



www.jbaconsulting.com

JBA
consulting

Cotswold Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Main Report

Draft Report

Prepared for
Cotswold District Council

Date
August 2026



COTSWOLD
District Council

Document Status

Issue date	August 2026
Issued to	Joanne Corbett
BIM reference	RNS-JBA-XX-XX-RP-EN-0033
Revision	P04
Prepared by	Laura Thompson-Jones BSc FRGS Senior Analyst Freya Nation BSc (Hons) Analyst
Reviewed by	Mike Williamson BSc MSc CGeog FRGS EADA Principal Analyst
Authorised by	Mike Williamson BSc MSc CGeog FRGS EADA Principal Analyst

Carbon Footprint

The format of this report is optimised for reading digitally in pdf format. Paper consumption produces substantial carbon emissions and other environmental impacts through the extraction, production and transportation of paper. Printing also generates emissions and impacts from the manufacture of printers and inks and from the energy used to power a printer. Please consider the environment before printing.

Accessibility

JBA aims to align with [governmental guidelines on accessible documents](#) and [WCAG 2.2 AA](#) standards, so that most people can read this document without having to employ special adaptation measures. This document is also optimised for use with assistive technology, such as screen reading software.

Contract

JBA Project Manager	Mike Williamson BSc MSc CGeog FRGS EADA
Address	Phoenix House, Lakeside Drive, Centre Park, Warrington, WA1 1RX
JBA Project Code	2025s1921

This report describes work commissioned by Cotswold District Council by an instruction via email dated 28 May 2026. The Client's representative for the contract was Joanne Corbett of Cotswold District Council. Laura Thompson-Jones and Freya Nation of JBA Consulting carried out this work.

Purpose and Disclaimer

Jeremy Benn Associates Limited ("JBA") has prepared this Report for the sole use of Cotswold District Council in accordance with the Agreement under which our services were performed.

JBA has no liability for any use that is made of this Report except to Cotswold District Council for the purposes for which it was originally commissioned and prepared. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this Report or any other services provided by JBA. This Report cannot be relied upon by any other party without the prior and express written agreement of JBA.

JBA disclaims any undertaking or obligation to advise any person of any change in any matter affecting the Report, which may come or be brought to JBA's attention after the date of the Report.

The methodology adopted and the sources of information used by JBA in providing its services are outlined in this Report. The work described in this Report was undertaken between June and July 2026 and is based on the conditions encountered and the information available during the said period. The scope of this Report and the services are accordingly factually limited by these circumstances.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the Environment Agency and United Utilities for their assistance with this work.

Copyright

© Jeremy Benn Associates Limited 2026

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	SFRA future proofing	1
2	Level 2 SFRA requirements	3
2.1	Objectives	3
3	Available data and information	5
3.1	EA models	5
3.2	EA open data	5
3.3	Other datasets	6
4	Methodology	7
4.1	Assessing fluvial flood risk	7
4.2	Assessing surface water flood risk	8
4.3	Residual risk	9
4.4	Assessing flood risk from reservoirs	10
4.5	Assessing flood risk from canals	10
4.6	Assessing risk from groundwater emergence	11
4.7	Assessing risk from sewers	11
4.8	Assessing historic flood risk	11
4.9	Access and escape routes and emergency planning	11
4.10	Cumulative impacts	11
4.11	Working with Natural Processes	12
5	Limitations	13
6	Level 2 sites screening assessment summary	14

List of Tables

Table 4-1: Peak river flow allowances for the management catchments within Cotswold district	8
Table 4-2: Peak rainfall allowances for the management catchments within Cotswold district	9
Table 6-1: Site assessment outcomes	15

Abbreviations

AEP	Annual Exceedance Probability
BGS	British Geological Survey
CDC	Cotswold District Council
DTM	Digital Terrain Model
EA	Environment Agency
FRA	Flood Risk Assessment
FRCC-PPG	Flood Risk and Coastal Change Planning Practice Guidance
HFM	Historic Flood Map
LLFA	Lead Local Flood Authority
NFM	Natural Flood Management
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
RBD	River Basin District
RFM	Reservoir Flood Map
RFO	Recorded Flood Outlines
RoFSW	Risk of Flooding from Surface Water
SFRA	Strategic Flood Risk Assessment
WWNP	Working with Natural Processes

1 Introduction

A Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) is required by Cotswold District Council (CDC) as all identified potential development sites cannot be allocated outside the areas of medium and high fluvial and / or surface water flood risk, as identified through the Level 1 SFRA (2026).

The Level 1 SFRA entailed the flood risk screening of 173 potential development site allocations across the Cotswold authority area. Of these, 34 were shown to be at medium or high flood risk from fluvial and or surface water sources yet considered important to the Council's new Local Plan. A Level 2 SFRA scoping study was undertaken in June 2026. As part of the scoping study, 22 sites were identified to require a detailed Level 2 SFRA assessment, with the remaining 12 sites identified to be at nominal risk. For these sites, a brief assessment of risk has been undertaken and included in a nominal risk report.

This Level 2 SFRA consists of the following documents:

- This main report introducing and summarising the Level 2 SFRA processes and methodologies,
- 22 detailed site assessment reports,
- A nominal risk report covering the 12 sites shown to be at nominal risk of flooding.

This Level 2 SFRA has been prepared with full consideration of the latest government and Environment Agency (EA) guidance on flood risk and planning policy, namely:

- [National Planning Policy Framework \(NPPF\) 2025](#),
- [Flood Risk and Coastal Change Planning Practice Guidance \(FRCC-PPG\) 2025](#),
- [How to Prepare a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment guidance 2026](#),
- [Strategic Flood Risk Assessments A Good Practice Guide 2021](#), and
- [Flood Risk Assessments: Climate Change Allowances 2022](#).

1.1 SFRA future proofing

At the time of writing, this Level 2 SFRA has assessed and considered flood risk in the Cotswold authority area using available data at a specific point in time. The Level 2 SFRA has been future proofed as far as possible, though the reader should always confirm with the source organisation (CDC) that the latest information is being used when decisions concerning development and flood risk are being considered.

At the time of writing, the proposed reforms and further changes to the NPPF are ongoing. The consultation window closed on 10 March 2026. The draft consultation version contains amendments to the structure of the NPPF, in addition to additional changes to reflect the recent updates to the Flood Risk and Coastal Change Planning Practice Guidance (FRCC-PPG). The FRCC-PPG (September 2025), alongside the NPPF (February 2025), is referred

to throughout this SFRA, being the current primary development and flood risk policy and guidance available at the time of finalisation of this SFRA.

The EA's SFRA guidance states a review of an SFRA should be carried out when there are changes to:

- The predicted impacts of climate change on flood risk,
- Detailed flood modelling - such as from the EA or Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA),
- The local plan or relevant local development documents,
- Local flood management schemes,
- Local flood risk management strategies, and
- National planning policy or guidance.

The SFRA should also be reviewed after a significant flood event. It is in an authority's interest to keep the SFRA as up to date as possible. Ideally, the SFRA should be kept as a 'live' entity and continually updated when new information becomes available. The EA requests for reports and maps to be published online and be easily updatable, when required.

2 Level 2 SFRA requirements

The aim of a Level 2 SFRA is to build on the findings of a Level 1 SFRA, focussing on identified sites or communities at high and medium flood risk that are considered important to Local Plan development. This allows the SFRA process to be time efficient using detailed modelling techniques only where they are required in the Level 2 assessment. These locations usually include significant development and / or regeneration areas that are at medium or high risk of flooding from main rivers, ordinary watercourses, the sea, or surface water whilst also accounting for the impacts of climate change. Flood risk data such as modelled flood extents, depths, velocities and hazards are used to assess the suitability of these areas for development. Appropriate mitigation techniques and sustainable site layouts can then be informed.

This detailed information should support further application of the sequential test, the sequential approach to development management, inform on whether sites can pass the exception test, where applicable, and allow for flood risk indicators to be produced for use in the Sustainability Appraisal of the Local Plan.

[EA guidance](#) states a Level 2 SFRA should:

- *"Be detailed enough for you to identify which development allocation sites have the least risk of flooding,*
- *Contain the information needed to apply the exception test, if relevant,*
- *Enable you to decide if development can be made safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere."*

It should allow the local planning authority to:

- *"Apply the sequential test by identifying the severity and variation in risk within medium and high flood risk areas,*
- *Establish whether proposed allocations or windfall sites, on which your local plan will rely, are capable of being made safe throughout their lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere,*
- *Apply the exception test, where relevant."*

A site-specific flood risk assessment (FRA) will be required at the planning application stage which will assess risk to each site in greater detail than this Level 2 SFRA. The Level 2 SFRA is a strategic assessment that is not intended to replace the requirements of a site-specific FRA.

2.1 Objectives

In accordance with the latest national planning policy and flood risk guidance, the requirements of CDC, and with consideration of the limitations stated in Chapter 5, the key objectives of this Level 2 SFRA are stated below. These objectives are met in the individual Level 2 SFRA site reports, where applicable.

- Assess present day flood risk from all sources (fluvial, surface water, groundwater, sewers, canals, and reservoirs),
- Assess the impacts of climate change on fluvial and surface water flood risk,
- Document residual risk, including locations potential defence breaches and culvert blockages, where applicable,
- Assess detailed modelled outputs including flood depths, velocities, and hazards, where information is available,
- Assess existing flood warnings and alerts and advise on required emergency planning procedures and safety of potential site access and escape routes in times of flood,
- Account for the potential cumulative impacts of development,
- Provide site-specific advice on mitigation options i.e. developable / non-developable areas; blue / green infrastructure and open spaces; maintenance of fluvial and / or surface water flow routes and topographic depressions; land raising and compensatory storage; advice on minimum finished floor levels; and appropriate SuDS techniques,
- Assess any catchment-wide or strategic solutions, e.g. upstream opportunity areas for flood management (storage solutions) to mitigate against the risk of flooding downstream and elsewhere using Natural Flood Management (NFM) and Working with Natural Processes (WwNP) datasets,
- Demonstrate whether the second part of the exception test (part b) can be passed for the potential development site allocations, where applicable,
- Provide recommendations for additional and future work requirements following on from or to supplement the Level 2 SFRA i.e. further fluvial or surface water modelling including for climate change, modelling of site layout / design options including provisions for safe access and escape routes, development optioneering (land raising, compensatory storage, flow routes / rates), groundwater assessments, drainage strategies, site-specific FRA requirements.

3 Available data and information

The data and information described in this chapter has been used in the Level 2 SFRA to assess the risk to each site.

3.1 EA models

The following local detailed EA flood models have been used within this assessment:

- Daglingworth 2016 model
- Thames (MRL to St Johns) 2014 model
- Churn (Baunton to Siddington) 2011 model

3.2 EA open data

Additional to the EA modelling information, the following datasets available from the EA's Open Data have been considered in the Level 2 SFRA:

- Most recent LIDAR digital terrain model (DTM) data
- Flood Map for Planning Flood Zones 2 and 3
- Flood Map for Planning Water Storage Areas (note: the potential storage areas at Baunton and Abbey Way and South of Abbey Way Bridge have been removed from the Cotswold Local Plan. However, these areas remain within the functional floodplain).
- Flood Map for Planning - Surface Water Spatial Planning Flood Extents for 3.3%, 1%, 0.1% and 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) present day events
- Flood Map for Planning - Surface Water Spatial Planning Flood Depths for 3.3%, 1%, 0.1% and 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) present day events
- Flood Map for Planning - Surface Water Spatial Planning Flood Extents for 3.3%, 1%, 0.1% and 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) climate change (2070s 'Upper End' allowance) events
- Flood Map for Planning - Surface Water Spatial Planning Flood Depths for 3.3%, 1%, 0.1% and 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) climate change (2070s 'Upper End' allowance) events
- Third generation Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (RoFSW) hazards for 3.3%, 1% and 0.1% AEP events
- Spatial Flood Defences
- Historic Flood Map
- Recorded Flood Outlines
- Flood Warning Areas
- Flood Alert Areas
- Reservoir Flood Map
- Working with Natural Processes:
 - Riparian Woodland Potential

- Wider Catchment Woodland Potential
- Floodplain Woodland Potential
- Floodplain Reconnection Potential
- Runoff Attenuation Features 3.3% AEP
- Runoff Attenuation Features 1% AEP.

3.3 Other datasets

Other datasets and information used include:

- JBA 5m Groundwater Emergence Map,
- Functional floodplain dataset - as updated through the Level 1 SFRA (2026),
- OS MasterMap Water Network
- OS OpenMap Local base mapping
- LLFA flood incident records
- Thames Water historic flood incidents record
- Severn Trent Water historic flood incidents record
- British Geological Survey (BGS) Geology 625k dataset

4 Methodology

This chapter presents the methodology used in each stage of the Level 2 SFRA. The site-specific reports contain further information.

4.1 Assessing fluvial flood risk

Flood risk from fluvial sources is assessed using the most recent version of the EA's Flood Map for Planning (downloaded May 2026), and the EA's detailed local models, namely the Daglingworth 2016, Thames (MRL to St Johns) 2014, and Churn (Baunton to Siddington) 2011 models.

4.1.1 Functional floodplain

The functional floodplain was updated through the Level 1 SFRA and is assessed at each site, where applicable. Note: the potential storage areas at Baunton and Abbey Way and South of Abbey Way Bridge have been removed from the Cotswold Local Plan. However, these areas remain within the functional floodplain.

4.1.2 Climate change

[EA SFRA guidance](#) states that the SFRA should assess the effects of climate change on all sources of flooding, including the functional floodplain, to help inform the sequential approach to development. For rivers, the central allowance for the 2080s is recommended for assessment in SFRAs, as stated in the EA's [Climate Change Allowance Guidance](#).

Each EA model domain is located within the Gloucestershire and the Vale management catchment. The percentage uplift on peak flows for the central allowance (2080s) in this catchment is 26%. However, the modelled climate change allowance in each model includes for a 30% uplift for the 1% AEP event, which reflects the required uplift for the Cotswold management catchment. The modelled climate change outputs may therefore be underestimating future risk.

Table 4-1 lists the peak river flow allowances for each management catchment within Cotswold district. The modelled fluvial climate change outputs have been assessed against each potential site allocation, where applicable.

The potential impacts of climate change on the functional floodplain have also been assessed to produce a 'future functional floodplain' flood extent, as updated through the Level 1 SFRA.

Table 4-1: Peak river flow allowances for the management catchments within Cotswold district

Management Catchment	Allowance category	Total potential change (%) anticipated for '2020s' (2015 to 2039)	Total potential change (%) anticipated for '2050s' (2040 to 2069)	Total potential change (%) anticipated for '2080s' (2070 to 2125)
Cotswolds	Upper end	31	43	82
Cotswolds	Higher Central	17	21	43
Cotswolds	Central	11	13	30
Gloucestershire and the Vale	Upper end	33	43	84
Gloucestershire and the Vale	Higher Central	17	19	41
Gloucestershire and the Vale	Central	11	11	26
Avon Warwickshire	Upper end	22	31	59
Avon Warwickshire	Higher Central	12	14	32
Avon Warwickshire	Central	7	8	21
Severn Vale	Upper end	34	52	94
Severn Vale	Higher Central	20	28	53
Severn Vale	Central	14	19	37
Avon Bristol and North Somerset Streams	Upper end	27	38	71
Avon Bristol and North Somerset Streams	Higher Central	15	19	39
Avon Bristol and North Somerset Streams	Central	10	12	26

4.2 Assessing surface water flood risk

4.2.1 Extents

Surface water flood extents have been assessed using the EA's Flood Map for Planning Surface Water Spatial Planning Extents, published May 2026.

4.2.2 Depths and hazards

The Flood Map for Planning - Surface Water Spatial Planning Present Day Depths dataset has been used to assess surface water flood depths. Surface water flood hazards have been assessed using the EA's third generation RoFSW mapping, as no suitable hazard data was available at the time of undertaking this Level 2 SFRA.

4.2.3 Climate change

EA climate change guidance states that for SFRAs, the upper end allowance on peak rainfall for the 2070s should be modelled for the 3.3% and 1% AEP events. For Cotswold district, this entails the allowances as shown in Table 4-2

Table 4-2: Peak rainfall allowances for the management catchments within Cotswold district

Management Catchment	Allowance category	Total potential change (%) anticipated for '2070s' (2061 to 2125) 3.3% AEP	Total potential change (%) anticipated for '2070s' (2061 to 2125) 1% AEP
Cotswolds	Upper end	35	40
Gloucestershire	Upper end	35	40
Avon Warwickshire	Upper end	35	40
Severn Vale	Upper end	35	40
Avon Bristol and North Somerset Streams	Upper end	40	45

The EA released the Flood Map for Planning - Surface Water Spatial Planning Climate Change Extent and Depths datasets in May 2026, which includes the modelled 2070s upper end peak rainfall intensity allowances. This dataset has been used to assess the impact of climate change on surface water flooding to each site. The allowance for the 0.1% AEP event is not stated by the EA.

4.3 Residual risk

Paragraph 004 of the [FRCC-PPG](#) states the requirement in plan making to account for residual flood risks from flood risk management infrastructure. For this Level 2 SFRA, this involves the consideration of potential defence breach locations and blockage or failure of drainage assets, such as culverts.

For sites shown to be at residual risk, the [FRCC-PPG](#) includes the following information:

- Areas of residual risk should be included in the sequential approach to risk avoidance when sequential testing or through development management,
- Where avoidance is not shown to be feasible through appropriate sequential testing, flood resistance and resilience measures should be in place, including for

finished floor levels to be placed above the design flood level plus a minimum of 600mm,

- Adequate flood warning and emergency plans should be available to site users. Residual risks will need to be safely managed to ensure people are not exposed to hazardous flooding. This includes the ability of residents and site users to safely access and escape a building during the design flood and to evacuate before an extreme flood event which is defined as the 0.1% AEP event with an allowance for climate change this event is not available in the EA models),
- The likelihood of defences keeping pace with climate change should be considered e.g. is funding available and what are the funding options (e.g. Community Infrastructure Levy, planning obligations / S106 agreements, or Partnership Funding). This should inform the nature of residual risk to be considered and whether new development can remain safe for its lifetime,
- Local planning authorities should use information on identified residual risk to state in strategic policies their preferred mitigation strategy for ensuring development will be safe throughout its lifetime in relation to urban form, risk management and where flood mitigation measures are likely to have wider sustainable design implications,
- A site-specific FRA will be required for all sites modelled to be at residual risk. the FRAs would need to show that appropriate emergency plans, evacuation procedures and flood response infrastructure are in place to manage the residual risk associated with an extreme flood event.

4.4 Assessing flood risk from reservoirs

The [EA's SFRA guidance](#) requests for the assessment of risk from reservoir dam failure using the EA's Reservoir Flood Map (RFM). This Level 2 SFRA assesses potential reservoir flood risk in both a 'dry day' and 'wet day' scenario. The 'dry day' scenario shows the flood extents if a reservoir were to fail and release the water held when local rivers are at normal levels, whereas the 'wet day' assumes the local rivers have already overflowed their banks.

The RFM shows the credible worst-case scenarios from dam failure. If a site is shown to be at risk, the SFRA should assess if the design or maintenance of the reservoir would need improving. This will require contacting the reservoir owner(s) to ascertain the flood risk in more detail and whether the proposed development could affect the reservoir's risk designation, its design category or how it is operated.

CDC may be required, as category 1 responders, to access more detailed information about reservoir risk and reservoir owners using the online [Resilience Direct System](#).

4.5 Assessing flood risk from canals

The Thames and Severn Canal flows past several potential site allocations. Given canals are controlled and managed features, the risk of flooding from a canal is considered low. The recommendation therefore is for any sites located near to the Thames and Severn Canal and situated at a lower elevation, as identified in the site reports, to be subject to a

more detailed assessment at the FRA stage in consultation with the canal owner, the Cotswold Canals Trust.

4.6 Assessing risk from groundwater emergence

Susceptibility of areas to groundwater emergence is appraised using JBA's national 5m Groundwater Flood Map which is more robust than the BGS dataset. In creating this map, modelling was carried out to show how and where groundwater levels would rise following prolonged periods of rainfall, considering factors such as topography, groundwater recharge volumes and spatial variations in aquifer storage and transmission properties. The model outputs were validated against recorded groundwater levels for past flood events and checked against areas historically affected by groundwater flooding. The high-resolution maps make it easier for users to pinpoint and report risks from groundwater emergence.

4.7 Assessing risk from sewers

Thames Water provided their historic flood event register at the postcode district level. Severn Trent Water provided theirs at the unit postcode level. The site reports flag where a sewer flooding incident has occurred within the postcode district or unit. Developers should contact the relevant wastewater undertaker directly for more specific details at the FRA stage.

4.8 Assessing historic flood risk

The EA's Historic Flood Map (HFM) and Recorded Flood Outlines (RFO) datasets have been considered. Gloucestershire County Council LLFA historic flood records have also been considered. Details on historic flooding have been documented within the site-specific reports where applicable.

4.9 Access and escape routes and emergency planning

The EA's Flood Warning Areas and Flood Alert Areas have been reviewed and mapped against each potential site allocation. Potential access and escape routes have been documented for each site, identified where they are modelled to stay dry or experience non-hazardous to life flooding. Liaison with emergency planners and the local resilience forum may be required at the site-specific FRA stage.

4.10 Cumulative impacts

A joined-up approach should be adopted between developers at the FRA stage for any clusters of sites to ensure possible flood risk mitigation at one site does not increase risk to a neighbouring or downstream site as a result of loss of floodplain storage, the deflection or constriction of flood flow routes, or through inadequate management of surface water. Paragraph 049 of the FRCC-PPG states that site-specific flood risk assessments should assess cumulative impacts and demonstrate how mitigation measures have addressed

them. The site-specific reports recommend for any clusters of sites at significant risk to be combined into a wider drainage strategy and masterplanning process.

4.11 Working with Natural Processes

The EA's national Working with Natural Processes mapping dataset has been assessed as to whether there is any potential for NFM measures that could benefit potential site allocations. This includes for tree planting, enhancing floodplain connectivity and attenuation of runoff through gully blocking and other runoff attenuation features.

5 Limitations

This Level 2 SFRA has been prepared under limitations associated within the availability and quality of data. These limitations have been subject to consultation with Council officers, the EA, and the LLFA whereby alternative approaches have been agreed to enable the Level 2 SFRA to be prepared using available existing information. The limitations include the following:

- The latest available EA flood models are not up to date with the latest hydrology. Therefore, they may not be fully representative of current hydrological conditions. Model survey and digital terrain model data will also not be based on the latest information, given updates to the national LIDAR datasets in June 2026. The EA models used in the assessment are listed in Section 3.1. Any future SFRA update may look to update the EA models with the latest information that is available at the time, including up to date hydrology inputs, channel and bank survey, LIDAR terrain data, and using the latest modelling software to update and run the models. The local plan timetable and budget constraints meant the models could not be updated through this SFRA.
- The EA models do not include for the latest climate change allowances associated with the Gloucestershire and the Vale management catchment. Therefore, there may be a small underestimation in future risk in the modelled locations. The local plan timetable and budget constraints meant the models could not be updated through this SFRA.
- Several sites being assessed are at risk of flooding from rivers though a local detailed EA model is not available for a more robust assessment of the risk. Therefore, flood risk can only be assessed using the Flood Map for Planning which is based on the New National Model. Depth, hazard and velocity information is unavailable for assessment in these areas.
- The recently published Flood Map for Planning Surface Water Spatial Planning dataset does not include useable flood hazard information. Therefore, the third generation Risk of Flooding from Surface Water hazard mapping has been used as the best available information.

6 Level 2 sites screening assessment summary

34 potential development sites have been assessed through this Level 2 SFRA, as identified through the Level 1 SFRA sites screening assessment. 22 sites have been subject to detailed assessment whereby individual Level 2 site screening reports have been produced, detailing the site-specific assessments carried out through this Level 2 SFRA. 12 sites have been subject to a nominal flood risk assessment and included in a separate 'nominal risk' report. It is recommended that three of the 34 sites are not allocated, based on current flood risk information. The other 31 sites may be allocated. However, there are various requirements at the FRA stage to enable safe and sustainable development.

Table 6-1 summarises the outcomes from the Level 2 assessment at each site.

Table 6-1: Site assessment outcomes

Site reference / name	How has main risk been identified?	Summary of assessment	Main barriers to development	Can the site be allocated, based on current information?	Potential additional work at FRA stage
B56 - Land off Mallard Crescent	Flood Map for Planning	Nominal risk from surface water.	None	Yes	Drainage strategy
BK11 - Former Station Road Allotments	Flood Map for Planning	Nominal risk from surface water.	None	Yes	Drainage strategy
BK14A - The Limes, Station Road	Flood Map for Planning	Risk area from Blockley Brook should not be developed. Detailed modelling of Blockley Brook may be required	Absence of up to date model for Blockley Brook	Yes. Though risk from Blockley Brook must be confirmed at the FRA stage	Detailed modelling of Blockley Brook. Drainage strategy
C71 - Land adjacent 'Donside', off Barnway	Flood Map for Planning	EA Daglingworth 2016 model not appropriate to inform on risk. Safe access and escape may be challenging to achieve. Potential risk from ordinary watercourse	Achieving safe access and escape. Absence of up to date model for Daglingworth Stream	Yes. Though risk from Daglingworth Brook and ordinary watercourse, and safe access and escape routes must be confirmed at the FRA stage	Updated modelling of Daglingworth Stream and ordinary watercourse. Drainage strategy
CC10A - Land south of Station Road and east of Chandlers	Flood Map for Planning	Significant fluvial and surface water risk. Detailed drainage strategy required	Fluvial and surface water risk. Absence of detailed model of The Cam ordinary watercourse	Recommend against allocation	Detailed modelling of The Cam. Drainage strategy

Site reference / name	How has main risk been identified?	Summary of assessment	Main barriers to development	Can the site be allocated, based on current information?	Potential additional work at FRA stage
C164A - Land east of Kingshill Lane	Flood Map for Planning	Nominal risk from surface water. Potential risk from ordinary watercourses	Absence of modelling for ordinary watercourse	Yes. Though risk from ordinary watercourse and surface water must be confirmed at the FRA stage	Modelling of ordinary watercourse. Drainage strategy
C190 - Steadings southern extension, Cirencester	Flood Map for Planning	Nominal risk from surface water. Potential risk from ordinary watercourses	Absence of modelling for ordinary watercourses	Yes. Though risk from ordinary watercourse and surface water must be confirmed at the FRA stage	Modelling of ordinary watercourses. Drainage strategy
CC68 - Land at Aston Road	Flood Map for Planning	Nominal risk from surface water. Potential risk from ordinary watercourses	Absence of modelling for ordinary watercourse	Yes. Though risk from ordinary watercourse and surface water must be confirmed at the FRA stage	Modelling of ordinary watercourse. Drainage strategy
DA16A - Land west of Church Lane	Flood Map for Planning. EA Ampney Brook Thames (MRL to St Johns) 2014 model	Significant fluvial flood risk. Area of Flood Zone 1 may be developed though must be informed by updated modelling	Functional floodplain. Absence of up to date model for Ampney Brook	Recommend against allocation	Updated modelling of Ampney Brook. Drainage strategy

Site reference / name	How has main risk been identified?	Summary of assessment	Main barriers to development	Can the site be allocated, based on current information?	Potential additional work at FRA stage
Strategic extension to the north, east and south of Down Ampney	Flood Map for Planning. EA Ampney Brook Thames (MRL to St Johns) 2014 model	Risk to the western site parcel should be assessed further through updated modelling. Potential risk from ordinary watercourses.	Absence of up to date model for Ampney Brook. Absence of modelling for ordinary watercourses	Yes. Though risk from Ampney Brook and the ordinary watercourses must be confirmed at the FRA stage	Updated modelling of Ampney Brook. Assess risk from ordinary watercourses. Drainage strategy
F20A - Land south-east of Fairford	Flood Map for Planning	Nominal risk from rivers and surface water. Development should avoid flood zones in southeast corner	None	Yes	Drainage strategy
F39C/F52 - Land west of Terminus Cottage and Station Cottage	Flood Map for Planning	Potential risk from ordinary watercourse. Surface water flood risk must be assessed	Absence of modelling for ordinary watercourse. Surface water flood risk	Yes. Though risk from ordinary watercourse and surface water must be confirmed at the FRA stage	Modelling of ordinary watercourse. Drainage strategy
F53A - Land at Totterdown Hill, Horcott	Flood Map for Planning	Surface water flood risk must be assessed	Surface water flood risk	Yes. Though risk from surface water must be confirmed at the FRA stage	Drainage strategy
Strategic extension to the north-east of Fairford	Flood Map for Planning	Potential risk from ordinary watercourses. Surface water flood risk must be assessed	Absence of modelling for ordinary watercourses	Yes. Though risk from ordinary watercourse and surface water must be confirmed at the FRA stage	Modelling of ordinary watercourse. Drainage strategy

Site reference / name	How has main risk been identified?	Summary of assessment	Main barriers to development	Can the site be allocated, based on current information?	Potential additional work at FRA stage
Strategic extension to the south-west of Kemble	Flood Map for Planning	Surface water flood risk must be assessed	None	Yes	Drainage strategy
L33 - Land south of Ferrers Park	Flood Map for Planning	Surface water flood risk must be assessed	None	Yes	Drainage strategy
Strategic extension to the South and East of Moreton-in-Marsh	Flood Map for Planning	Risk to three site parcels should be confirmed through detailed modelling. Detailed drainage strategy required	Absence of detailed modelling for River Evenlode and several ordinary watercourses	Yes. Though fluvial and surface water flood risk must be confirmed at the FRA stage	Modelling of River Evenlode and potentially the ordinary watercourses. Drainage strategy
M28B - Land west of Aldi	Flood Map for Planning	Risk area from ordinary watercourse should not be developed. Detailed modelling of ordinary watercourse may be required. Surface water flow path must be mitigated onsite. Safe access and escape may be challenging to achieve.	Absence of detailed modelling for ordinary watercourse. Surface water flow path. Achieving safe access and escape	Yes. Though fluvial and surface water flood risk, and safe access and escape routes must be confirmed at the FRA stage	Detailed modelling of the ordinary watercourse. Drainage strategy
Strategic extension to	Flood Map for Planning	Risk area from Norton Brook should not be developed.	Absence of detailed	Yes. Though fluvial and surface water flood risk must be	Detailed modelling of Norton Brook.

Site reference / name	How has main risk been identified?	Summary of assessment	Main barriers to development	Can the site be allocated, based on current information?	Potential additional work at FRA stage
the north and west of Mickleton		Detailed modelling of Norton Brook may be required. Surface water flow paths must be mitigated onsite.	modelling for Norton Brook. Surface water flow paths	confirmed at the FRA stage	Drainage strategy
Strategic extension to the south of Preston	Flood Map for Planning	Potential risk from ordinary watercourses.	Absence of modelling for ordinary watercourses	Yes. Though risk from the ordinary watercourses must be confirmed at the FRA stage	Modelling of ordinary watercourses. Drainage strategy
MK7 - Land between Summerville Ltd. and Stratford Road	Flood Map for Planning	Nominal risk from surface water. Potential risk from ordinary watercourse	Absence of modelling for ordinary watercourse	Yes. Though risk from the ordinary watercourses must be confirmed at the FRA stage	Modelling of ordinary watercourse. Drainage strategy
R203ABC - Land to rear of the Knoll, Whelford Road	Flood Map for Planning	Nominal risk from surface water.	None	Yes	Drainage strategy
R591 - Former Godwin Pumps factory Springfield Road, GL7 5BX	Flood Map for Planning	Nominal risk from surface water.	None	Yes	Drainage strategy
R592 - Land at Springfield Road	Flood Map for Planning	Nominal risk from surface water.	None	Yes	Drainage strategy

Site reference / name	How has main risk been identified?	Summary of assessment	Main barriers to development	Can the site be allocated, based on current information?	Potential additional work at FRA stage
R607 - Land north of London Road	Flood Map for Planning	Surface water flow paths must be mitigated onsite	Risk from surface water	Yes. Though surface water flood risk must be confirmed at the FRA stage	Drainage strategy
R670 - Glebe Farmyard, Hatherop	Flood Map for Planning	Nominal risk from surface water.	None	Yes	Drainage strategy
New settlement to the south of Driffield	Flood Map for Planning	Risk area from ordinary watercourse should not be developed. Detailed modelling of ordinary watercourses may be required. Surface water flow paths must be mitigated onsite	Absence of modelling for ordinary watercourses. Risk from surface water	Yes. Though fluvial and surface water flood risk must be confirmed at the FRA stage	Modelling of ordinary watercourses. Drainage strategy
S55B - Land adjoining Tall Trees, Oddington Road	Flood Map for Planning	Nominal risk from surface water.	None	Yes	Drainage strategy
SD15 - Plummers Farm, east of Aston Road	Flood Map for planning. River Churn (Baunton to Siddington) 2011 model	Nominal risk from rivers and surface water.	None	Yes	Potential update to River Churn model. Drainage strategy. Consultation with canal owner

Site reference / name	How has main risk been identified?	Summary of assessment	Main barriers to development	Can the site be allocated, based on current information?	Potential additional work at FRA stage
SD17 - Land east of Siddington Road and west of Bluebell Drive	Flood Map for planning. River Churn (Baunton to Siddington) 2011 model	Climate change risk area should not be developed. This will limit plot numbers. Potential risk from ordinary watercourse.	Flood Zone 2 and impacts of climate change	Recommend against allocation	Potential update to River Churn model. Assess risk from ordinary watercourse. Drainage strategy
SD20 - Land north of Clark's Lane and south of Old Canal	Flood Map for Planning	Nominal risk from surface water.	None	Yes	Drainage strategy
SD23 - Land between disused canal and disused railway line, north of Park Way	Flood Map for planning. River Churn (Baunton to Siddington) 2011 model	Potential risk from ordinary watercourse. Safe access and escape may be challenging to achieve	Absence of modelling for ordinary watercourse. Achieving safe access and escape	Yes. Though risk from ordinary watercourse and safe access and escape routes must be confirmed at the FRA stage	Potential update to River Churn model. Assess risk from ordinary watercourse. Drainage strategy
W4B - Land between Colin Lane and future Heritage Railway	Flood Map for Planning	Potential risk from ordinary watercourses. Surface water flow paths must be mitigated onsite	Absence of modelling for ordinary watercourses. Risk from surface water	Yes. Though risk from ordinary watercourses and surface water must be confirmed at the FRA stage	Modelling of ordinary watercourses. Drainage strategy

Site reference / name	How has main risk been identified?	Summary of assessment	Main barriers to development	Can the site be allocated, based on current information?	Potential additional work at FRA stage
W8C - Land west of Field Close & north of B4632	Flood Map for Planning	Potential risk from ordinary watercourses. Surface water flow paths must be mitigated onsite	Absence of modelling for ordinary watercourses. Risk from surface water	Yes. Though risk from ordinary watercourses and surface water must be confirmed at the FRA stage	Modelling of ordinary watercourses. Drainage strategy



www.jbaconsulting.com

JBA
consulting

Our Offices

Bristol
Coleshill
Cork
Doncaster
Dublin
Edinburgh
Exeter
Glasgow
Haywards Heath
Leeds
Limerick

Newcastle
Newport
Peterborough
Portsmouth
Saltaire
Skipton
Tadcaster
Thirsk
Wallingford
Warrington



