td>0.6%</td><td>0.00</td><td>20/0</td><td>2.64</td><td>100%</td><td>0.00</td><td>29/</td><td>0.00</td><td>129/</td><td>0.03</td><td>229/</td><td>0.02</td><td>220/</td><td>0.32</td><td>/8/0</td><td>0.09</td><td>22/0</td><td>0.00</td><td>29/</td><td>2.60</td><td>0%</td><td>100%</td><td>No</td></thc.<> | NAV14 | 23-37 The Parade | 2.64 | 0.00 | 10/0 | 0.0 | 2 | 179/ | 129/ | 2.54 | 0/6 | 0/0 | 100/0 | 2.54 | 0.6% | 2.54 | 0.6% | 0.00 | 20/0 | 2.64 | 100% | 0.00 | 29/ | 0.00 | 129/ | 0.03 | 229/ | 0.02 | 220/ | 0.32 | /8/0 | 0.09 | 22/0 | 0.00 | 29/ | 2.60 | 0% | 100% | No |
| Mixe Land East of Ascot Road Out Out <td>MX18</td> <td>Colne Bridge Retail Park</td> <td>0.91</td> <td>0.03</td> <td>2%</td> <td>0.2</td> <td>3</td> <td>31%</td> <td>33%</td> <td>0.73</td> <td>59%</td> <td>90%</td> <td>10%</td> <td>0.73</td> <td>90%</td> <td>0.73</td> <td>90%</td> <td>0.03</td> <td>33%</td> <td>0.55</td> <td>68%</td> <td>0.07</td> <td>16%</td> <td>0.31</td> <td>37%</td> <td>0.67</td> <td>64%</td> <td>0.35</td> <td>48%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.05</td> <td>2%</td> <td>0.81</td> <td>100%</td> <td>100%</td> <td>No</td> | MX18 | Colne Bridge Retail Park | 0.91 | 0.03 | 2% | 0.2 | 3 | 31% | 33% | 0.73 | 59% | 90% | 10% | 0.73 | 90% | 0.73 | 90% | 0.03 | 33% | 0.55 | 68% | 0.07 | 16% | 0.31 | 37% | 0.67 | 64% | 0.35 | 48% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.05 | 2% | 0.81 | 100% | 100% | No |
| Mark Land R value Land R value <thland r="" th="" value<=""> Land R value</thland> | MX16 | Land Fast of Ascot Road | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0% | 0.2 | 0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.01 | 2% | 0.00 | 1% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.20 | 45% | 0.12 | 27% | 0.13 | 28% | 55% | No |
| Instrumentary Instrume | HS07 | Land at Russell Lane | 1.61 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | 0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.06 | 4% | 0.01 | 1% | 0.00 | 0% | 1.61 | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | No |
| MX10 13-21 Carrenton Road 0.00 0.% <td>FM02</td> <td>Land to the south of Wiggenhall IF</td> <td>0.58</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.0</td> <td>1</td> <td>25%</td> <td>25%</td> <td>0.18</td> <td>5%</td> <td>30%</td> <td>70%</td> <td>0.18</td> <td>30%</td> <td>0.18</td> <td>30%</td> <td>0.02</td> <td>3%</td> <td>0.58</td> <td>100%</td> <td>0.01</td> <td>2%</td> <td>0.05</td> <td>9%</td> <td>0.16</td> <td>27%</td> <td>0.09</td> <td>15%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.06</td> <td>11%</td> <td>0.33</td> <td>57%</td> <td>0.19</td> <td>32%</td> <td>89%</td> <td>No</td> | FM02 | Land to the south of Wiggenhall IF | 0.58 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | 1 | 25% | 25% | 0.18 | 5% | 30% | 70% | 0.18 | 30% | 0.18 | 30% | 0.02 | 3% | 0.58 | 100% | 0.01 | 2% | 0.05 | 9% | 0.16 | 27% | 0.09 | 15% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.06 | 11% | 0.33 | 57% | 0.19 | 32% | 89% | No |
| HS27 Inverpol Road Garages 0.21 0.00 0% 0.00 <td>MX10</td> <td>19-21 Clarendon Road</td> <td>0.08</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>100%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.08</td> <td>97%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>3%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>No</td> | MX10 | 19-21 Clarendon Road | 0.08 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | 0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.08 | 97% | 0.00 | 3% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | No |
| MX04 Land at 453 st Albans Road 0.0 0% 0.0 0% 0.0 0% 0.0 0% 0.0 0% 0.00 0% | HS27 | Liverpool Road Garages | 0.21 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | 0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.21 | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | No |
| MX02 Land at 501 St Albans Road 0.1 0.0 0% 0.0 0% 0.0 0% 0.0 0% 0.0 0% 0.0 0% 0.0 0% 0.0 0% 0.0 0% 0.0 0% 0.0 0% 0.00 | MX04 | Land at 453 St Albans Road | 0.30 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | 0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.01 | 4% | 0.03 | 10% | 0.05 | 17% | 0.04 | 12% | 0.29 | 97% | 0.01 | 3% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | No |
| MX15 Land To West Of And Parallel To Ascot Road 0.71 0.00 0% 0.0 0% 0.0 0% 0.0 | MX02 | Land at 501 St Albans Road | 0.21 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | 0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.02 | 10% | 0.05 | 21% | 0.03 | 15% | 0.20 | 97% | 0.01 | 3% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | No |
| | MX15 | Land To West Of And Parallel To Ascot Road | 0.71 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.0 | .0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.02 | 3% | 0.06 | 8% | 0.19 | 27% | 0.08 | 12% | 0.00 | 0% | 0.09 | 12% | 0.11 | 15% | 0.51 | 72% | 87% | No |

Watford Borough Council



Level 2 SFRA Detailed Site Summary Tables – DRAFT DOCUMENT

Table of Contents

| M02 | 2 |
|------|----|
| M03 | 7 |
| IS11 | 11 |
| IS25 | 15 |
| IS28 | 20 |
| IS31 | 24 |
| IS33 | 28 |
| IS35 | 33 |
| ИХО6 | 38 |
| ИХ12 | 42 |
| /X14 | 49 |
| ИХ16 | 54 |
| ИХ17 | 58 |
| ИХ18 | 63 |


| Site code | | EM02 | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|--|--|--|
| Site name | | Land to the south of Wiggenhall Industrial Estate | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Site details | OS Grid reference | TQ 10983 95529 | | | | | | |
| | Area | 0.58 ha | | | | | | |
| | Current land use | Brownfield | | | | | | |
| | Proposed site use | Employment | | | | | | |
| | Flood risk vulnerability | Less vulnerable | Less vulnerable | | | | | |
| | Watford Sustainability Area Band | Area of High Sustainability | | | | | | |
| | Existing watercoursesThere are no watercourses within the site boundary. Approximately 100m s the site, the River Colne flows in a westerly direction. | | | | | | | |
| | Flood history | The northern border of the site is located within the EA Recorded Flood Outlines. The site has previously been affected by fluvial flooding during two recorded events: December 2000 February 2014 Both of these events occurred as a result of channel exceedance on the River Colne | | | | | | |
| | | Fluvial | | | | | | |
| | | Proportion of the site | FZ3b (5% AEP) | FZ3a (1% AEP) | FZ2 (0.1% AEP) | | | |
| | | at IISK (%) | 0% | 25% | 5% | | | |
| | | on site (mAOD) | N/A | 53.45 | 53.79 | | | |
| Sources of flood risk | Fluvial | Available modelled data: The site is covered by the 2010 Upper Colne 1D-2D hydraulic model. Flood depth and hazard results were not provided with this model, and therefore water level results have been used. Flood Zone 2 has been used as a proxy for Flood Zone 3a +35%CC and +70%CC extents, as the Upper Colne model became unstable when higher flows were applied. | | | | | | |
| | | The northern and western boundaries of the site are located within Flood Zones 3a | | | | | | |
| | | and 2. Proportion of site at risk (PoFSW) | | | | | | |
| | | 3.3% AEP | 1% AEP | | 0.1% AEP | | | |
| | | (1 in 30) | (1 in 100) | (| 1 in 1,000) | | | |
| | | 2% | 9% | | 27% | | | |
| | Surface Water | Description of surface water flow paths: The northern and western boundaries of the site are at medium to high risk of flooding from surface water. The surface water flooding here is associated with a large area of ponding which forms in a low point where the industrial estate is located. | | | | | | |
| surface water flooding may occur independently. | | | | anai nak, altiouyn | | | | |



| Site code EM02 | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| Site name | | Land to the south of Wiggenhall Industrial Estate | | | | | | |
| | | Draw antian af the aite | .4!!! | | | Mars 4 in 40 | 0 | |
| | | Proportion of the site a | AEF | n JBA G P) risk ca | roundwate tegories | r мар 1 in 10 | 0-year (1% | |
| | | Depth below surface 0-0.025m | Depth below surface 0.025-0.5m | | m | Total in highest risk categories | | |
| | Groundwater | 32% | | 57% | | 89 | 9% | |
| | | flood risk is the northern and eastern boundary of the site, which is Category 4 (where groundwater is predicted to lie at or within 0.025m during a 1% AEP event). The rest of the site is largely located with (where groundwater is predicted to lie 0.025 to 0.5m below the surface AEP event). | | | | | area of highest located within of the surface nin Category 3 ce during a 1% | |
| | Reservoir | The entire site is at risk of reservoir flooding in the extremely unlikely event of a breach at either Aldenham or Hilfield Park reservoirs. | | | | | | |
| | Canal | There are no canals witin the site. | | | | | | |
| Flood risk | Defences | Defence Type | | Standard of Protection | | 0 | Condition | |
| | | There are no defences within the site | | | site or within close proximity. | | | |
| | | Culvert / structure blockage? There of the | | There a of the s | re are no culverts present within the vicinity ne site. | | | |
| infrastructure | Residual risk | Impounded water body failure? The event Hilfield | | The ent the eve Hilfield | entire site is at risk of reservoir flooding in event of a breach event on Aldenham or eld Park reservoir. | | | |
| | | Defence breach / | | | Br | each Zone | | |
| | | Overtopping? | followin | | d Warning | and Flood Al | ort Arooc: | |
| Emorgonov | Flood Alert Area including Carpend Flood Warning A | Flood Alert Area: The Middle River Colne at Watford and Rickmansworth including Carpenders Park Flood Warning Area: The River Colne at Watford including Bushey | | | | | | |
| planning | Access and egress | The site is likely to be accessed from Wiggenhall Road or Thomas Sawyer Both of these routes are at risk of fluvial flooding during a 1% AEP even surface water flooding during a 3.3% AEP event. This is likely to restrict acces egress during a flood event, with Wiggenhall Road, adjacent to the site, at hig of surface water flooding. | | | | | Sawyer Way. EP event and ict access and ite, at high risk | |
| | Climate change | River Basin Dis | strict | | Central | Higher Central | Upper End | |
| | '2080s' | Thames | | | 25% | 35% | 70% | |
| Climate Change | Implications for | Due to model instability when applying 35% and 70% climate change allowances to inflows, Flood Zone 2 has been used as a proxy for climate change. This provides a conservative extent, with 31% of the site identified as at risk from a 1% AEP (1 in 100-year) + 70%CC flood event | | | | | e allowances je. This isk from a 1% | |
| | the site | The 1% AEP (1 in 100-year) surface water flood extent within the site increases when a 40% climate change allowance is applied to rainfall. However, it does not reach the 0.1% (1 in 1,000-year) surface water flood extent. | | | | | | |



| Site code | | EM02 | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Site name | | Land to the south of Wiggenhall Industria | l Estate | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Bedrock Geology | The site is underlain by Sussex White Chalk Formation. | | | | |
| | Superficial Geology | There are glacial sand and gravel deposi | ts across the site. | | | |
| | Soils | oamy and clayey floodplain soils with naturally high groundwater. | | | | |
| | | Storage of surface water runoff from the or should be located out of fluvial flood risk a SuDS techniques (such as green roofs, ra paving) are utilised across the site. | development during extreme events areas. It is advised that source control ainwater harvesting and permeable | | | |
| | | Conveyance features should be designed paths where possible. | above ground and follow natural flow | | | |
| | | Groundwater flood risk is variable across that groundwater monitoring is undertake better understand the groundwater dynam | the site and therefore it is recommended n (preferably during winter months), to nics. | | | |
| | SuDS | Where below ground storage is proposed, the base of the feature must be located at least 1m above the highest groundwater level, to reduce the risk of groundwater ingress or flotation. | | | | |
| Requirement for drainage control and impact mitigation | | The bedrock geology suggests that infiltration may be suitable. However, mapping indicates a high risk of groundwater flooding and the site is located within Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1. Therefore further site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration, including at least 12 months of groundwater level monitoring on site. Infiltration techniques should only be used where there are suitable levels of surface water runoff treatment, and following the granting of any required environmental permits from the Environment Agency. | | | | |
| | Groundwater Source Protection Zone | The site is within Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1 (inner zone). This is defined as the 50 day travel time from any point below the water table to the groundwater catchment source. The Environment Agency may object to certain forms of development which present a high risk of groundwater contamination. | | | | |
| | Historic Landfill Site | There are no historic landfill sites within the proximity. | he site boundary or within close | | | |
| | Opportunities for flood risk betterment | Opportunities for using source control SuDS to manage runoff rates and volume contributing to the reduction of flood peaks downstream on the River Colne and existing surface water flow paths leaving the site. Redevelopment of the site should look to reduce coverage of impermeable area where possible. Where surface water has previously been connected to combined sewers, there is opportunity to reduce the risk of sewer flooding and Combined Sewer (USC) discharges. | | | | |
| | Cumulative | Water Framework Directive Catchment | Sensitivity to cumulative impacts | | | |
| | impacts of development | Colne (from Confluence with Ver to Gade) | High | | | |
| | Sequential Test an | d Exception Test requirements | | | | |



| Site code EM02 | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Site name | | Land to the south of Wiggenhall Industrial Estate | |
| | The Sequential Tes Test be applied. It Flood Zone 1. For If More Vul If Essential Infrastru test is satisfied. De Highly Vul More Vuln Recommendations for developers | t must be satisfied. Only once the Sequential Test is satisfied should the Exception is anticipated that proposed development will be sequentially located within this site, the Exception Test must be satisfied: nerable and Essential Infrastructure is located in FZ3a or FZ3a plus climate change. ulnerable development is located in FZ2. Incrure is located in Flood Zone 3b then it must be demonstrated that the exception velopment will not be permitted in the following scenarios: merable development within FZ3a or FZ3a plus climate change and FZ3b. erable and Less Vulnerable development within FZ3b. | |
| Recommend- ations for Local Plan policy | At the pla drainage s Consultatic early stage A site-spec and 3 and on flood assessment Other sou assessment Other sou assessment Climate ch time of the allowances published i The site is development catchment Appropriate identify op development catchment Appropriate identify op development catchment Development catchment Safe access All develop be designed As a brown meet the e and volume be required Storage for risk areas. Floodplain raising of le Infiltration shallow an care must canacity at | Besimin: naming application stage, a site-specific flood risk assessment and surface water rategy will be required. on with the Local Authority and the Environment Agency should be undertaken at an | |



| Site code | | EM02 |
|-----------|---|---|
| Site name | | Land to the south of Wiggenhall Industrial Estate |
| • | The design managed v SuDS desi Statutory T | n must ensure that flows resulting from rainfall in excess of a 1 in 100-year event are via exceedance routes that minimise the risks to people and property. gn must follow Hertfordshire County Council guidance, meet the Defra National Non- rechnical Standards, and follow current best design practice (CIRIA Manual 2015). |

| | S | ite | | | |
|-----|----|-----|----|---|--|
| ref | eı | e | nc | е | |

Site Name Land to the south of Wiggenhall IE

EM02

Watford Borough Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 Detailed Site Summary Tables





| | 5 | π | • | | | |
|-----|---|----|---|----|---|--|
| ref | | re | n | ~6 | 2 | |

Site Name Land to the south of Wiggenhall IE

EM02

Watford Borough Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 Detailed Site Summary Tables





Level 2 SFRA Detailed Site Summary Tables – DRAFT DOCUMENT



JBA

Level 2 SFRA Detailed Site Summary Tables – DRAFT DOCUMENT



| | Defences | Defence Type | Standard of Protection Condition | | | Condition | |
|--|---------------------------|---|---|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|
| | | There are no defences within clo | ose proximi | ty of the site. | | | |
| Flood risk management infrastructure | | Culvert / structure blockage? | There are no culverts within, or within close proximity to, the site. | | | | |
| | Residual risk | Impounded water body failure? | The site is not at risk of flooding due to reservoir breach. | | | ue to reservoir | |
| | | Defence breach / | | Brea | ch Zone | | |
| | | overtopping? | N/A | | | | |
| _ | Flood warning | The site is not covered by an EA Flood Warning or Flood Alert Area. | | | | | |
| Emergency planning | Access and egress | The site is expected to be accessed via Greenhill Crescent. This route is predicted to affected by surface water flooding during the 1% AEP (1 in 100-year) and 0.1% AEP (1 in 1,000-year) rainfall events, which may affect access. | | | | | |
| | Climate change | River Basin District | | Central | Higher Central | Upper End | |
| | '2080s' | Thames | | 25% | 35% | 70% | |
| Climate Change | Implications for the site | The site is predicted to remain within Flood Zone 1, when climate change allowances are applied. The 1% AEP (1 in 100-year) surface water flood extent within the site increases when a 40% climate change allowance is applied to rainfall. However, it does not reach the 0.1% (1 in 1,000-year) surface water flood extent. | | | | | |

JBA consulting

Level 2 SFRA Detailed Site Summary Tables – DRAFT DOCUMENT



JBA



| Site code | EM03 |
|---|--|
| Site name | Gateway Zone |
| Other sour assessmer Climate ch time of the allowances published i The site is I of develop catchment High level a so efforts s Guidance for s Develo Safe a All der should As a b aim to greenf Counce Infiltrat be sha used b the sto Mitigat finishe The de are ma SuDS Non-S 2015). | rces of flooding should also be considered as part of a site-specific flood risk t, including surface water and groundwater. ange should be assessed using recommended climate change allowances at the assessment (https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessments-climate-change- t) for the type of development and level of risk. The current allowances were n February 2016 but may be subject to change in the future. ocated within a catchment identified as moderately sensitive to the cumulative impact ment. The effects which development of the site may have on flood risk within the will need to be considered within a site-specific flood risk assessment. assessment suggests the catchment is largely at risk of surface water flooding, and hould be made within all new developments to limit runoff to greenfield rates. Site design and making development safe: ppment must seek opportunities to reduce overall level of flood risk at the site. ccess and egress should be demonstrated in the 1 in 100 plus climate change event. velopment should adopt source control SuDS techniques. Conveyance features I be designed above ground and following natural flow paths where possible. rownfield site, post-development surface water runoff rates and volumes should meet the equivalent greenfield values, in line with Defra national guidance. If ield rates and volumes are not attainable, consultation with Hertfordshire County il (the LLFA) will be required. tion techniques may be ineffective and may pose a pollution risk. SuDS may need to allow and take up larger areas. Above ground conveyance and attenuation can be but care must be taken that groundwater does not enter the SuDS feature and reduce orage capacity and structural integrity of the design. tion for seasonal high groundwater levels must be considered (for example by raising d floor levels to an appropriate height above ground level). seign must ensure that flows resulting from rainfall in excess of a 1 in 100-year event anaged via exceedance routes that minimise the risks to peo |

| Site | |
|-----------|---|
| reference | |
| | ľ |

Site Name Gateway Zone

EM03

Watford Borough Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 Detailed Site Summary Tables





| reference | |
|-----------|--|

Site Name Gateway Zone

EM03

Watford Borough Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 Detailed Site Summary Tables







| Site code | | HS11 | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---------------------------|---------------------|--|--|--|
| Site name | | Lane at 420 – 420a St Albans Road | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Site details | OS Grid reference | TQ 10992 98839 | | | | | | |
| | Area | 0.1 Ha | | | | | | |
| | Current land use | Brownfield | | | | | | |
| | Proposed site use | Residential | | | | | | |
| | Flood risk vulnerability | More vulnerable | | | | | | |
| | Watford Sustainability Area Band | Area of Medium Sustainability | | | | | | |
| | Existing watercourses | There are no watercourse | There are no watercourses within or near the site. | | | | | |
| | Flood history | There are no reported flood incidents within or near the site. | | | | | | |
| | | | Fluvial | | | | | |
| | | Proportion of the site | FZ3b (5% AEP) | FZ3a (1% AEP) | FZ2 (0.1% AEP) | | | |
| | - | at risk (%) | 0% | 0% | 0% | | | |
| | Fluvial | Available modelled data: There is no fluvial model data available for the site, as | | | | | | |
| | | Flood characteristics: The site is located within Flood Zone 1, and is therefore at negligible risk of fluvial flooding. | | | | | | |
| | | Proportion of site at risk (RoFSW) | | | | | | |
| | | 3.3% AEP | 1% AEP | | 0.1% AEP | | | |
| | | (1 in 30) | (1 in 100) | (| 1 in 1,000) | | | |
| | | 9% | 46% | | /1% | | | |
| Sources of | Curfo on Wotor | Description of surface water flow paths: | | | | | | |
| nood risk | Surface water | I ne majority of the site is at moderate risk of surface water flooding, with runoff predicted to enter the site from both Bushev Mill Lane and St Albans Road. The | | | | | | |
| | | highest risk is concentrated in the north eastern corner of the site, where flooding | | | | | | |
| | | is predicted to occur during a 3.3% AEP (1 in 30-year) rainfall event. | | | | | | |
| | | the site during the 1% AFP (1 in 100-year) event and the majority of the site during | | | | | | |
| | | the 0.1% AEP (1 in 1,000-year) rainfall event. | | | | | | |
| | | Proportion of the site | at risk in JBA Gro year) risk cate | undwater Map 1% gories | 6 AEP (1 in 100- | | | |
| | | Depth below surface | Depth below su | rface Total | in highest risk | | | |
| | Groundwater | 0-0.025m | 0.025-0.5m | | ategories | | | |
| | Groundwater | 0% | 0% | | 0% | | | |
| | | The site is at moderate ris | k of groundwater flo | oding, and is loca | ted within Category | | | |
| | | 3, where groundwater leve a 1% AEP (1in 100-year) | 3, where groundwater levels are predicted to lie 0.5 to 5m below the surface during a 1% AEP (1in 100-year) flood event. | | | | | |
| Reservoir The site is not at risk of reservoir flooding. | | | | | | | | |



| Site code | | HS11 | | | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|--|--|---|---|--|
| Site name | | Lane at 420 – 420a St Albans Re | oad | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Canal | There are no canals witin the site | э. | | | |
| | Defences | Defence Type | Standar | d of Protect | ion C | Condition |
| | | There are no defences within the | e site bound | dary. | | |
| Flood risk management | | Culvert / structure blockage? | There are | e no culverts | within the si | te. |
| infrastructure | Residual risk | Impounded water body failure? | The site i breach. | s not at risk (| of flooding d | ue to reservoir |
| | | Defence breach / | | Brea | ach Zone | |
| | | overtopping? | N/A | | | |
| | Flood warning | The site is not covered by an EA | Flood Wa | rning or Floo | d Alert Area | |
| Emergency planning | Access and egress | The site is liley to be accessed road, is at high risk of surface wa the 3.3% AEP (1 in 30-year) rain risk would be required to ensure | via St Alba ter flooding fall event. safe acces | ans Road, to , with floodin Managemen ss and egress | the west of g predicted t t of this surfa s to the site. | ^t the site. This o occur during ice water flood |
| | Climate change | River Basin District | | Central | Higher Central | Upper End |
| | '2080s' | Thames | | 25% | 35% | 70% |
| Climate Change | Implications for the site | The site is predicted to remain w allowances are applied. The 1% AEP (1 in 100-year) sur when a 40% climate change allo reach the 0.1% (1 in 1,000-year) | ithin Flood face water wance is a surface wa | Zone 1, whe flood extent pplied to rair ater flood ext | en climate ch within the sit ıfall. Howeve ent. | ange e increases er, it does not |



| Site code | | HS11 | |
|--|--|---|---|
| Site name | | Lane at 420 – 420a St Albans Road | |
| | | | |
| | Bedrock Geology | The site is underlain by Sussex White Ch | alk Formation. |
| | Superficial Geology | There are glacial sand and gravel deposi | ts across the site. |
| | Soils | Freely draining slightly acid loamy soils. | |
| | 0 | SuDS are possible on all sites, including one. All development should adopt sourc Conveyance features should be designed paths where possible. | previously developed sites such as this e control SuDS techniques. I above ground and following natural flow |
| Requirement for drainage control and | Suds | The bedrock geology suggests that infiltra indicates a high risk of groundwater flood should be carried out to assess potential least 12 months of groundwater level mon should be avoided in areas where the dep | ation may be suitable. However, mapping ing, therefore further site investigation for drainage by infiltration, Including at hitoring on site. If infiltration is suitable it oth to the water table is <1m. |
| impact mitigation | Groundwater Source Protection Zone | The site is within Groundwater Source Pr 400-day travel time from a point below the | otection Zone 2. This is defined as a e water table. |
| | Historic Landfill Site | There are no historic land fill sites within o | close proximity of the site. |
| | Opportunities for flood risk betterment | Opportunities for using source control Su contributing to the reduction in surface wa Redevelopment of the site should look to where possible. Where surface water has sewers, there is opportunity to reduce the Sewer Overflow (CSO) discharges. | DS to manage runoff rates and volumes, ater flow paths leaving the site. reduce coverage of impermeable areas, previously been connected to combined risk of sewer flooding and Combined |
| | Cumulative | Water Framework Directive Catchment | Sensitivity to cumulative impacts |
| | impacts of development | Colne (from Confluence with Ver to Gade) | High |
| | Sequential Test an | d Exception Test requirements | |
| | The site is within Flo passed. The Excep will be safe for its life | bod Zone 1 but at risk from other sources of tion Test is not required under the NPPF, b etime and the risk can be managed through | of flooding. The Sequential Test must be ut it must be shown that the development a sequential approach to design. |
| | Recommendations for developers | for requirements of site-specific Flood | Risk Assessment, including guidance |
| Recommend- ations for Local Plan policy | Flood risk ass At the plan drainage si Consultation early stage A site-spect flooding oth be followed Other source | essment: nning application stage, a site-specific flo trategy will be required. on with the Local Authority and the Environ stric flood risk assessment will be required b her than rivers and the sea. Government g (<u>https://www.gov.uk/guidance/floodrisk-as</u> rees of flooding should also be consider t, including surface water and groundwate | bod risk assessment and surface water ment Agency should be undertaken at an because the site is at risk from sources of juidance on flood risk assessments must <u>seessment-for-planning-applications</u>). red as part of a site-specific flood risk |



| Site code | HS11 |
|---|---|
| Site name | Lane at 420 – 420a St Albans Road |
| | |
| Climate ch time of the allowances published i The site is developme catchment Appropriate identify op developme catchment, restoration Guidance for s Develo Safe a Flow re water As a b aim to greenf Counce All de should Examp and re The de are ma SuDS Non-S 2015). | ange should be assessed using recommended climate change allowances at the assessment (https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessments-climate-change- a) for the type of development and level of risk. The current allowances were n February 2016 but may be subject to change in the future. located within a catchment identified as highly sensitive to the cumulative impact of ent. The effects which development of the site may have on flood risk within the will need to be considered within a site-specific flood risk assessment. e storage of surface water runoff will need to be provided, and assessments should portunities to provide off-site betterment, to help offset the cumulative impact of ent. For example, this may include contribution to the delivery of schemes within the subject as a slood alleviation schemes, Natural Flood Management, SuDS retrofit or river . Site design and making development safe: Dopment must seek opportunities to reduce overall level of flood risk at the site. Iccess and egress should be demonstrated in the 1 in 100 plus climate change event. Outes would need to be preserved if carrying out land-raising within an area of surface flood risk area, and a safe access route provided. Irownfield site, post-development surface water runoff rates and volumes should meet the equivalent greenfield values, in line with Defra national guidance. If field rates and volumes are not attainable, consultation with Hertfordshire County ill (the LLFA) will be required. velopment should adopt source control SuDS techniques. Conveyance features a be designed above ground and following natural flow paths where possible. De features may include swales, attenuation features, green roofs, rainwater capture tage and permeable paving. esign must follow Hertfordshire County Council guidance, meet the Defra National tatutory Technical Standards, and follow current best design practice (CIRIA Manual |

| | S | ite | | |
|-----|---|-----|----|----|
| ref | e | rer | 10 | e. |

Site Name Land at 420-420a St Albans Road

HS11

Watford Borough Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 Detailed Site Summary Tables





| 3 | 116 | • | | |
|-----|-----|---|----|--|
| Foi | ro | n | 20 | |

Tence

HS11

Site Name Land at 420-420a St Albans Road

Watford Borough Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 Detailed Site Summary Tables







| Site code | | HS25 | | | |
|--------------------------|--|---|--|---|---|
| Site name | | Land and buildings at Lov | ver High Street | | |
| | | 1 | | | |
| Site details | OS Grid reference | TQ 11621 95891 | | | |
| | Area | 0.14 Ha | | | |
| | Current land use | Brownfield | | | |
| | Proposed site use | Residential | | | |
| | Flood risk vulnerability | More vulnerable | | | |
| | Watford Sustainability Area Band | Area of High Sustainabilit | у | | |
| | Existing watercourses | There are no watercourse direction approximately 6 | es within the site. Th Om east of the west | ne River Colne flow ern border. | s in a southerly |
| | Flood history | There are no records of h the EA Recorded Flood C located on Lower High St water flooding. | istorical fluvial flood outline dataset. An I reet, adjacent to the | ling within the site b ICC recorded flood e site, which occurre | ooundary, within incident is ed due to surface |
| | | | Fluvial | | |
| | | Proportion of the site | FZ3b (5% AEP) | FZ3a (1% AEP) | FZ2 (0.1% AEP) |
| | | | 0% | 90% | 10% |
| | | Maximum modelled flood level on site (mAOD) | N/A | N/A | 54.48 |
| Sources of flood risk | Fluvial | The site is covered by the 2010 Upper Colne 1D-2D hydraulic model. Flood de and hazard results were not provided with this model, and therefore water lear results have been used. Flood Zone 2 has been used as a proxy for Flood Zone +35%CC and +70%CC extents, as the Upper Colne model became unstable withigher flows were applied. Flood levels for Flood Zone 3a were not available within the site boundary. Flood characteristics: The site is entirely within Flood Zone 2 (0.1% AEP), with the majority of the clear within Flood Zone 3a (10% AEP). | | nodel. Flood depth erefore water level for Flood Zone 3a me unstable when boundary. najority of the site | |
| | | Pr | oportion of site at | risk (RoFSW) | |
| | | 3.3% AEP | 1% AEP | (| 0.1% AEP |
| | | (1 in 30) | (1 in 100) | (* | 1 in 1,000) |
| | Surface Water | Description of surface v Surface water flooding is AEP (1 in 1,000-year) rai the site. The surface water flo | vater flow paths: predicted to cover nfall event, with the ter risk is located poding may occur in | the majority of the e exception of an a within the same an dependently | site during a 0.1% rea in the north of rea as fluvial risk, |
| | Groundwater | Proportion of the site | at risk in JBA Gro year) risk cate | oundwater Map 1% egories | AEP (1 in 100- |



| ildings at Lower | High Street | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| | | | | |
| w surface I 25m | Depth belov 0.025-0 | / surface .5m | Total in h categ | ighest risk gories |
|)% | 0% | | (|)% |
| a high risk of gro undwater is like nt). | oundwater flo ly to be with | oding, with th n 0.025m of t | e entire site v he ground si | vithin Category Irface during a |
| te is at risk of r lenham or Hilfie | eservoir floo Id Park rese | ding in the e voir. | tremely unlik | ely event of a |
| canals within th | ne site. | | | |
| ence Type | Stand | ard of Protec | tion | Condition |
| flood defences | present at th | e site. | | |
| ucture | There a | are no culverte | s within the si | te. |
| water body | The en event o Hilfield | tire site is at ri of a breach ev Park reservoi | sk of flooding /ent on eithe r. | in the unlikely r Aldenham or |
| ach / | | Bre | ach Zone | |
| ? | N/A | | | |
| overed by both E od Alert Area: T uding Carpende od Warning Are | ≟A Flood Ale The Middle R ers Park ea : The Rive | rt and Flood V iver Colne at V r Colne at Wa | Varning Area Vatford and F tford includin | s: Rickmansworth g Bushey |
| The site is likely to be accessed via Lower High Street which is adjacent to western borer of the site. Access is likely to be affected by surface water floor as the road is at risk of flooding during a 3.3% AEP rainfall event and has se reported incidents of surface water flooding. | | adjacent to the water flooding, nd has several | | |
| ver Basin Distr | rict | Central | Higher Central | Upper End |
| | | 25% | 35% | 70% |
| I instability when ood Zone 2 has onservative exte - 70%CC flood e | n applying 35 been used a ent, with 1009 event. | i% and 70% o s a proxy for 6 of the site io | limate chang climate chang lentified as a | e allowances ge. This t risk from a 1 |
| | v surface 25m % a high risk of grundwater is like nt). te is at risk of r lenham or Hilfie canals within th nce Type flood defences ucture water body ach / ? bytered by both E od Alert Area: T Juding Carpende od Warning Are kely to be acce r of the site. Ac s at risk of flood dents of surface ver Basin Distri I instability whe ood Zone 2 has onservative exter 70%CC flood | v surface 25m Depth below 0.025-0 % 0% a high risk of groundwater floundwater is likely to be withint). 0% te is at risk of reservoir floo lenham or Hilfield Park reser 1000 canals within the site. 1000 nce Type Standation flood defences present at the ucture There at The entipe vent of Hilfield water body The entipe vent of Hilfield ach / N/A overed by both EA Flood Alert od Alert Area: The Middle Ridding Carpenders Park od Warning Area: The River kely to be accessed via Low or of the site. Access is likely s at risk of flooding during a dents of surface water flooding ver Basin District H instability when applying 35 ood Zone 2 has been used a onservative extent, with 100% - 70%CC flood event. | v surface 25m Depth below surface 0.025-0.5m % 0% a high risk of groundwater flooding, with th undwater is likely to be within 0.025m of to nt). te is at risk of reservoir flooding in the ex- lenham or Hilfield Park reservoir. canals within the site. nce Type Standard of Protector flood defences present at the site. ucture There are no culverts water body The entire site is at ri event of a breach ex- Hilfield Park reservoi ach / Bre ? N/A overed by both EA Flood Alert and Flood V od Alert Area: The Middle River Colne at Wa uding Carpenders Park od Warning Area: The River Colne at Wa kely to be accessed via Lower High Streer r of the site. Access is likely to be affected s at risk of flooding during a 3.3% AEP raidents of surface water flooding. ver Basin District Central 25% H instability when applying 35% and 70% co ood Zone 2 has been used as a proxy for onservative extent, with 100% of the site ic onservative extent, with 100% of the site ic onservative extent, with 100% of the site ic onservative extent. | v surface 25m Depth below surface 0.025-0.5m Total in h cates % 0% C a high risk of groundwater flooding, with the entire site v undwater is likely to be within 0.025m of the ground sunt). C te is at risk of reservoir flooding in the extremely unlikenham or Hilfield Park reservoir. C canals within the site. C nce Type Standard of Protection C flood defences present at the site. C ucture There are no culverts within the si water body The entire site is at risk of flooding event of a breach event on eithe Hilfield Park reservoir. ach / Breach Zone ? N/A wered by both EA Flood Alert and Flood Warning Area: The River Colne at Watford and Fluiding Carpenders Park od Warning Area: The Middle River Colne at Watford includin kely to be accessed via Lower High Street which is a er of the site. Access is likely to be affected by surface is a trisk of flooding during a 3.3% AEP rainfall event at dents of surface water flooding. ver Basin District Central Higher Central 25% 35% A instability when applying 35% and 70% climate chang oonservative extent, with 100% of the site identified as at -70% CC flood event |



| Site code | | HS25 | |
|--|---|--|---|
| Site name | | Land and buildings at Lower High Street | |
| | | | |
| | Bedrock Geology | The site is underlain by Sussex White Ch | alk Formation |
| Requirement for drainage control and | Superficial Geology | There are alluvium deposits across the si | ie. |
| impact mitigation | Soils | Loamy and clayey floodplain soils with na | turally high groundwater. |
| | | As the site is located entirely within Flood control SuDS techniques (such as green permeable paving) are utilised across the Conveyance features should be designed | Zones 2 and 3, it is advised that source roofs, rainwater harvesting and site. above ground and follow natural flow |
| | | paths where possible. Groundwater flood risk is high across the that groundwater monitoring is undertake better understand the groundwater dynan | site and therefore it is recommended n (preferably during winter months), to nics. |
| | SuDS | Where below ground storage is proposed at least 1m above the highest groundwate groundwater ingress or flotation. | , the base of the feature must be located er level, to reduce the risk of |
| | | The bedrock geology suggests that infiltra indicates a high risk of groundwater flood should be carried out to assess potential least 12 months of groundwater level mor should be avoided in areas where the dep The site is also located within Groundwate therefore infiltration techniques should on levels of treatment, and the required envir Agency have been granted. | ation may be suitable. However, mapping ing, therefore further site investigation for drainage by infiltration, Including at hitoring on site. If infiltration is suitable it oth to the water table is <1m. er Source Protection Zone 1, and ly be used where there are suitable ronmental permits from the Environment |
| | Groundwater Source Protection Zone | The site is within Groundwater SPZ 1 (inr travel time from any point below the wate source. The Environment Agency may ob which present a high risk of groundwater | er zone). This is defined as the 50-day r table to the groundwater catchment ject to certain forms of development contamination. |
| | Historic Landfill Site | There are no historic landfill sites within c development. | lose proximity of the proposed |
| | Opportunities for flood risk betterment | Opportunities for using source control Sul contributing to the reduction of flood peak water flow paths leaving the site. Redevelopment of the site should look to where possible. Where surface water had sewers, there is an opportunity to reduce Sewer Overflow (CSO) discharges. | DS to manage runoff rates and volumes, s downstream and existing surface reduce coverage of impermeable areas, previously been connected to combined the risk of sewer flooding and Combined |
| | | Water Framework Directive Catchment | Sensitivity to cumulative impacts |



Level 2 SFRA Detailed Site Summary Tables – DRAFT DOCUMENT



JBA consulting

| Site | |
|-----------|--|
| reference | |

HS25

Site Name Land and buildings at 247 Lower High Street

Watford Borough Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 Detailed Site Summary Tables





| Site | |
|-----------|--|
| reference | |

HS25

Site Name Land and buildings at 247 Lower High Street

Watford Borough Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 Detailed Site Summary Tables







| Site name Land and garages to the rear of 2-24 Elfrida Road Site details OS Grid reference TQ 11140 95716 Area 0.08 Ha Current land use Brownfield Proposed site use Residential |
|--|
| Site details OS Grid reference TQ 11140 95716 Area 0.08 Ha Current land use Brownfield Proposed site use Residential |
| Site details OS Grid reference TQ 11140 95716 Area 0.08 Ha Current land use Brownfield Proposed site use Residential |
| Area 0.08 Ha Current land use Brownfield Proposed site use Residential |
| Current land use Brownfield Proposed site use Residential |
| Proposed site use Residential |
| |
| Flood risk vulnerability More vulnerable |
| Watford Area of High Sustainability Area Band Area of High Sustainability |
| Existing watercourses There are no watercourses within the site. |
| Flood history The site is not included within the EA recorded flood outlines. There are also no reported flood incidents near the site. |
| Fluvial |
| Proportion of the site FZ3b (5% AEP) FZ3a (1% AEP) FZ2 (0.1% AEF |
| Fluvial Available modelled date: There is no fluvial model date evailable for the site of |
| it is located within Flood Zone 1. |
| Flood characteristics: The site is located within Flood Zone 1, and is therefore a negligible risk of fluvial flooding. |
| Proportion of site at risk (RoFSW) |
| 3.3% AEP 1% AEP 0.1% AEP |
| (1 in 30) (1 in 100) (1 in 1,000) |
| |
| flood risk The majority of the site is at risk of surface water flooding during the 0.1% AFP (|
| in 1,000-year) rainfall event. The flooding is caused by ponding against the railwa |
| embankment, to the west of the site. |
| occur during the 1% AEP (1 in 100-year) event. |
| |
| Proportion of the site at risk in JBA Groundwater Map 1% AEP (1 in 100- year) risk categories |
| Proportion of the site at risk in JBA Groundwater Map 1% AEP (1 in 100- year) risk categories Depth below surface 0-0.025m Depth below surface 0.025-0.5m Total in highest risk categories |
| Proportion of the site at risk in JBA Groundwater Map 1% AEP (1 in 100- year) risk categories Depth below surface 0-0.025m Depth below surface 0.025-0.5m Total in highest risk categories Groundwater 0% 35% 35% |
| Groundwater Proportion of the site at risk in JBA Groundwater Map 1% AEP (1 in 100-year) risk categories Groundwater Depth below surface 0-0.025m Depth below surface 0.025-0.5m Total in highest risk categories Groundwater 0% 35% 35% The south of the site is at a high risk of groundwater flooding. Located withi Category 3, groundwater is predicted to lie between 0.025 – 0.5m below the groun surface during a 1% AEP flood event (1 in 100-year). The remaining areas of th site are located within Category 2, with groundwater levels predicted to lie between 0.5 – 5m below the ground surface. |



| Site code | | HS28 | | | | |
|--------------------------|---|---|--|--------------|-------------------|-----------|
| Site name | | Land and garages to the rear of 2-24 Elfrida Road | | | | |
| | 1 | | | | | |
| | Canal | There are no canals witin the site | e. | | | |
| | Defences | Defence Type | Standar | d of Protect | ion (| Condition |
| | | There are defences present with | in the site. | | | |
| Flood risk management | | Culvert / structure blockage? | There are no culverts within the site. | | | |
| infrastructure | Residual risk | Impounded water body failure? | The site is not at risk of flooding due to reservoir breach. | | | |
| | | Defence breach / | | Breach Zone | | |
| | Flood warning | The site is not included within EA Flood Alert or Flood Warning Areas. | | | | |
| Emergency planning | Access and egress | The site is likely to be accessed from Elfrida Road to the east of the site. Surface water flooding is predicted to affect the road during a 0.1% AEP (1 in 1,000-year) event. Within the adjacent cul-de-sac area, there is a small area of ponding which occurs during the 1% AEP (1 in 100-year) event. | | | | |
| Climate Change | Climate change allowances for '2080s' | River Basin District | | Central | Higher Central | Upper End |
| | | Thames | | 25% | 35% | 70% |
| | Implications for the site | The site remains in Flood Zone 1 when accounting for the impact of climate change. The 1% AEP (1 in 100-year) surface water flood extent within the site increases when a 40% climate change allowance is applied to rainfall. However, it does not reach the 0.1% (1 in 1,000-year) surface water flood extent. | | | | |



| Site code | | HS28 | | | | |
|--|---|---|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Site name | | Land and garages to the rear of 2-24 Elfrida Road | | | | |
| | - | | | | | |
| | Bedrock Geology | The site is underlain by Sussex White Chalk Formation. | | | | |
| | Superficial Geology | Across the site there are glacial sand and gravel deposits. | | | | |
| | Soils | Freely draining slightly acidic loamy soils. | | | | |
| Requirement for drainage control and | | SuDS are possible on all sites, including previously developed sites such as this one. All development should adopt source control SuDS techniques. Conveyance features should be designed above ground and following natural flow paths where possible. | | | | |
| | SuDS | The bedrock geology suggests that infiltration may be suitable. However, mapping indicates a high risk of groundwater flooding, therefore further site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration, Including at least 12 months of groundwater level monitoring on site. If infiltration is suitable it should be avoided in areas where the depth to the water table is <1m. The site is also located within Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1, and therefore infiltration techniques should only be used where there are suitable levels of treatment, and the required environmental permits from the Environment Agency have been granted. | | | | |
| mitigation | Groundwater Source Protection Zone | The site is within Groundwater SPZ 1 (inner zone). This is defined as the 50-day travel time from any point below the water table to the groundwater catchment source. The Environment Agency may object to certain forms of development which present a high risk of groundwater contamination. | | | | |
| | Historic Landfill Site | There are no historic landfill sites within close proximity of the proposed development. | | | | |
| | Opportunities for | Opportunities for using source control SuDS to manage runoff rates and volumes, contributing to the reduction of flood peaks downstream and existing surface water flow paths leaving the site. | | | | |
| | flood risk betterment | Redevelopment of the site should look to reduce coverage of impermeable areas, where possible. Where surface water had previously been connected to combined sewers, there is an opportunity to reduce the risk of sewer flooding and Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) discharges. | | | | |
| | Cumulative impacts of development | Water Framework Directive Catchment | Sensitivity to cumulative impacts | | | |
| | | Colne (from Confluence with Ver to Gade) | High | | | |
| Recommend- ations for Local Plan policy | Sequential Test and Exception Test requirements | | | | | |
| | The site is within Flood Zone 1 but at risk from other sources of flooding. The Sequential Test must be passed. The Exception Test is not required under the NPPF, but it must be shown that the development will be safe for its lifetime and the risk can be managed through a sequential approach to design. | | | | | |
| | Recommendations for requirements of site-specific Flood Risk Assessment, including guidance for developers | | | | | |
| | Flood risk assessment: At the planning application stage a site-specific flood risk assessment and surface water | | | | | |
| | drainage strategy will be required. | | | | | |



| Site code | HS28 |
|---|--|
| Site name | Land and garages to the rear of 2-24 Elfrida Road |
| Consultation early stage A site-spect flooding off be followed Other sourd assessmen Climate ch time of the allowances published in The site is developme catchment Appropriate identify op developme catchment, restoration. Guidance for s Develove Safe a As a b aim to greenf Counce All dev should Mitigat finisher Infiltrat be should Mitigat finisher Infiltrat be should The stores Developme catchment, restoration. Dev | In the series of the feat of 2.2.4 Ender fead in with the Local Authority and the Environment Agency should be undertaken at an the field of the sessessment will be required because the site is at risk from sources of her than rivers and the sea. Government guidance on flood risk assessments must (https://www.gov.uk/guidance/floodrisk-assessment-for-planning-applications). The set of flooding should also be considered as part of a site-specific flood risk t, including surface water and groundwater. ange should be assessed using recommended climate change allowances at the assessment (https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessments-climate-change- t) for the type of development and level of risk. The current allowances were in February 2016 but may be subject to change in the future. located within a catchment identified as highly sensitive to the cumulative impact of nt. The effects which development of the site may have on flood risk within the will need to be considered within a site-specific flood risk assessment. e storage of surface water runoff will need to be provided, and assessments should portunities to provide off-site betterment, to help offset the cumulative impact of nt. For example, this may include contribution to the delivery of schemes within the such as flood alleviation schemes, Natural Flood Management, SuDS retrofit or river stite design and making development safe: poment must seek opportunities to reduce overall level of flood risk at the site. ccess and egress should be demonstrated in the 1 in 100 plus climate change event. rownfield site, post-development surface water runoff rates and volumes should meet the equivalent greenfield values, in line with Defra national guidance. If ield rates and volumes are not attainable, consultation with Hertfordshire County if (the LLFA) will be required. velopment should adopt source control SuDS techniques. Conveyance features be designed above ground and following natural flow paths where possible. tion for seas |

| Site | | | | |
|------|----|-----|----|---|
| ref | er | 'er | ۱C | е |

HS28

Site Name Land and Garages to the rear of 2-24 Elfirda Road

Watford Borough Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 Detailed Site Summary Tables



Dig JBA Consulting 2020. Some of the responses contained in this mapping are based on data and information provided by the Natural Environment Research Council (NERC) or its component body the British Geological Survey (BGS). Your use of any information contained in this mapping is at your own risk. Neither JBA, NERC or BGS in connection with it. Contains Ordnance Survey data © crown copyright and database right 2020. Contains public sector information licensed under the Open GovernmentLicence v3.0.



| Site | |
|-----------|--|
| reference | |

Site Name

HS28

Land and Garages to the rear of 2-24 Elfirda Road

Watford Borough Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 Detailed Site Summary Tables





Level 2 SFRA Detailed Site Summary Tables – DRAFT DOCUMENT



JBA



| Site code | | HS31 | | | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|--|--------------|-------------------|--|
| Site name | | Chalk Hill Car Park | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Canal | There are no canals witin the site | 9. | | | |
| | Defences | Defence Type | Standar | d of Protect | ion (| Condition |
| | | There are no defences present v | vithin the si | ite. | | |
| Flood risk management | Residual risk | Culvert / structure blockage? | There are no culverts within the site. | | | |
| infrastructure | | Impounded water body failure? | The site is not at risk of flooding due to reservoir breach. | | | |
| | | Defence breach / | Breach Zone | | | |
| | | overtopping? | | | | |
| | Flood warning | The site is not within EA Flood Warning or Flood Alert Area. | | | | |
| Emergency planning | Access and egress | The site is likely to be accessed from Chalk Hill, at the south of the site. This route is at a high risk of surface water flooding, particularly to the north-west of the site, where flooding is expected to occur during the 3.33% AEP (1 in 30-year) event. To the north west of the site, Chalk Hill is also located within Flood Zone 2 and Flood Zone 3a. | | | | |
| Climate Change | Climate change allowances for '2080s' | River Basin District | | Central | Higher Central | Upper End |
| | | Thames | | 25% | 35% | 70% |
| | Implications for the site | The site is predicted to remain within Flood Zone 1, when climate change allowances are applied. The 1 in 100-year surface water flood extent within the site increases w climate change allowance is applied to rainfall. However, it does not rea 1,000-year surface water flood extent. | | | | ange s when a 40% reach the 1 in |

Bedrock

Geology

Geology

Soils

SuDS

Groundwater

Protection Zone

Historic Landfill

Opportunities for flood risk

Source

Site

Superficial

Site code

Site name

Requirement for drainage

control and impact

mitigation

Level 2 SFRA Detailed Site Summary Tables -DRAFT DOCUMENT

HS31



| | betterment | sewers, there is opportunity to reduce the Sewer Overflow (CSO) discharges. | risk of sewer flooding and Combined | | |
|--|---|---|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| | Cumulative | Water Framework Directive Catchment | Sensitivity to cumulative impacts | | |
| | impacts of development | Colne (from Confluence with Ver to Gade) | High | | |
| | Sequential Test and Exception Test requirements | | | | |
| Recommend- ations for Local Plan | The site is within Flood Zone 1 but at risk from other sources of flooding. The Sequential Test must be passed. The Exception Test is not required under the NPPF, but it must be shown that the development will be safe for its lifetime and the risk can be managed through a sequential approach to design. | | | | |
| | Recommendations for requirements of site-specific Flood Risk Assessment, including guidance for developers | | | | |
| policy | Flood risk assessment: | | | | |
| At the planning application stage, a site-specific flood risk assessment and s drainage strategy will be required. | | | | | |
| | Consultation with the Local Authority and the Environment Agency should be undertaken at an early stage. | | | | |



| Site code | HS31 |
|---|--|
| Site name | Chalk Hill Car Park |
| | |
| A site-spec flooding ot be followed Other sour assessmer Climate ch time of the allowances published i The site is developme catchment Appropriate identify op developme catchment, restoration Guidance for s Develo Safe a As a b aim to greent Counce Mitigat finishe Infiltra be sha used b the sto Examp and re Storag risk ar The de are ma SuDS Non-S 2015). | bific flood risk assessment will be required because the site is at risk from sources of her than rivers and the sea. Government guidance on flood risk assessments must d (https://www.gov.uk/guidance/floodrisk-assessment-for-planning-applications). rccs of flooding should also be considered as part of a site-specific flood risk t, including surface water and groundwater. ange should be assessed using recommended climate change allowances at the assessment (https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessments-climate-climate-change-a) for the type of development and level of risk. The current allowances were in February 2016 but may be subject to change in the future. Iocated within a catchment identified as highly sensitive to the cumulative impact of ent. The effects which development of the site may have on flood risk within the will need to be considered within a site-specific flood risk assessment. e storage of surface water runoff will need to be provided, and assessments should portunities to provide off-site betterment, to help offset the cumulative impact of ent. For example, this may include contribution to the delivery of schemes within the such as flood alleviation schemes, Natural Flood Management, SuDS retrofit or river . site design and making development safe: opment must seek opportunities to reduce overall level of flood risk at the site. tcccss and egress should be demonstrated in the 1 in 100 plus climate change event. or such a groundwater levels must be considered (for example by raising diflor levels to an appropriate height above ground level). tion techniques may be ineffective and may pose a pollution risk. SuDS may need to allow and take up larger areas. Above ground conveyance and attenuation can be out care must be taken that groundwater dees not enter the SuDS feature and reduce orage capacity and structural integrity of the design. ple features may include swales, attenuation features, green roofs, rainwater capture us |
| Site | 11004 |
|-----------|-------|
| reference | H531 |
| | |

Site Name Chalk Hill Car Park

Watford Borough Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 Detailed Site Summary Tables





| Site reference | HS31 | Watford Borough Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment | WATFORD | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| Site Name | Chalk Hill Car Park | Level 2 Detailed Site Summary Tables | | | |
| © JBA Consulting 2020. Sc JBA, NERC or BGS give al JBA, NERC or BGS in con | ome of the responses contained in this mapping are based on data and informat ny warranty, condition or representation as to the quality, accuracy or completen nection with it. Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database | ion provided by the Natural Environment Research Council (NERC) or its component body the British Geolog ess of suchinformation and all liability (including for negligence) arising from its use is excluded to the fullest e right 2020. Contains public sector information licensed under the Open GovernmentLicence v3.0. | ical Survey (BGS). Your use of any information contained in this mapping is at your own risk. Neither extent permitted by law. Your use of the mapping constitutes your agreement to bring no claim against | | |
| Maxi | mum Fluvial Flood Depth (m) - 1% AEP | Maximum Fluvial Flood Level (mAOD) - 1% AEP | Maximum Fluvial Flood Velocity (m/s) - 1% AEP | | |
| | Canals Main Rivers Ordinary Watercourses | Canais Main Rivers Ordinary Watercourses | -Canals -Main Rivers -Ordinary Watercourses | | |

Site Boundary 1% AEP

10

Πm

0

5

45.6 - 48.8 56.8 - 67.2

52.6 - 56.8

0

5

10

🗆 m

C Other L2 Sites Flood Level (mAOD) 48.8 - 52.6 67.2 - 73.0

41.7 - 45.6

1877

0

5

10

l m

Site Boundary 1% AEP

Other L2 Sites Depth (m)

0 - 0.25

0.25 - 0.50 🔲 1.25 - 1.50

— 0.50 - 0.75 **—** 1.50 - 1.75

— 0.75 - 1.0 **—** 1.75 - 2.0

🗔 1.0 - 1.25 🔳 >2.0

Ν

0.25 - 0.5

1.0 - 2.0

0.5 - 1.0

>2.0

177

Site Boundary 1% AEP

Other L2 Sites Velocity (m/s)

0 - 0.25

Maximum Surface Water Flood Depth (m) -1% AEP Maxmimum Surface Water Flood Level (mAOD) - 1% AEP Maximum Surface Water Flood Velocity (m/s) - 1% AEP Ν Ν Ν Canals Canals -Canals Main Rivers Main Rivers Main Rivers -Ordinary Watercourses Ordinary Watercourses Ordinary Watercourses

Site Boundary **RoFSW 1% AEP** 0.50 - 1.00 Site Boundary RoFSW 1% AEP 0.15 - 0.30 0.90 - 1.20 Site Boundary RoFSW 1% AEP = 0.75 - 1.25 : Moderate ☐ Other L2 Sites Velocity (m/s) ■ 1.00 - 2.00 0 5 10 Other L2 Sites Depth (m) 0.30 - 0.60 > 1.20 0 5 10 0 5 10 COther L2 Sites Hazard = 1.25 - 2.00 : Significant 0 - 0.25 > 2.00 Πm Πm Πm 0.00 - 0.15 0.60 - 0.90 ■< 0.75 : Low ■> 2.00 : Extreme 0.25 - 0.50

Level 2 SFRA Detailed Site Summary Tables – DRAFT DOCUMENT



JBA



| Site code | HS33 |
|-----------|-----------------------|
| Site name | Wiggenhall Road Depot |

| | | Proportion of the site at risk in JBA Groundwater Map 1% AEP (1 in 100- year) risk categories | | | | | P (1 in 100- | |
|--|---------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| | | Depth below surface 0-0.025m | Depth below surface 0.025-0.5m | | urface m | Total in highest risk categories | | |
| | | 48% | | 52% | | 10 | 100% | |
| | Groundwater | The entirety of the site is at high risk of groundwater flooding. The north and west of the site are at highest risk, located within Category 4, where groundwater levels are expected to be at or within 0.025m of the ground surface during a 1% AEP (1 in 100-year) event. The rest of the site is located within Category 3, where groundwater is expected to be between 0.025 – 0.5m of the ground surface during a flood event. | | | | | | |
| | Reservoir | The north of the site is at ri on Aldenham or Hilfield Pa | sk of fl irk res | looding in t ervoir. | he extreme | y unlikely eve | ent of a breach | |
| | Canal | There are no canals witin t | he site |) . | | | | |
| | Defences | Defence Type | | Standar | d of Protec | tion | Condition | |
| | | There are no flood defence | es pres | sent. | | · | | |
| Flood risk management infrastructure | Residual risk | Culvert / structure blockage? | | There are no culverts present within the site. | | | in the site. | |
| | | Impounded water body failure? | | The north of the site is at risk of flooding from reservoirs in the unlikely event of a breach or either Aldenham or Hilfield Park reservoir. | | | flooding from f a breach on eservoir. | |
| | | Defence breach / | | | Breach Zone | | | |
| | | Overtopping? | ito is i | N/A | thin both E | | ning and Flood | |
| Emergency planning | Flood warning | Alert areas: Flood Alert Area: The Middle River Colne at Watford and Rickmansworth including Carpenders Park Flood Warning Area: The River Colne at Watford including Bushey | | | | | | |
| Access and egress The site is likely to be accessed via Deacons Hill at the western bord This route is at risk of fluvial flooding during a 0.1% AEP event. The risk of flooding during a 3.3% AEP (1 in 30-year) rainfall even access to the site may be restricted during times of flood. | | | | | der of the site. road is also at ent. Therefore | | | |
| | Climate change | River Basin Dis | strict | | Central | Higher Central | Upper End | |
| | '2080s' | Thames | | | 25% | 35% | 70% | |
| Climate Change | Implications for the site | Due to model instability when applying 35% and 70% climate chan to inflows, Flood Zone 2 has been used as a proxy for climate char provides a conservative extent, with 12% of the site identified as at 100-year + 70%CC flood event. | | | | limate chang climate chang ntified as at i | e allowances ge. This isk from a 1 in | |
| | | The 1% AEP (1 in 100-year) surface water flood extent within the site increases when a 40% climate change allowance is applied to rainfall. However, it does not reach the 0.1% (1 in 1,000-year) surface water flood extent. | | | | | | |



| Site code | | HS33 | | | |
|---|---|--|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| Site name | | Wiggenhall Road Depot | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Bedrock Geology | The site is underlain by Sussex White C | Chalk Formation. | | |
| | Superficial Geology | There are glacial sand and gravel deposits across the site. | | | |
| | Soils | Freely draining slightly acidic loamy soil. | | | |
| | | SuDS are possible on all sites, including previously developed sites such as this one. All development should adopt source control SuDS techniques. Conveyance features should be designed above ground and following natural flc paths where possible. Where below ground storage is proposed, the base of the feature must be locate of the storage the bighest groundwater level to reduce the risk of | | | |
| | SuDS | groundwater ingress or flotation. Storage of surface water runoff from the development during extreme events should be located out of fluvial flood risk areas. | | | |
| for drainage control and impact mitigation | | indicates a high risk of groundwater flooding and its location within Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1. Therefore further site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration, including at least 12 months of groundwater level monitoring on site. Infiltration techniques should only be used where there are suitable levels of surface water runoff treatment, and following the granting of any required environmental permits from the Environment Agency. | | | |
| | Groundwater Source Protection Zone | The site is within Groundwater SPZ 1 (inner zone). This is defined as the 50-day travel time from any point below the water table to the groundwater catchment source. The Environment Agency may object to certain forms of development which present a high risk of groundwater contamination. | | | |
| | Historic Landfill Site | There are no historic landfill sites within | the site boundary. | | |
| | Opportunities for flood risk betterment | Opportunities for using source control SuDS to manage runoff rates and volumes, contributing to the reduction of existing surface water flow paths leaving the site. Redevelopment of the site should look to reduce coverage of impermeable areas, where possible. Where surface water has previously been connected to combined sewers, there is opportunity to reduce the risk of sewer flooding and Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) discharges. | | | |
| | Cumulative | Water Framework Directive Catchment | Sensitivity to cumulative impacts | | |
| | impacts of development | Colne (from Confluence with Ver to Gade) | High | | |
| | Sequential Test and Exception Test requirements | | | | |



| Site code | | HS33 |
|--|---|--|
| Site name | | Wiggenhall Road Depot |
| | The Sequential Test Test be applied. It Flood Zone 1. For If More Vul If Highly Vu If Essential Infrastru test is satisfied. Dev Highly Vulr More Vuln Recommendations for developers Flood risk ass | t must be satisfied. Only once the Sequential Test is satisfied should the Exception is anticipated that proposed development will be sequentially located within this site, the Exception Test must be satisfied: nerable and Essential Infrastructure is located in FZ3a or FZ3a plus climate change. ulnerable development is located in FZ2. acture is located in Flood Zone 3b then it must be demonstrated that the exception velopment will not be permitted in the following scenarios: nerable development within FZ3a or FZ3a plus climate change and FZ3b. erable and Less Vulnerable development within FZ3b. for requirements of site-specific Flood Risk Assessment, including guidance essment: |
| Recommend- ations for Local Plan policy | At the plan drainage si early stage Consultation early stage A site-spect and 3 and 3 on flood assessment Other sourd assessment Climate ch time of the allowances published i The site is developme catchment Appropriate identify op developme catchment, restoration | nning application stage, a site-specific flood risk assessment and surface water trategy will be required. In with the Local Authority and the Environment Agency should be undertaken at an a. bific flood risk assessment will be required because the site is within Flood Zone 2 at risk from sources of flooding other than rivers and the sea. Government guidance risk assessments must be followed (<u>https://www.gov.uk/guidance/floodrisk- nt-for-planning-applications</u>). Trees of flooding should also be considered as part of a site-specific flood risk at, including surface water and groundwater. ange should be assessed using recommended climate change allowances at the assessment (<u>https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessments-climate-change- action of the type of development and level of risk. The current allowances were in February 2016 but may be subject to change in the future. located within a catchment identified as highly sensitive to the cumulative impact of int. The effects which development of the site may have on flood risk within the will need to be considered within a site-specific flood risk assessment. e storage of surface water runoff will need to be provided, and assessments should portunities to provide off-site betterment, to help offset the cumulative impact of int. For example, this may include contribution to the delivery of schemes within the such as flood alleviation schemes, Natural Flood Management, SuDS retrofit or river</u> |
| | Guidance for s Develo Safe a As a b aim to greenf Counce All de should Floodp the rai Mitigat finishe Infiltrat be sha used b the sto | Site design and making development safe: opment must seek opportunities to reduce overall level of flood risk at the site. ccess and egress should be demonstrated in the 1 in 100 plus climate change event. rownfield site, post-development surface water runoff rates and volumes should meet the equivalent greenfield values, in line with Defra national guidance. If ield rates and volumes are not attainable, consultation with Hertfordshire County iil (the LLFA) will be required. velopment should adopt source control SuDS techniques. Conveyance features I be designed above ground and following natural flow paths where possible. Jolain compensation must be demonstrated for any loss in floodplain storage through sing of levels for development. tion for seasonal high groundwater levels must be considered (for example by raising d floor levels to an appropriate height above ground level). tion techniques may be ineffective and may pose a pollution risk. SuDS may need to allow and take up larger areas. Above ground conveyance and attenuation can be but care must be taken that groundwater does not enter the SuDS feature and reduce but care must be taken that groundwater does not enter the SuDS feature and reduce orage capacity and structural integrity of the design. |

Site code

Site name

Level 2 SFRA Detailed Site Summary Tables -**DRAFT DOCUMENT**



| | are managed via exceedance routes that minimise the risks to people and property. |
|---|---|
| • | SuDS design must follow Hertfordshire County Council guidance, meet the Defra National |
| | Non-Statutory Technical Standards, and follow current best design practice (CIRIA Manual 2015). |
| | |

JBA consulting

| Site | |
|-----------|--|
| reference | |

Site Name Wiggenhall Road Depot

HS33

Watford Borough Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 Detailed Site Summary Tables





| Site | |
|-----------|--|
| reference | |

Site Name Wiggenhall Road Depot

HS33

Watford Borough Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 Detailed Site Summary Tables







| Site code HS35 | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|-------------------------|--|----------------------|--|
| Site name | | Land and Garages at Riverside Road | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Site details | OS Grid reference | TQ 10678 95070 | | | | |
| | Area | 0.1 Ha | | | | |
| | Current land use | Brownfield | | | | |
| | Proposed site use | Residential | | | | |
| | Flood risk vulnerability | More vulnerable | | | | |
| | Watford Sustainability Area Band | Area of Medium Sustaina | bility | | | |
| | Existing watercourses | An ordinary watercourse forms the north eastern border of the site, and flows in a north westerly direction to join the River Colne (Main River) 30m north of the site | | | | |
| Flood history Flood history Fl | | | | The EA Recorded Flood Outlines identifies that one historic flood event, occurring in December 2000, reached the north east boundary of the site. This is reported to have occurred due to exceedance in channel capacity on the River Colne. An incident of external surface water flooding to residential property was also recorded on Riverside Road, although the date of flooding was not specified. | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Proportion of the site FZ3b (5% AEP) FZ3a (1% AEP) FZ2 (| | | | FZ2 (0.1% AEP) | |
| at risk (%) 0% Maximum modelled N/A flood level on site (mAOD) | | | | 470 9670 52.12 52.38 | | |
| | | Available modelled data | 1: | | | |
| Sources of flood risk | Fluvial | Fluvial The site is covered by the 2010 Upper Colne 1D-2D hydraulic model. Flor and hazard results were not provided with this model, and therefore waresults have been used. Flood Zone 2 has been used as a proxy for Flood +35%CC and +70%CC extents, as the Upper Colne model became unsta | | | | |
| | | Flood obsractoristics | | | | |
| | | The entire site is located | l within Flood Zone | 2 and is therefor | a at risk of fluvial | |
| | | flooding during a 0.1% A | EP (1 in 1,000-year |) event. A small are | a at the north east | |
| | | corner of the site is locat | ed within Flood Zo | ne 3a, and is there | fore at higher risk, | |
| | | Pr | oportion of site at | risk (RoFSW) | ar) event. | |
| | | 3.3% AEP 1% AEP 0.1% AEP | | | | |
| | | (1 in 30) | (1 in 100) (1 in 1,000) | | l in 1,000) | |
| | | 0% 2% 11% | | | | |
| Surface Water The majority of the site is at very low risk of surface water flooding eastern and southern borders are at moderate risk, with surface predicted to enter the site from Riverside Road during the 1% AEP (1 event. In the north eastern boundary of the site, surface water risk is the same area as fluvial risk, although surface water flooding | | | | ling. However, the ace water flooding P (1 in 100) rainfall sk is located within oding may occur | | |
| | | independently. | | | | |



| Site code HS35 | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|-----------------------------------|
| Site name | | Land and Garages at Riverside Road | | | | | |
| | | Drepartian of the site | ot rick | | | Map 49/ A | ED (1 in 100 |
| | | Proportion of the site a | at risk ye | ar) risk ca | tegories | мар 1% А | EP (1 IN 100- |
| | Groundwater | Depth below surface 0-0.025m | Depth below surface 0.025-0.5m | | surface m | ce Total in highest risk categories | |
| | | 100% | | 0% | | 100% | |
| | | The entirety of the site is levels expected to lie at o (1 in 100-year) event. | at hig r withir | h risk of g n 0.025m c | roundwater of the groun | flooding, w d surface du | ith groundwater uring a 1% AEP |
| | Reservoir | The entire site is at risk of Hilfield Park reservoir. | f floodi | ng in the e | extremely ur | ilikely event | of a breach on |
| | Canal | There are no canals witin | the site | 9. | | | |
| | Defences | Defence Type | | Standar | d of Protec | tion | Condition |
| | | There are no flood defence | es pre | sent. | | | |
| Flood risk | Residual risk | Culvert / structure blockage? | | There are no culverts present within the site. | | | hin the site. |
| management infrastructure | | Impounded water body failure? | | The entire site is at risk of flooding in the extremely unlikely event of a breach on Hilfie Park reservoir. | | flooding in the each on Hilfield | |
| | | Defence breach / | | Breach Zone | | | |
| Flood warning Flood warning Flood warning Flood warning Flood warning Flood warning Flood Alert Area: The Middle River Colu including Carpenders Park Flood Warning Area: The River Colue | | | | Flood Warn er Colne at V Colne at Wa | l Warning and Flood Alert Areas: ne at Watford and Rickmansworth at Watford including Bushey | | |
| planning | Access and egress | The site is likely to be accessed via Riverside Road at the southern border of th site. This route is at risk of fluvial flooding during a 0.1% AEP event within th vicinity of the site, and is also at high risk of surface water flooding during a 3.3 AEP (1 in 30-year) rainfall event. Therefore access to the site may be restricted during times of flood. | | | | event within the during a 3.3% ay be restrcted | |
| | Climate change | River Basin Di | strict | | Central | Higher Central | Upper End |
| | '2080s' | Thames 25% 35% | | | 70% | | |
| Climate Change | Implications for the site | Due to model instability wh to inflows, Flood Zone 2 has provides a conservative ex 100-year + 70%CC flood e The 1% AEP (1 in 100-year | and 70% of a proxy for tire site iden flood extent | limate chan climate char tified as at r within the s | ge allowances ige. This isk from a 1 in ite increases | | |
| | | when a 40% climate change allowance is applied to rainfall. However, it does not reach the 0.1% (1 in 1,000-year) surface water flood extent. | | | | | |



| Site code | | HS35 | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|--|
| Site name | | Land and Garages at Riverside Road | | | |
| | F | | | | |
| | Bedrock Geology | The site is underlain by Sussex White Chalk Formation. | | | |
| | Superficial Geology | There are glacial sand and gravel deposits across the site. | | | |
| | Soils | Loamy and clayey floodplain soils with r | naturally high groundwater. | | |
| Requirement for drainage control and impact mitigation | | SuDS are possible on all sites, including one. All development should adopt sour Conveyance features should be designe paths where possible. | g previously developed sites such as this rce control SuDS techniques. ed above ground and following natural flow | | |
| | SuDS | Where below ground storage is proposed, the base of the feature must be located at least 1m above the highest groundwater level, to reduce the risk of groundwater ingress or flotation. | | | |
| | | The bedrock geology suggests that infiltration may be suitable. However, mapping indicates a high risk of groundwater flooding and its location within Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1. Therefore further site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration, including at least 12 months of groundwater level monitoring on site. Infiltration techniques should only be used where there are suitable levels of surface water runoff treatment, and following the granting of any required environmental permits from the Environment Agency. | | | |
| | Groundwater Source Protection Zone | The site is within Groundwater SPZ 1 (inner zone). This is defined as the 50-day travel time from any point below the water table to the groundwater catchment source. The Environment Agency may object to certain forms of development which present a high risk of groundwater contamination. | | | |
| | Historic Landfill Site | There are no historic landfill sites within the site boundary. | | | |
| | Opportunities for flood risk betterment | Opportunities for using source control SuDS to manage runoff rates and volumes, contributing to the reduction of existing surface water flow paths leaving the site. Redevelopment of the site should look to reduce coverage of impermeable areas, where possible. Where surface water has previously been connected to combined sewers, there is opportunity to reduce the risk of sewer flooding and Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) discharges. | | | |
| | Cumulative | Water Framework Directive Catchment | Sensitivity to cumulative impacts | | |
| | impacts of development | Colne (from Confluence with Ver to Gade) | High | | |
| Sequential Test an | | d Exception Test requirements | | | |

DRAFT DOCUMENT



| Site code | | HS35 | |
|--|--|---|--|
| Site name | | Land and Garages at Riverside Road | |
| Recommend- ations for Local Plan policy | The Sequential Tes Test be applied. It Flood Zone 1. For If More Vul If Highly Vul Stassential Infrastru- test is satisfied. De Highly Vul More Vul More Vul Recommendations for developers Flood risk ass At the pla drainage s Consultation early stage A site-spect and 3 and on flood assessmen Other sou assessmen Climate ch time of the allowances published i The site is development catchment Appropriate identify op development catchment Safe a As a b aim to greent Counce All de should Flood the rai | t must be satisfied. Only once the Sequential Test is satisfied should the Exception is anticipated that proposed development will be sequentially located within this site, the Exception Test must be satisfied: inerable and Essential Infrastructure is located in FZ3a or FZ3a plus climate change. Junerable development is located in FZ2. Incure is located in Flood Zone 3b then it must be demonstrated that the exception velopment will not be permitted in the following scenarios: nerable development within FZ3a or FZ3a plus climate change and FZ3b. erable and Less Vulnerable development within FZ3b. for requirements of site-specific Flood Risk Assessment, including guidance essment: nning application stage, a site-specific flood risk assessment and surface water trategy will be required. on with the Local Authority and the Environment Agency should be undertaken at an e. | |



| Site code | HS35 |
|---|---|
| Site name | Land and Garages at Riverside Road |
| Stor risk The are SuD Non 201 | age for runoff from the development in extreme events should be located out of flood areas. design must ensure that flows resulting from rainfall in excess of a 1 in 100-year event nanaged via exceedance routes that minimise the risks to people and property. S design must follow Hertfordshire County Council guidance, meet the Defra National Statutory Technical Standards, and follow current best design practice (CIRIA Manual b). |

| Site | |
|-----------|--|
| reference | |

Site Name

Land and Garages at Riverside Road

HS35

Watford Borough Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 Detailed Site Summary Tables





| Site | |
|-----------|--|
| reference | |

Site Name

Land and Garages at Riverside Road

HS35

Watford Borough Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 Detailed Site Summary Tables







| Site code | | MX06 | | | | |
|--------------|--|---|------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| Site name | | Land at Watford Junction Station | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Site details | OS Grid reference | TQ 11052 97405 | | | | |
| | Area | 7.5 На | | | | |
| | Current land use | Brownfield | | | | |
| | Proposed site use | Mixed use – residential ar | nd commercial | | | |
| | Flood risk vulnerability | More vulnerable | | | | |
| | Watford Sustainability Area Band | Area of High Sustainability | / | | | |
| | Existing watercourses | There are no watercourse | s within the site bou | undary. | | |
| | Flood history | There are no recorded floo | od incidents within t | he site. | | |
| | | | Fluvial | | | |
| | Fluvial | Proportion of the site | FZ3b (5% AEP) | FZ3a (1% AEP |) FZ2 (0.1% AEP) | |
| | | Available modelled date | 0% | 0% | 0% | |
| | | Available modelled data: There is no fluvial model data available for the site, as it is located within Flood Zone 1. | | | | |
| | | Flood characteristics: The site is located within Flood Zone 1, and is therefore at negligible risk of fluvial flooding. | | | | |
| | | Proportion of site at risk (RoFSW) | | | | |
| | | 3.3% AEP | 1% AEP | | 0.1% AEP | |
| Sources of | | (1 in 30) | (1 in 100) | | (1 in 1,000) | |
| flood risk | | 970 21% 50% | | | | |
| | Surface Water | The site is at high risk of s | urface water floodin | g. The highest ar | reas of risk within the | |
| | | site are in the south (near the existing bus station) and in the north, which are at | | | | |
| | | risk of flooding during a 3.3% AEP (1 in 30-year) rainfall event. A much larger area, through the centre of the site, is at risk of flooding during the 0.1% AEP (1 in 1.000- | | | | |
| | | year) event. | | | | |
| | | Proportion of the site | at risk in JBA Gro | undwater Map 1 | % AEP (1 in 100- | |
| | | | year) risk cate | gories | | |
| | | Depth below surface 0-0.025m | Depth below su 0.025-0.5m | rface Tota | al in highest risk categories | |
| | Groundwater | | | | | |
| | | 0% | 0% | | 0% | |
| | | The entire site is at moderate risk of groundwater flooding, and is located within Category 3, where groundwater levels are predicted to lie 0.5 to 5m below the | | | | |
| | | surface during a 1% AEP | (1in 100-year) floo | d event. | | |



| Site code | | MX06 | | | | | |
|--------------------------|---|---|--|---------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Site name | | Land at Watford Junction Station | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Reservoir | The site is not at risk of reservoir | flooding. | | | | |
| | Canal | There are no canals witin the site. | | | | | |
| | Defences | Defence Type | Standar | d of Protect | ion C | Condition | |
| | | There are no flood defences with | nin the site. | | | | |
| Flood risk management | | Culvert / structure blockage? | There are potential | e no culvert risk to the sit | s or structu e. | res to pose a | |
| infrastructure | Residual risk | Impounded water body failure? | The site is not at risk of flooding due to reservoid breach. | | | ue to reservoir | |
| | | Defence breach / | | Brea | ach Zone | | |
| | | overtopping? | N/A | | | | |
| | Flood warning | The site is not covered by an EA Flood Warning or Flood Alert Area. | | | | | |
| Emergency planning | Access and egress and egress and egress | | | | oodford Roa he 0.1% AE be accessed ing the 1 in 1 | Road. The entirety AEP (1 in 1,000- sed via St Albans in 100-year event | |
| | Climate change | River Basin District | | Central | Higher Central | Upper End | |
| '2080s' | | Thames | | 25% | 35% | 70% | |
| Climate Change | Implications for the site | Thankes 25% 35% 70% The site is predicted to remain within Flood Zone 1, when climate change allowances are applied. The 1% AEP (1 in 100-year) surface water flood extent within the site increase when a 40% climate change allowance is applied to rainfall. However, it does reach the 0.1% (1 in 1,000-year) surface water flood extent. | | | | | |



| Site code | | MX06 | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Site name | | Land at Watford Junction Station | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Requirement for drainage control and | Bedrock Geology | The site is underlain by Sussex White Ch | alk Formation. | | | |
| | Superficial Geology | There are glacial sand and gravel deposit | is across the site. | | | |
| | Soils | Freely draining slightly acidic loamy soil. | | | | |
| | | SuDS are possible on all sites, including p one. All development should adopt source Conveyance features should be designed paths where possible. | previously developed sites such as this e control SuDS techniques. I above ground and following natural flow | | | |
| | SuDS | The bedrock geology suggests that infiltra indicates a moderate risk of groundwater investigation should be carried out to asso Including at least 12 months of groundwa is suitable it should be avoided in areas w <1m. | ation may be suitable. However, mapping flooding, therefore further site ess potential for drainage by infiltration, ter level monitoring on site. If infiltration /here the depth to the water table is | | | |
| impact mitigation | Groundwater Source Protection Zone | The site is within Groundwater Source Protection Zone 2. This is defined as a 400-day travel time from a point below the water table. | | | | |
| | Historic Landfill Site | There are no historic land fill sites within close proximity of the site. | | | | |
| | Opportunities for flood risk betterment | Opportunities for using source control SuDS to manage runoff rates and volumes contributing to the reduction in surface water flow paths leaving the site. Redevelopment of the site should look to reduce coverage of impermeable areas where possible. Where surface water has previously been connected to combine sewers, there is opportunity to reduce the risk of sewer flooding and Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) discharges. | | | | |
| | Cumulative | Water Framework Directive Catchment | Sensitivity to cumulative impacts | | | |
| | impacts of development | Colne (from Confluence with Ver to Gade) | High | | | |
| | Sequential Test and Exception Test requirements The site is within Flood Zone 1 but at risk from other sources of flooding. The Sequential Te passed. The Exception Test is not required under the NPPF, but it must be shown that the de will be safe for its lifetime and the risk can be managed through a sequential approach to des | | | | | |
| Recommend- ations for Local Plan policy | Recommendations for requirements of site-specific Flood Risk Assessment, including guidance | | | | | |
| | Flood risk ass At the pla drainage s Consultatio early stage A site-spec flooding ot | essment: nning application stage, a site-specific flo trategy will be required. on with the Local Authority and the Environr e. cific flood risk assessment will be required b her than rivers and the sea. Government g | bod risk assessment and surface water ment Agency should be undertaken at an because the site is at risk from sources of uidance on flood risk assessments must | | | |
| | be followed | d (<u>https://www.gov.uk/guidance/floodrisk-as</u> | sessment-for-planning-applications). | | | |



Site reference

Site Name Land at Watford Junction Station

MX06

Watford Borough Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 Detailed Site Summary Tables





Site reference

Site Name Land at Watford Junction Station

MX06

Watford Borough Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 Detailed Site Summary Tables







| Site code | | MX12 | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|---|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Site name | | Land at Tesco, Lower High Street, Watford | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Site details | OS Grid reference | TQ 11700 96099 | | | | |
| | Area | 7.6 На | | | | |
| | Current land use | Commercial site with parking area | | | | |
| | Proposed site use | Mixed use – residential and commercial | | | | |
| | Flood risk vulnerability | More vulnerable | | | | |
| | Watford Sustainability Area Band | Area of high sustainability | , | | | |
| | Existing watercourses | The River Colne flows thr There is also a culverted River Colne. | ough the centr watercourse in | e of the site in the south ea | n a sou st whicl | thernly direction. h connects to the |
| | Flood history | The Environment Agency Recorded Flood Outlines dataset includes the following flood incidents within the site, all of which have occurred as a result of channel exceedance from the River Colne: • July 1987 • October 1993 • December 2000 • February 2009 • February 2014 | | | | |
| | | Fluvial | | | | |
| | | Proportion of the site | FZ3b | FZ3a | | FZ2 |
| | | at 115K (70) | (5% AEP) 7% | (1% AE) 30% | P) | (0.1% AEP) 60% |
| Sources of flood risk | | Maximum modelled flood level on site (mAOD) | 54.24 | 55.15 | | 55.83 |
| | Fluvial | Available modelled data: The site is covered by the Environment Agency 2010 Upper Colne model. A a linked 1D-2D model, flood depth grids were not provided with this However, modelled water levels were provided and have been used. instability of the model when run with higher flows, Flood Zone 2 has been a proxy for Flood Zone 3a + 70%CC. Flood characteristics: The majority of the site is located within Flood Zone 2, with a 0.1% chance of flooding in any given year. A significant area in the north and east of the site located within Flood Zone 3a, where there is a 1% chance of flooding in ary year. Flood Zone 3b, the functional floodplain, closely follows the chance | | | | Colne model. Although ded with this model. e been used. Due to the 2 has been used as 0.1% chance of fluvial east of the site is also f flooding in any given ws the channel of the |
| | | River Coine. | oportion of si | te at risk (Ro | FSW) | |
| | Surface Water | 3.3% AEP (1 in 30) | 1% | AEP 100) | | 0.1% AEP |
| | | 3% | 99 | % | | 41% |



| Site code | | MX12 | | | |
|-----------|-------------|--|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Site name | | Land at Tesco, Lower High Street, Watford | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | Description of surface water flow paths: The site is at risk of surface water flooding, predominantly during a 1 in 1,000-year (0.1% AEP) event. The north of the site is at greatest risk. It should be noted that this area is also within the fluvial flood zones. There are areas within the site that are at a higher risk (1 in 30-year event), but this | | | |
| | | Proportion of site at risk in JBA Groundwater Map 1% AEP (1 in 100-year risk categories | | ap 1% AEP (1 in 100-year) | |
| | | Depth below surface 0-0.025m | Depth below surface 0.025-0.5m | Total in highest risk categories | |
| | Groundwater | 27% | 71% | 98% | |
| | | The site is at a high risk of groundwater flooding. Across the majority of the site, groundwater levels predicted to reach 0.025 – 0.5m below the ground surface during a 1% AEP event (Category 3). There are areas of higher risk (Category 4) in the north, centre and south west of the site, where the groundwater is estimated to lie within 0.025m of the ground surface for the same flood event. The entire site is at risk of reservoir flooding in the extremely unlikely event of a breach at Aldenham or Hilfield Park reservoirs. | | | |
| | Reservoir | | | | |
| | Canal | There are no canals witin | the site. | | |



| Site code | | MX12 | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|--|---|--|--|
| Site name | | Land at Tesco, Lower High Street, Watford | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Flood risk management infrastructure | | Defence Type | Standard | of Protecti | ion (| Condition |
| | Flood defences | There are no defences within the site or within close proximity. However, flood defence walls on the River Colne are located 25m downstream of the site. Therefore, the south west boundary of the site is classified as benefiting from defence. | | | | |
| | Residual risk | Culvert / structure blockage? | | | | the River Colne, at the ses a risk of blockage, span structure it is not gh probability of blocking. modelling indicate that ert by 75% significantly ding during the 1% AEP of the site at risk. Peak 0.02m in the south west e northern access roads. g increases with 90% e, although flood depths range. |
| | | Impounded water body failure? | In the unli Aldenham the entire s | In the unlikely event of a reservoir breach at Aldenham Reservoir or Hilfield Park Reservoir, the entire site would be at risk of flooding | | |
| | | Defence breach / | | Brea | ich Zone | - |
| | | | | | | |
| | Flood warning | The site is within the following Er Areas: • Flood Alert Area: The M including Carpenders P • Flood Warning Area: Th | N/A nvironment A liddle River ark ne River Coli | Agency Floo Colne at W ne at Watfo | od Alert and atford and F rd including | Flood Warning Rickmansworth Bushey. |
| Emergency planning | Flood warning Access and egress | The site is within the following Er Areas: Flood Alert Area: The M including Carpenders P Flood Warning Area: The Flood Warning Area: The There are multiple routes providin north, A411 Waterfields Way to south west. Water Lane is located wihin Floo flooding, wih access predicted to flood event. However, the road is Lower High Street is also at high Waterfields Way, with flooding p 100-year) and 0.1% AEP (1 in predicted to flood from surface greater rainfall events. A411 Waterfields Way is located likely to be affected by flooding However, the surface water flood east of the site affected during the | Aiddle River ark ne River Colu- ing access to the east/sou od Zone 3b be restricted s at very low fluvial risk, p redicted to r 1,000-year) water durin d within Flo during a 1 risk is lower ie 1% AEP (| Agency Floo Colne at W ne at Watfo the site, in the site, in the site, in the site, in the site, in the site, in the site, in the site, | atford and F rd including cludimg Wa d Lower Hig 6 AEP (1 in 2 ace water flo bear the junct ace water flo bear the junct bear | Flood Warning Rickmansworth Bushey. ter Lane to the h Street to the h Street to the n risk of fluvial 20-year) fluvial boding. tion with A411 1% AEP (1 in e route is also 30-year) and fore, access is) fluvial event. but to the south vent. |
| Emergency planning Climate | Flood warning Access and egress | The site is within the following Er Areas: Flood Alert Area: The M including Carpenders P Flood Warning Area: The There are multiple routes providin north, A411 Waterfields Way to south west. Water Lane is located wihin Flood flooding, wih access predicted to flood event. However, the road is Lower High Street is also at high Waterfields Way, with flooding p 100-year) and 0.1% AEP (1 in predicted to flood from surface greater rainfall events. A411 Waterfields Way is located likely to be affected by flooding However, the surface water flood east of the site affected during th River Basin District | Aiddle River ark ne River Coll ng access to the east/sou od Zone 3b be restricted s at very low fluvial risk, p redicted to r 1,000-year) water durin d within Flo d within Flo d within Flo | Agency Floo Colne at W ne at Watfo the site, in the ast and and is there during a 5% risk of surfa particularly r restrict acce fluvial flood ng the 3.3% od Zone 3a % AEP (1 r, with only th 1 in 100-ye Central | ad Alert and atford and F rd including cludimg Wa d Lower Hig b AEP (1 in ace water flo bear the junc ess during a d event. The b AEP (1 in a and theref in 100-year he roundabo ar) rainfall e Higher Central | Flood Warning Rickmansworth Bushey. ter Lane to the h Street to the h risk of fluvial 20-year) fluvial boding. tion with A411 1% AEP (1 in e route is also 30-year) and fore, access is) fluvial event. but to the south vent. |



| Site code | MX12 | | |
|---------------------------|--|--|--|
| Site name | Land at Tesco, Lower High Street, Watford | | |
| | | | |
| Implications for the site | Due to model instability within the Upper Colne when applying plus 35% and 70% climate change allowances to inflows, Flood Zone 2 has been used as a proxy for the extent of Flood Zone 3a plus climate change. This provides a conservative extent, with 90% of the site identified as at risk from a 1% AEP (1 in 100-year) plus 35%/70% climate change flood event. The 1% AEP (1 in 100-year) surface water flood extent within the site increases when a 40% climate change allowance is applied to rainfall. However, it does not | | |



| Site code | | MX12 |
|--|---|--|
| Site name | | Land at Tesco, Lower High Street, Watford |
| | | |
| | Bedrock Geology | The site is underlain by Sussex White Chalk Formation. |
| | Superficial (surface) Geology | The majority of the site is overlain with alluvial deposits. Along the eastern border there is an area of glacial sands and gravels. |
| | Soils | The site contains loamy and clayey floodplain soils, with naturally high groundwater. |
| | | Storage of surface water runoff from the development during extreme events should be located out of fluvial flood risk areas. Due to the constrained space outside Flood Zones 2 and 3, it is advised that source control SuDS techniques (such as green roofs, rainwater harvesting and permeable paving) are utilised across the site. |
| Requirement for drainage control and impact mitigation | SuDS | Conveyance features should be designed above ground and follow natural flow paths where possible. |
| | | Groundwater flood risk is variable across the site and therefore it is recommended that groundwater monitoring is undertaken (preferably during winter months), to better understand the groundwater dynamics. |
| | | Where below ground storage is proposed, the base of the feature must be located at least 1m above the highest groundwater level, to reduce the risk of groundwater ingress or flotation. |
| | | The bedrock geology suggests that infiltration may be suitable. However, mapping indicates a high risk of groundwater flooding and its location within Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1. Therefore further site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration, including at least 12 months of groundwater level monitoring on site. Infiltration techniques should only be used where there are suitable levels of surface water runoff treatment, and following the granting of any required environmental permits from the Environment Agency. |
| | Groundwater Source Protection Zone (SPZ) | The site is within Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1 (inner zone). This is defined as the 50-day travel time from any point below the water table to the groundwater catchment source. The Environment Agency may object to certain forms of development which present a high risk of groundwater contamination. |
| | Historic Landfill Site | There are no historic landfill sites within the site boundary or within close proximity. |



| Site code | | MX12 | |
|--|--|---|---|
| Site name | | Land at Tesco, Lower High Street, Watford | |
| | Opportunities for flood risk betterment | Opportunities for using source control SuDS to manage runoff rates and volumes, contributing to the reduction of flood peaks downstream on the River Colne and existing surface water flow paths leaving the site. Redevelopment of the site should look to reduce coverage of impermeable areas, where possible. The River Colne is heavily engineered at this location, and opportunities should be taken to re-naturalise the watercourse, to help mitigate flood risk downstream. Removal, or 'daylighting' of the culvert in the east of the site should be undertaken where possible, to increase biodiversity and reduce the risk of flooding due to blockage. Where surface water has previously been connected to combined sewers, there is opportunity to reduce the risk of sewer flooding and Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) discharges. | |
| | Cumulative impacts of | Water Framework Directive Catchment | Sensitivity to cumulative impacts |
| | development (see SW Herts L1 SFRA, 2019) | Colne (from Confluence with Ver to Gade) | High |
| Recommend- ations for Local Plan policy | Sequential Test an Exception Test requirements The Sequential Test must be passed. Only once the Sequential Test is passed should the Exception Test be applied. For this site, the Exception Test would be required: If More Vulnerable and Essential Infrastructure is located in FZ3a or FZ3a plus climate change. If Highly Vulnerable development is located in FI22. If Essential Infrastructure is located in FI0od Zone 3b Development will not be permitted in the following scenarios: Highly Vulnerable and Less Vulnerable development within FZ3b. More Vulnerable and Less Vulnerable development within FZ3b. More Vulnerable and Less Vulnerable development within FZ3a, and therefore, the Exception Test must be applied. For this site, More Vulnerable development is proposed within FZ3a, and therefore, the Exception Test must be applied. The site is at high risk of flooding from multiple sources, and therefore it may not be safe to develop the site for residential purposes. Evidence that both parts of the Exception Test can be fulfilled will be required to justify development of the site. Recommendations for requirements of site-specific Flood Risk Assessment, including guidance for developers At the planning application stage, a site-specific flood risk assessment and surface water drainage strategy will be required. Consultation with the Local Authority and the Environment Agency should be undertaken at an | | |
| | A site-spec and 3 and 3 assessmer planning-al Other sour assessmer Climate ch | cific flood risk assessment will be required at risk from sources of flooding other than r nts must be followed (<u>https://www.g</u> <u>pplications</u>). rces of flooding should also be consider at, including surface water and groundwate ange should be assessed using recomment (<u>https://www.g</u> | because the site is within Flood Zone 2 ivers. Government guidance on flood risk <u>ov.uk/guidance/floodrisk-assessment-for-</u> red as part of a site-specific flood risk r. ended climate change allowances at the |



| Site code | | MX12 |
|-----------|--|--|
| Site name | | Land at Tesco, Lower High Street, Watford |
| | | |
| | allowances published i The site is developme catchment Appropriate identify op developme catchment, restoration | a) for the type of development and level of risk. The current allowances were in February 2016 but will be subject to change in the future. located within a catchment identified as highly sensitive to the cumulative impact of ent. The effects which development of the site may have on flood risk within the will need to be considered within a site-specific flood risk assessment. e storage of surface water runoff will need to be provided, and assessments should portunities to provide off-site betterment, to help offset the cumulative impact of ent. For example, this may include contribution to the delivery of schemes within the , such as flood alleviation schemes, Natural Flood Management, SuDS retrofit or river |
| | Guidance for s Develo Safe a event. All de should As a b aim to greenf Counce Storage flood r Floodp the rai Mitigar finishe Infiltra be sha used, l the storage the storage the rai Sups Non-S 2015). | site design and making development safe: opment must seek opportunities to reduce the overall level of flood risk at the site. access and egress should be demonstrated in the 1 in 100-year plus climate change velopment should adopt source control SuDS techniques. Conveyance features d be designed above ground and following natural flow paths where possible. prownfield site, post-development surface water runoff rates and volumes should meet the equivalent greenfield values, in line with Defra national guidance. If field rates and volumes are not attainable, consultation with Hertfordshire County cil (the LLFA) will be required. ge for runoff from the development in extreme events should be located out of fluvial isk areas. olain compensation must be demonstrated for any loss in floodplain storage through ising of levels for development. tion for seasonal high groundwater levels must be considered (for example by raising de floor levels to an appropriate height above ground level). tion techniques may be ineffective and may pose a pollution risk. SuDS may need to allow and take up larger areas. Above-ground conveyance and attenuation can be but care must be taken that groundwater does not enter the SuDS feature and reduce orage capacity and structural integrity of the design. esign must ensure that flows resulting from rainfall in excess of a 1 in 100-year event anaged via exceedance routes that minimise the risks to people and property. design must follow Hertfordshire County Council guidance, meet the Defra National tatutory Technical Standards, and follow current best design practice (CIRIA Manual |

Site reference

Site Name Land at Tesco Lower High Street

MX12

Watford Borough Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 Detailed Site Summary Tables





Site reference

Site Name Land at Tesco Lower High Street

MX12

Watford Borough Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 Detailed Site Summary Tables





Level 2 SFRA Detailed Site Summary Tables – DRAFT DOCUMENT



JBA

Reservoir

Canal

Site code

Site name





breach at Aldenham or Hilfield Park reservoir.

There are no canals witin the site.

The entire site is at risk of reservoir flooding, in the extremely unlikely event of a

JBA consulting

Level 2 SFRA Detailed Site Summary Tables – DRAFT DOCUMENT



JBA



| Site code | | MX14 | |
|--|---|---|---|
| Site name | | Colne Valley Retail Park | |
| | | | |
| | Bedrock Geology | The site is underlain by Sussex White Chalk Formation. | |
| | Superficial Geology | There are glacial sand and gravel deposits across the site. | |
| | Soils | Loamy and clayey floodplain soils with na | aturally high groundwater. |
| Requirement for drainage control and impact mitigation | SuDS | Due to the constrained space outside Flo source control SuDS techniques (such as permeable paving) are utilised across the | od Zones 2 and 3, it is advised that green roofs, rainwater harvesting and site. |
| | | Conveyance features should be designed paths where possible. | d above ground and follow natural flow |
| | | Where below ground storage is proposed, the base of the feature must be located at least 1m above the highest groundwater level, to reduce the risk of groundwater ingress or flotation. | |
| | | The bedrock geology suggests that infiltratindicates a high risk of groundwater flood Source Protection Zone 1. Therefore furthout to assess potential for drainage by intigroundwater level monitoring on site. Infil where there are suitable levels of surface the granting of any required environment | ation may be suitable. However, mapping ing and its location within Groundwater her site investigation should be carried filtration, including at least 12 months of tration techniques should only be used water runoff treatment, and following al permits from the Environment Agency. |
| | Groundwater Source Protection Zone | The site is within Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1 (inner zone). This is defined as the 50-day travel time from any point below the water table to the groundwater catchment source. The Environment Agency may object to certain forms of development which present a high risk of groundwater contamination. | |
| | Historic Landfill Site | There are no historic landfill sites within t | he site or within close proximity. |
| | Opportunities for flood risk betterment | Opportunities for using source control Su contributing to the reduction of flood peak existing surface water flow paths leaving Redevelopment of the site should look to where possible. Where surface water ha combined sewers, there is opportunity to Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) discha | uDS to manage runoff rates and volumes, aks downstream on the River Colne and g the site. o reduce coverage of impermeable areas, as previously been connected to o reduce the risk of sewer flooding and barges. |
| | Cumulative impacts of development | Water Framework Directive Catchment | Sensitivity to cumulative impacts |
| | | Colne (from Confluence with Ver to Gade) | High |
| | Sequential Test an | d Exception Test requirements | |
| Recommend- ations for Local Plan policy | The Sequential Tes FZ3a, and therefore The site is at high ri site for residential p required to justify de | at must be passed. For this site, More Vul , the Exception Test must be applied. sk of flooding from multiple sources, and th urposes. Strong evidence that both parts of evelopment of the site. | nerable development is proposed within nerefore it may not be safe to develop the the Exception Test can be fulfilled will be |



| Site name Colne Valley Retail Park |
|--|
| |
| Recommendations for requirements of site-specific Flood Risk Assessment, including guidat for developers Flood risk assessment: At the planning application stage, a site-specific flood risk assessment and surface we drainage strategy will be required. Consultation with the Local Authority and the Environment Agency should be undertaken at early stage. A site-specific flood risk assessments will be required because the site is within Flood Zon and 3 and at risk from sources of flooding other than rivers and the sea. Government guidat on flood risk assessments must be followed (https://www.gov.uk/guidanceflood/assessment_flor-planning-applications). Other sources of flooding should also be considered as part of a site-specific flood assessment. Including surface water and groundwater. Climate change should be assessed using recommended climate change allowances at time of the assessment (the row way guidanceflood/take-assessment. Climate change should be assessed to change in the future. The site is located within a catchment identified as highly sensitive to the cumulative impact development. The effects which development of the site may have on flood risk within catchment will need to be considered within a site-specific flood risk assessments she identify opportunities to provide off-site betterment, to help offset the eurunlative impact development. The rearrange, this may include contribution to the delivery of schemes within catchment will need to be possible on all sites and a greenfield site such as this should be able to implem an exemplar scheme to deliver multiple benefits including water quality, biodivers amentily, green infrastructure etc. Development must seek opportunities to reduce overall level of flood risk at the site. Safe access and egrees should be demonstrated in |
| Site | |
|-----------|--|
| reference | |

Site Name Colne Valley Retail Park

MX14

Watford Borough Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 Detailed Site Summary Tables





| Site | |
|-----------|--|
| reference | |

Site Name Colne Valley Retail Park

MX14

Watford Borough Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 Detailed Site Summary Tables







| Site code | | MX16 | | | | |
|--|--|---|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|--|----------------------------|
| Site name | | Land east of Ascot Road | | | | |
| | | 1 | | | | |
| Site details | OS Grid reference | TQ 09155 95664 | | | | |
| | Area | 0.45 Ha | | | | |
| | Current land use | Brownfield | | | | |
| | Proposed site use | Mixed – residential and commercial | | | | |
| | Flood risk vulnerability | More vulnerable | | | | |
| | Watford Sustainability Area Band | Area of Medium Sustainability | | | | |
| | Existing watercourses | There are no watercourse | s within the site or w | ithin clos | e proximit | у. |
| | Flood history | The site is not within the E | A historic flood map | | | |
| | | | Fluvial | | | |
| | | Proportion of the site | 5% AEP | 1% A | AEP | 0.1% AEP |
| | | al risk (%) | 0% | 0% | 6 | 0% |
| | | it is located within Flood 7 | : There is no fluvial i | model da | ata availab | le for the site, as |
| | | Flood characteristics: The negligible risk of fluvial flo | he site is located with oding. | nin Flood | Zone 1, a | nd is therefore at |
| | | Pro | oportion of site at ri | isk (RoF | SW) | |
| | | 3.3% AEP | 1% AEP | | 0. | 1% AEP |
| Sources of | | (1 in 30) | (1 in 100) | | (1 in 1,000) | |
| flood risk | Surface Water | Description of surface water flow paths: The site is at a low risk of flooding from surface water. A very small area in of the site is shown to be at risk of flooding during a 0.1% AEP (1 in 1, event). This flooding is associated with a surface water flow path from the | | | | |
| Proportion of the site at risk in JBA Groundwater year) risk categories | | | | er Map 1% AEP (1 in 100- | | |
| | | Depth below surface 0-0.025m | Depth below surf 0.025-0.5m | face | Total ir ca | n highest risk tegories |
| | Groundwater | 28% | 27% | | | 55% |
| | | The western half of the site is shown to be at a high risk of ground Here, the site is within Category 4, where groundwater is predicted to 0.025m of the ground surface during a 1 in 100-year event (1% AE the site is at moderate flood risk, with groundwater estimated to lie 5m of the ground surface during a flood event. | | | ndwater flooding. d to lie at or within AEP). The east of lie between 0.5 – | |

Level 2 SFRA Detailed Site Summary Tables – DRAFT DOCUMENT



| Site code | | MX16 | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| Site name | | Land east of Ascot Road | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Reservoir | The site is not at risk of reservoir flooding. | | | | |
| | Canal | There are no canals witin the site. | | | | |
| | Defences | Defence Type | Standar | d of Protect | ion C | Condition |
| | | There are no defences within the | e site. | | | |
| Flood risk management | | Culvert / structure blockage? | There are close pro | e no culvert ximity. | s within the | site or within |
| infrastructure | Residual risk | Impounded water body failure? | The site i breach. | s not at risk (| of flooding d | ue to reservoir |
| | | Defence breach / | Breach Zone | | | |
| | | overtopping? | N/A | | | |
| | Flood warning | The site is not within EA Flood Alert or Flood Warning Areas. | | | | |
| Emergency planning | Access and egress | The site is likely to be accessed via Ascot Road, from the west or south of the Along the western border, this road is shown to be at risk of surface water flood during the1% AEP (1 in 100-year) rainfall event. However, north of the boundary, surface water flooding is predicted to affect the road during a 3.3% / (1 in 30-year) rainfall event. | | | | uth of the site. water flooding th of the site g a 3.3% AEP |
| | Climate change | River Basin District | | Central | Higher Central | Upper End |
| | '2080s' | Thames | | 25% | 35% | 70% |
| Climate Change | Climate Change Implications for the site Implications for the site Imp | | ithin Flood face water wance is a surface wa | Zone 1, whe flood extent pplied to rair ater flood ext | en climate ch within the sit ifall. Howeve ent. | ange e increases er, it does not |



| Site code | | MX16 | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Site name | | Land east of Ascot Road | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Bedrock Geology | The site is underlain by Sussex White Chalk Formation. | | | | |
| | Superficial Geology | There are alluvium deposits across the si | te. | | | |
| | Soils | Freely draining slightly acidic loamy soils. | | | | |
| | | SuDS are possible on all sites, including one. All development should adopt sourc Conveyance features should be designed paths where possible. | previously developed sites such as this e control SuDS techniques. I above ground and following natural flow | | | |
| Requirement for drainage control and impact mitigation | SuDS | The bedrock geology suggests that infiltration may be suitable. However, mapping indicates a high risk of groundwater flooding and its location within Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1. Therefore further site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration, including at least 12 months of groundwater level monitoring on site. Infiltration techniques should only be used where there are suitable levels of surface water runoff treatment, and following the granting of any required environmental permits from the Environment Agency. | | | | |
| inigation | Groundwater Source Protection Zone | The site is within Groundwater SPZ 1 (inner zone). This is defined as the 50-day travel time from any point below the water table to the groundwater catchment source. The Environment Agency may object to certain forms of development which present a high risk of groundwater contamination. | | | | |
| | Historic Landfill Site | There are no historic landfill sites within th proximity. | ne site boundary or within close | | | |
| | Opportunities for flood risk betterment | The current site is brownfield and so action permeability across the development. Ru returned to (or as close to) the greenfield | ons should be taken to increase noff rates within the site should be rate. | | | |
| | Cumulative | Water Framework Directive Catchment | Sensitivity to cumulative impacts | | | |
| | impacts of development | Gade (from confluence with Bulbourne to Chess) | Medium | | | |
| | Sequential Test an | d Exception Test requirements | | | | |
| | The site is within Flood Zone 1 but at risk from other sources of flooding. The Sequential Test must passed. The Exception Test is not required under the NPPF, but it must be shown that the developm will be safe for its lifetime and the risk can be managed through a sequential approach to design | | | | | |
| | Recommendations | for requirements of site-specific Flood | Risk Assessment, including guidance | | | |
| Recommend- | Flood risk ass | essment: | | | | |
| ations for | At the plan | nning application stage, a site-specific flo | ood risk assessment and surface water | | | |
| policy | drainage st Consultation | trategy will be required. on with the Local Authority and the Environi | ment Agency should be undertaken at an | | | |
| | early stage | if flood rick approximativell he required h | | | | |
| | A site-spec flooding otl be followed | her than rivers and the sea. Government g (<u>https://www.gov.uk/guidance/floodrisk-as</u> | juidance on flood risk assessments must sessment-for-planning-applications). | | | |
| | Other sources of flooding should also be considered as part of a site-specific flood assessment including surface water and groundwater | | | | | |



| Site code | MX16 |
|---|--|
| Site name | Land east of Ascot Road |
| The site is I of develops catchment High level a so efforts s Climate ch time of the allowances published in Guidance for s Develo Safe a As a b aim to greenf Counce All dev should Infiltrat be sha used b the sto Mitigat finishe The de are ma SuDS Non-S 2015). | ocated within a catchment identified as moderately sensitive to the cumulative impact ment. The effects which development of the site may have on flood risk within the will need to be considered within a site-specific flood risk assessment. assessment suggests the catchment is largely at risk of surface water flooding, and hould be made within all new developments to limit runoff to greenfield rates. ange should be assessed using recommended climate change allowances at the assessment (https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessments-climate-change-) for the type of development and level of risk. The current allowances were in February 2016 but may be subject to change in the future. Site design and making development safe: popment must seek opportunities to reduce overall level of flood risk at the site. ccess and egress should be demonstrated in the 1 in 100 plus climate change event. rownfield site, post-development surface water runoff rates and volumes should meet the equivalent greenfield values, in line with Defra national guidance. If ield rates and volumes are not attainable, consultation with Hertfordshire County il (the LLFA) will be required. velopment should adopt source control SuDS techniques. Conveyance features to the the up larger areas. Above ground conveyance and attenuation can be but care must be taken that groundwater does not enter the SuDS feature and reduce orage capacity and structural integrity of the design. tion for seasonal high groundwater levels must be considered (for example by raising d floor levels to an appropriate height above ground level). esign must ensure that flows resulting from rainfall in excess of a 1 in 100-year event anaged via exceedance routes that minimise the risks to people and property. design must follow Hertfordshire County Council guidance, meet the Defra National tatutory Technical Standards, and follow current best design practice (CIRIA Manual |

| Site reference | MX16 | Watford Borough Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment | WATFORD |
|---|---|--|--|
| Site Name | Land East of Ascot Road | Level 2 Detailed Site Summary Table | es BOROUGH COUNCIL |
| © JBA Consulting 2020. So JBA, NERC or BGS give a JBA, NERC or BGS in con | some of the responses contained in this mapping are based on data and informati any warranty, condition or representation as to the quality, accuracy or completen nnection with it. Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database | on provided by the Natural Environment Research Council (NERC) or its component body the British Geolog ess of suchinformation and all liability (including for negligence) arising from its use is excluded to the fullest right 2020. Contains public sector information licensed under the Open GovernmentLicence v3.0. | ical Survey (BGS). Your use of any information contained in this mapping is at your own risk. Neither extent permitted by law. Your use of the mapping constitutes your agreement to bring no claim against |
| | Flood Zones Map (present day) | Flood Zone 3a - Climate Change Map | Surface Water Map (RoFSW) |
| | Main Rivers Canals Ordinary Watercourses | Canals Main Rivers Ordinary Watercourses | Canals Main Rivers Ordinary Watercourses |



Ν

| Site reference Site Name | MX16 Land East of Ascot Road | Watford Borough Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 Detailed Site Summary Tables | WATFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL |
|---|--|---|--|
| © JBA Consulting 2020. So JBA, NERC or BGS give ar JBA, NERC or BGS in conr | me of the responses contained in this mapping are based on data and information warranty, condition or representation as to the quality, accuracy or completent nection with it. Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database | on provided by the Natural Environment Research Council (NERC) or its component body the British Geological Survey (BGS). Your use of any ess of suchinformation and all liability (including for negligence) arising from its use is excluded to the fullest extent permitted by law. Your use of the right 2020. Contains public sector information licensed under the Open GovernmentLicence v3.0. | information contained in this mapping is at your own risk. Neither the mapping constitutes your agreement to bring no claim against |
| | Canals Main Rivers Ordinary Watercourses | Canals Main Rivers Ordinary Watercourses | Canals Main Rivers Ordinary Watercourses |
| 0 12.5 25 m Maxin | Site Boundary 1% AEP 0.50 - 0.75 1.50 - 1.75 ✓ Other L2 Sites Depth (m) 0.75 - 1.0 1.75 - 2.0 0 - 0.25 1.0 - 1.25 >2.0 0.25 - 0.50 1.25 - 1.50 num Surface Water Flood Depth (m) -1% AEP | Image: Site Boundary 1% AEP 45.6 - 48.8 = 56.8 - 67.2 Image: Site Boundary 1% AEP 45.6 - 48.8 = 56.8 - 67.2 Image: Site Boundary 1% AEP 48.8 - 52.6 = 67.2 - 73.0 Image: Site Boundary 1% AEP 48.8 - 52.6 = 67.2 - 73.0 Image: Site Boundary 1% AEP 41.7 - 45.6 Image: Site Boundary 1% AEP Maximum Surface Water Flood Level (mAOD) - 1% AEP | Site Boundary 1% AEP 0.25 - 0.5 Other L2 Sites Velocity (m/s) 0.5 - 1.0 0 - 0.25 0 - 0.25 >2.0 |
| Ascot Road | Canals Main Rivers Ordinary Watercourses | Canals Main Rivers Ordinary Watercourses | Canals Main Rivers Ordinary Watercourses |
| 0 12.5 25 | Site Boundary RoFSW 1% AEP 0.15 - 0.30 0.90 - 1.20 Other L2 Sites Depth (m) 0.30 - 0.60 > 1.20 0.00 - 0.15 0.60 - 0.90 | 0 12.5 25 m m Bite Boundary RoFSW 1% AEP 0.75 - 1.25 : Moderate □ 0 12.5 25 m 0 12.5 25 m 0 12.5 2.00 : Extreme | ■ Site Boundary RoFSW 1% AEP ■ 0.50 - 1.00 ✓ Other L2 Sites Velocity (m/s) ■ 1.00 - 2.00 ■ 0 - 0.25 ■ > 2.00 ■ 0.25 - 0.50 |

Level 2 SFRA Detailed Site Summary Tables – DRAFT DOCUMENT



JBA

Level 2 SFRA Detailed Site Summary Tables – DRAFT DOCUMENT



| Site code | | MX17 | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---------------------|
| Site name | | Land at Riverwell | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Depth below surface 0-0.025m | Depth (| n below surface 0.025-0.5m | surface Tota 5m | | v surface Total in highest ris 5m categories | | ghest risk ories |
| | | 23% 36% | | 36% | 59% | |)% | | |
| | | The southern half of the site is at a high risk of groundwater flooding, with covera of Category 4 (where groundwater is predicted to be at or within 0.025m of ground surface during a 1% EP event) and Category 3 (where groundwate predicted to be 0.025 – 0.5m below the ground surface). | | | | with coverage).025m of the roundwater is | | | |
| | Reservoir | The southern area of the sit event of a breach at Aldenh | e is at r nam or l | isk of reservoir floo Hilfield Park reserv | ding, in tł oirs. | ne extr | emely unlikely | | |
| | Canal | There are no canals witin the | ne site. | | | | | | |
| | Defences | Defence Type | | Standard of Prote | ction | С | ondition | | |
| | | There are no defences pres | sent at t | the site. | - | | | | |
| Flood risk management | | Culvert / structure blockage? | T V S | There are multip within/near the site site in the case of a | ole culv which m blockag | erts o ay pos e. | or structures a risk to the | | |
| infrastructure | Residual risk | Impounded water body failure? | T C T | The site is at risk of flooding in the unlikely event of a reservoir breach at Aldenham or Hilfield Park reservoirs. | | unlikely event or Hilfield Park | | | |
| | | Defence breach / | | Breach Zone | | | | | |
| | | Defence breach / overtopping? | _ | В | reach Zo | one | | | |
| | Flood warning | Defence breach / overtopping? The site within both EA Flo • Flood Alert Area: including Carpend • Flood Warning A | od Alert The Mi lers Par rea : Th | B t and Flood Warnin iddle River Colne a rk ne River Colne at W | g Areas: Watford | and R | ickmansworth g Bushey | | |
| Emergency planning | Flood warning Access and egress | Defence breach / overtopping? The site within both EA Flo • Flood Alert Area: including Carpend • Flood Warning A The site is likely to be acce the west. It should be note (Thomas Sawyer Way) no 2017. The aerial imagery sh centre of the site which is of Cardiff Road and continues the 3.3% AEP (1 in 30-ye identified as at negligible rist | od Alert The Mi lers Par rea: Th essed v ed that longer e hows a letected onto th ear) even sk of su | B t and Flood Warnin iddle River Colne a rk ne River Colne at W via Cardiff Road fro the existing road t exists according to new road that has d in the RoFSW man nis new access road ent and greater ra urface water floodin | g Areas: Watford in atford in the ea nrough th aerial ph been con pping. A d. This flo nfall eve g. | and R cluding ast or V he cen otogra astrcute flow p pow path ents. W | ickmansworth g Bushey Villow Lane in tre of the site phy from May ed through the path begins on n exists during Villow Lane is | | |
| Emergency planning | Flood warning Access and egress | Defence breach / overtopping? The site within both EA Flo • Flood Alert Area: including Carpend • Flood Warning A The site is likely to be acce the west. It should be note (Thomas Sawyer Way) no 2017. The aerial imagery sl centre of the site which is of Cardiff Road and continues the 3.3% AEP (1 in 30-ye identified as at negligible ris River Basin Dis | od Alert The Mi lers Par rea: Th essed v ed that longer e hows a letected onto th ear) eve sk of su trict | t and Flood Warnin iddle River Colne a rk ne River Colne at W via Cardiff Road fro the existing road t exists according to new road that has d in the RoFSW ma nis new access road ent and greater ra urface water floodin Central | g Areas: Watford atford in m the ea hrough th aerial ph been con upping. A d. This flo nfall eve g. Hig Cer | and R cluding ast or V he cen otogra astrcute flow p bw path ents. W | ickmansworth g Bushey Villow Lane in tre of the site phy from May ed through the bath begins on n exists during Villow Lane is Upper End | | |
| Emergency planning | Flood warning Access and egress Climate change allowances for '2080s' | Defence breach / overtopping? The site within both EA Flo • Flood Alert Area: including Carpend • Flood Warning A The site is likely to be acce the west. It should be note (Thomas Sawyer Way) no 2017. The aerial imagery sh centre of the site which is of Cardiff Road and continues the 3.3% AEP (1 in 30-ye identified as at negligible ris River Basin Dis Thames | od Alert The Mi lers Par rea: Th essed v ed that longer e hows a letected onto th ear) eve sk of su trict | t and Flood Warnin iddle River Colne a rk he River Colne at M ria Cardiff Road fro the existing road t exists according to new road that has d in the RoFSW manis new access road ent and greater ra inface water floodin Central 25% | g Areas: g Areas: Watford atford in m the ea nrough th aerial ph been con pping. A d. This flo nfall ever g. Hig Cer 35 | and R cluding ist or V he cen otogra strcute flow p bow path ents. W | ickmansworth g Bushey Villow Lane in tre of the site phy from May ed through the path begins on n exists during Villow Lane is Upper End 70% | | |
| Emergency planning Climate Change | Flood warning Access and egress Climate change allowances for '2080s' Implications for the site | Defence breach / overtopping? The site within both EA Flo • Flood Alert Area: including Carpend • Flood Warning A The site is likely to be accession the west. It should be noted (Thomas Sawyer Way) no 2017. The aerial imagery slicentre of the site which is of Cardiff Road and continues the 3.3% AEP (1 in 30-yearidentified as at negligible rist River Basin Dist Thames Due to model instability whito inflows, Flood Zone 2 ha provides a conservative ext 100-year + 70%CC flood ext | od Alert The Mi lers Par rea: Th essed v ed that longer e hows a letected onto th ear) eve sk of su trict en appl s been tent, wit vent. | t and Flood Warnin iddle River Colne a rk ne River Colne at W via Cardiff Road fro the existing road t exists according to new road that has d in the RoFSW manis new access road ent and greater ra urface water floodin 25% lying 35% and 70% used as a proxy fo th 54% of the site in | g Areas: g Areas: Watford atford in m the ea hrough th aerial ph been con upping. A d. This flo nfall eve g. Cer climate dentified | and R cluding ast or V he cen otogra strcute flow p bw path ents. W her tral 5% change change as at ri | ickmansworth g Bushey Villow Lane in tre of the site phy from May ed through the bath begins on n exists during Villow Lane is Upper End 70% e allowances te. This isk from a 1 in | | |

Level 2 SFRA Detailed Site Summary Tables – DRAFT DOCUMENT



| Site code | | MX17 | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| Site name | | Land at Riverwell | | |
| | 1 | | | |
| | Bedrock Geology | The site is underlain by Sussex White Chalk formation. | | |
| Superficial Geology | | There are glacial sand and gravel deposits across the site. | | |
| | Soils | Loamy and clayey floodplain soils with naturally high groundwater. | | |
| | | Storage of surface water runoff from the or should be located out of fluvial flood risk a SuDS techniques (such as green roofs, ra paving) are utilised across the site. | development during extreme events areas. It is advised that source control ainwater harvesting and permeable | |
| | | Conveyance features should be designed paths where possible. | l above ground and follow natural flow | |
| Sul Requirement for drainage control and impact mitigation | SuDS | Where below ground storage is proposed within groundwater-risk areas, the base of the feature must be located at least 1m above the highest groundwater level, to reduce the risk of groundwater ingress or flotation. | | |
| | | The bedrock geology suggests that infiltration may be suitable. However, mapping indicates a high risk of groundwater flooding and its location within Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1. Therefore further site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration, including at least 12 months of groundwater level monitoring on site. Infiltration techniques should only be used where there are suitable levels of surface water runoff treatment, and following the granting of any required environmental permits from the Environment Agency. | | |
| | Groundwater Source Protection Zone | The site is within Groundwater SPZ 1 (inner zone). This is defined as the 50-day travel time from any point below the water table to the groundwater catchment source. The Environment Agency may object to certain forms of development which present a high risk of groundwater contamination. | | |
| | Historic Landfill Site | There are no historic landfill sites within the | ne site boundary. | |
| | Opportunities for flood risk betterment | Opportunities for using source control SuDS to manage runoff rates and volumes contributing to the reduction of flood peaks downstream on the River Colne and existing surface water flow paths leaving the site. Redevelopment of the site should look to reduce coverage of impermeable areas where possible. Where surface water has previously been connected to combined sewers, there is opportunity to reduce the risk of sewer flooding and Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) discharges | | |
| | Cumulative | Water Framework Directive Catchment | Sensitivity to cumulative impacts | |
| | impacts of development | Colne (from Confluence with Ver to Gade) | High | |
| | Sequential Test an | d Exception Test requirements | | |

Level 2 SFRA Detailed Site Summary Tables – DRAFT DOCUMENT



JBA



JBA consulting

| Site | | |
|-----------|--|--|
| reference | | |
| Site Name | | |

MX17

Land at Riverwell

Watford Borough Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 Detailed Site Summary Tables





| Site reference | MX17 |
|-------------------|-------|
| Site Name | Landa |

Land at Riverwell

Watford Borough Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 Detailed Site Summary Tables





Level 2 SFRA Detailed Site Summary Tables – DRAFT DOCUMENT



JBA



| Site code | | MX18 | | |
|-------------|-----------|---|-----------------------------------|--|
| Site name | | Colne Bridge Retail Park | | |
| | | | | |
| Groundwater | | Description of surface water flow paths: The site is at high risk of surface water flooding, with runoff generated on Chalk Hill to the north as well as within the site itself. The north and south of the site are at highest risk, with flooding expected during a 3.3% AEP (1 in 30-year) rainfall event. The extent of flooding is predicted to increase during the 1% AEP (1 in 100-year) event, to reach the eastern and western borders of the site, and extend again during the 0.1% AEP (1 in 1,000-year) event, to cover the west of the site. The surface water risk is located within the same area as fluvial risk, although surface water flooding may occur independently. Additionally, the current RoFSW mapping shows ponding against an existing building, which remains dry. This may therefore change when the site is redeveloped. | | |
| | | Proportion of the site at risk in JBA Groundwater Map 1 in 100-year (1% AEP) risk categories | | |
| | | Depth below surface 0-0.025m | Depth below surface 0.025-0.5m | Total in highest risk categories |
| | | 100% | 0% | 100% |
| | | The site is at a high risk of groundwater flooding. Located within Category 4, it is estimated that groundwater levels will lie at or within 0.025m of the ground surface during a 1% AEP 1 in 100-year event. The majority of site is at risk of reservoir flooding, in the extremely unlikely event of a breach at Aldenham reservoir or Hillfield Park reservoir. | | cated within Category 4, it is 0.025m of the ground surface |
| | Reservoir | | | ne extremely unlikely event of voir. |
| | Canal | There are no canals witin the site. | | |



| Site code | | MX18 | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|--|--|--------------|----------------------------------|---|
| Site name | | Colne Bridge Retail Park | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | Defence Type | Standard of | f Protection | C | ondition |
| | | Defence wall | 50 | 0 | | 3 |
| Flood risk management infrastructure | Defences | The defence wall is located along the left bank of the River Colne, upstream of the proposed site. The northern corner of the site boundary is shown to benefit from the defence, although this is not a notable extent. Dalton Way, at the northern boundary of the site, also benefits from defence and therefore the defence does influence the safety of access/egress to the site. | | | | |
| | | Culvert / structure blockage? | The River Colne passes below a bridge upstream of the site and through a railway culvert downstream of the site. The impact of blockage to the railway culvert should be considered within a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment. | | | |
| | | Impounded water body failure? | The majority of the site is at risk of flooding in the unlikely event of a reservoir breach at Aldenham and Hillfield Park reservoirs. | | flooding in the n at Aldenham | |
| | Residual lisk | | | Breach | Zone | |
| | | Defence breach / overtopping? | Overtopping of the flood wall upstream of the site should be considered. This defence has an SOP of 50 years, but safe access and egress is required during 1 in 100-year plus climate change event. Overtopping of the breach is likely to impact Dalton Road (based upon the areas benefitting from defences). | | | |
| | Flood warning | The site is within both EA Flood Warning and Flood Alert Areas: Flood Alert Area: The Middle River Colne at Watford and Rickmansworth including Carpenders Park Flood Warning Area: The River Colne at Watford including Bushey | | | | |
| Emergency planning | Access and egress | Access to the site is likely to be from Dalton Way, along the northern or western boundary of the site. The route is shown to be at risk of fluvial floodig during the 1% AEP (1 in 100-year) event. The road is also expected to experience surface water flooding during the 0.1% AEP (1 in 1,000-year) rainfall event, with multiple surface water flood incidents also reported to HCC for flooding along Dalton Way. Therefore, acces to the site is likely to be restricted by fluvial and surface water flooding. | | | | |
| | Climate change | River Basin District | | entral I | ligher Central | Upper End |
| Climate Change | allowances for '2080s' | Thames | | 25% | 35% | 70% |
| | Implications for the site | Due to model instability when applying 35% and 70% climate change allowand to inflows, Flood Zone 2 has been used as a proxy for climate change. This provides a conservative extent, with 64% of the site identified as at risk from a 100-year + 70%CC flood event. | | | | e allowances le. This isk from a 1 in |
| | | The 1 in 100-year surface water flood extent within the site increases when a 40% climate change allowance is applied to rainfall. However, it does not reach the 1 in 1,000-year surface water flood extent. | | | | |



| Site code | | MX18 | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| Site name | | Colne Bridge Retail Park | | |
| | | | | |
| | Bedrock Geology | The site is underlain by Sussex White Chalk Formation. | | |
| | Superficial Geology | The majority of the site is underlain by gla area in the west is underlain by alluvium. | acial sand and gravel deposits. A small | |
| | Soils | Freely draining slightly acidic loamy soils. | | |
| | | Storage of surface water runoff from the development during extreme events should be located out of fluvial flood risk areas. It is advised that source control SuDS techniques (such as green roofs, rainwater harvesting and permeable paving) are utilised across the site. | | |
| | | Conveyance features should be designed above ground and following natural flow paths where possible. | | |
| Requirement for drainage control and impact mitigation | SuDS | The bedrock geology suggests that infiltration may be suitable. However, mapping indicates a high risk of groundwater flooding and its location within Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1. Therefore further site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration, including at least 12 months of groundwater level monitoring on site. Infiltration techniques should only be used where there are suitable levels of surface water runoff treatment, and following the granting of any required environmental permits from the Environment Agency. | | |
| | Groundwater Source Protection Zone | The site is within Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1 (inner zone). This is defined as the 50-day travel time from any point below the water table to the groundwater catchment source. The Environment Agency may object to certain forms of development which present a high risk of groundwater contamination. | | |
| | Historic Landfill Site | There are no historic landfill sites within the site boundary or within close proximity. | | |
| | Opportunities for flood risk betterment | Opportunities for using source control SuDS to manage runoff rates and volumes, contributing to the reduction of flood peaks downstream on the River Colne and existing surface water flow paths leaving the site. Redevelopment of the site should look to reduce coverage of impermeable areas, where possible. Where surface water has previously been connected to combined sewers, there is opportunity to reduce the risk of sewer flooding and Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) discharges. | | |
| | Cumulative | Water Framework Directive Catchment | Sensitivity to cumulative impacts | |
| | development | Colne (from Confluence with Ver to Gade) | High | |
| | Sequential Test an | d Exception Test requirements | | |
| Recommend- ations for Local Plan policy | The Sequential Test must be passed. For this site, More Vulnerable development is proposed within FZ3a, and therefore, the Exception Test must be applied. The site is at high risk of flooding from multiple sources, and therefore it may not be safe to develop the site for residential purposes. Strong evidence that both parts of the Exception Test can be fulfilled will be required to justify development of the site. | | | |
| | | | | |

Г



| Site code | | MX18 | |
|-----------|--|---|--|
| Site name | | Colne Bridge Retail Park | |
| | | | |
| | Recommendations for developers | for requirements of site-specific Flood Risk Assessment, including guidance | |
| | Flood risk ass | essment: | |
| | At the plan drainage st | nning application stage, a site-specific flood risk assessment and surface water trategy will be required. | |
| | Consultation with the Local Authority and the Environment Agency should be undertaken a early stage. | | |
| | A site-specific flood risk assessment will be required because the site is within Flood and 3 and at risk from sources of flooding other than rivers and the sea. Government gu on flood risk assessments must be followed (<u>https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flc</u> | | |
| | Other sources assessmer | rces of flooding should also be considered as part of a site-specific flood risk int, including surface water and groundwater. | |
| | Climate ch time of the | ange should be assessed using recommended climate change allowances at the assessment (https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessments-climate-change- | |
| | allowances published i | b) for the type of development and level of risk. The current allowances were n February 2016 but may be subject to change in the future. | |
| | Consideration should be made for overtopping of the defences upstream of the site. This should include effect upon the site and access/egress. | | |
| | A blockage assessment should be carried out on the railway culvert at the south west corner of the site, to determine the potential flood risk to the site in the event of a structure blockage | | |
| | • The site is located within a catchment identified as highly sensitive to the cumulative impact of development. The effects which development of the site may have on flood risk within the catchment will need to be considered within a site-specific flood risk assessment. | | |
| | Appropriate identify op developme catchment, restoration | e storage of surface water runoff will need to be provided, and assessments should portunities to provide off-site betterment, to help offset the cumulative impact of ent. For example, this may include contribution to the delivery of schemes within the such as flood alleviation schemes, Natural Flood Management, SuDS retrofit or river. | |
| | Guidance for s | site design and making development safe: | |
| | Developme | ent must seek opportunities to reduce overall level of flood risk at the site. | |
| | Safe acces | s and egress should be demonstrated in the 1 in 100 plus climate change event. | |
| | SuDS are an exemple green infra | ar scheme to deliver multiple benefits including water quality, biodiversity, amenity, structure etc. | |
| | As a brown meet the e and volume be required | field site, post-development surface water runoff rates and volumes should aim to quivalent greenfield values, in line with Defra national guidance. If greenfield rates are not attainable, consultation with Hertfordshire County Council (the LLFA) will d. | |
| | Floodplain raising of left | compensation must be demonstrated for any loss in floodplain storage through the evels for development. | |
| | All develop be designed | ment should adopt source control SuDS techniques. Conveyance features should adove ground and following natural flow paths where possible. | |
| | Infiltration t shallow an care must capacity ar | techniques may be ineffective and may pose a pollution risk. SuDS may need to be d take up larger areas. Above ground conveyance and attenuation can be used but be taken that groundwater does not enter the SuDS feature and reduce the storage and structural integrity of the design. | |
| | The design Infiltration to shallow an care must capacity an | n of SuDS schemes must take into account the seasonally high groundwater table. techniques may be ineffective and may pose a pollution risk. SuDS may need to be d take up larger areas. Above ground conveyance and attenuation can be used but be taken that groundwater does not enter the SuDS feature and reduce the storage and structural integrity of the design. | |

Level 2 SFRA Detailed Site Summary Tables – DRAFT DOCUMENT



| Site code | MX18 |
|---|---|
| Site name | Colne Bridge Retail Park |
| Storage for areas. The desig managed SuDS des Statutory | or runoff from the development in extreme events should be located out of flood risk on must ensure that flows resulting from rainfall in excess of a 1 in 100-year event are via exceedance routes that minimise the risks to people and property. Ign must follow Hertfordshire County Council guidance, meet the Defra National Non- rechnical Standards, and follow current best design practice (CIRIA Manual 2015). |

| Site reference | MX18 |
|-------------------|------|
| | |

Site Name Colne Bridge Retail Park

Watford Borough Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 Detailed Site Summary Tables





| Site reference | MX18 |
|-------------------|--------------------------|
| Site Name | Colne Bridge Retail Park |

Watford Borough Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 Detailed Site Summary Tables









| Site Reference | MX12 | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Site Name | Land at Tesco Lower High Street | | | |
| Legend | | | | |
| MX12 | 0.75 - 1 | | | |
| 90% Blockage (1% | 1.0 - 1.25 | | | |
| Depth of Flooding | (m) 1.25 - 1.5 | | | |
| 0 - 0.1 | 1.5 - 1.75 | | | |
| 0.1 - 0.25 | 1.75 - 2 | | | |
| 0.25 - 0.5 | > 2.0 | | | |
| 0.5 - 0.75 | | | | |
| Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database right 2020. Contains public sector information licensed under the Open Government Licence v3.0. | | | | |
| | | | | |





Watford Borough Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 Detailed Site Summary Blockage Scenario Testing

| Blockage Scenario Testing | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|--|--|
| Site Reference | MX12 | | |
| Site Name | Land at Tesco Lower High Street | | |
| Legend | | | |
| Blockage Location | Baseline (1% AEP) | | |
| MX12 | 50% Blockage (1% AEP) | | |
| | 75% Blockage (1% AEP) | | |
| | 90% Blockage (1% AEP) | | |
| | | | |
| Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database right 2020. Contains public sector information licensed under the Open Government Licence v3.0. | | | |
| WATFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL | | | |
| 0 0.025 | 0.05 0.1 Km | | |





| Site Reference | MX14 | | |
|---|--------------------------|--|------------|
| Site Name | Colne Valley Retail Park | | |
| Legend | | | |
| Breach Log | cation | | 0.5 - 0.75 |
| MX14 | | | 0.75 - 1 |
| Breach (1% AEP) | | | 1.0 - 1.25 |
| Depth of Flooding | g (m) | | 1.25 - 1.5 |
| 0 - 0.1 | | | 1.5 - 1.75 |
| 0.1 - 0.25 | | | 1.75 - 2 |
| 0.25 - 0.5 | | | > 2.0 |
| Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database right 2020. Contains public sector information licensed under the Open Government Licence v3.0. | | | |





Watford Borough Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 Detailed Site Summary Blockage Scenario Testing

| Site Reference | MX14 | | |
|---|--------------------------|--|--|
| Site Name | Colne Valley Retail Park | | |
| l egend | | | |
| Legenu | I | | |
| Breach Location | Baseline (1% AEP) | | |
| MX14 | Breach (1% AEP) | | |
| —— Wall | | | |
| Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database right 2020. Contains public sector information licensed under the Open Government Licence v3.0. | | | |
| WATFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL | | | |
| | 0.04 0.08 Km | | |