Source of Flooding	High Risk	Medium Risk	Low Risk	Present Day	Future
Fluvial	Greater than 1 in 100 year (FZ3)	Between 1 in 100 and 1 in 1000 year (FZ2)	Less than 1 in 1000 year	EA's Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3 use a risk-based approach. Functional Floodplain (FZ3b) is displayed using the best available model data: 2015 Anker ISIS Tuflow. Where model data is not available, Fluvial Floodzone 3a is used as a Proxy for FZ3b.	EA's Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3 use a risk-based approach. Climate change uplifts should be assessed as part of the screening process. Where significant parts of sites area's are shown to be at risk in the 1000 year (0.1%AEP), a review of whether the site is sequentially appropriate may be required following a Level 2 assessment. This may result in slightly larger numbers of sites requiring assessment at Level 2. Climate Change uplifts use the best available data: - where climate change datasets are not avaiable to define FZ3b, the 1% AEP event should be used. - where climate change datasets are not available to define FZ3a the 0.1% AEP event should be used. - No climate change datasets are available to define Low Risk into the future and the current 0.1% AEP event should be used, noting the comment above about re-screening following any Level 2 assessment.
Coastal	Greater than 1 in 200 year (FZ3)	Between 1 in 200 and 1 in 1000 year (FZ2)	Less than 1 in 1000 year	Not relevant for Warwickshire and Coventry Authorities.	Not relevant for Warwickhire and Coventry Authorities.
Surface Water	Greater than 1 in 1000 year		Less than 1 in 1000 year	Different assumptions are used to derive surface water risk than is the case for fluvial and tidal flood zones. The RoFSW dataset potentially does not provide the confidence or certainty required to define areas of high medium and low flood risk that are comparable with the risk zones for river and sea flooding. Therefore, a precautionary approach should be taken so development is located in areas of low flood risk. This approach will require that sites where proposed development is located in a high risk surface water zone are assessed in more detail in the Level 2 SFRA.	Different assumptions are used to derive surface water risk than is the case for fluvial and tidal flood zones. The RoFSW dataset potentially does not provide the confidence or certainty required to define areas of high medium and low flood risk that are comparable with the risk zones for river and sea flooding. Therefore, a precautionary approach should be taken so development is located in areas of low flood risk. This approach will require that sites where proposed development is located in a high risk surface water zone are assessed in more detail in the Level 2 SFRA. Climate Change datasets exist for the following events and scenarios 3.3% AEP CC+25%; 3.3%AEP CC+35%; 1%AEP CC+25%; and 1%AEP CC+35%. Surface water flood risk into the future should be sequentially assessed using the maximum extent of either the existing 0.1% AEP dataset of the 1% AEP extent inlcuding 35% uplift for Climate Change.

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