

Sheffield City Council Sequential and Exception Test Report

1. Introduction and Background

Introduction

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to demonstrate how the Sequential and Exception Tests have been undertaken and applied to inform the selection of sites for allocation in the Sheffield Plan - Proposed Additional Site Allocations (May 2025) document.

National Policy and Guidance

- 1.2 The Flood Risk And Climate Change Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) states (Paragraph 025) that for the purposes of strategic plan preparation, a Sequential Test needs to be applied to the whole local planning authority area. This note therefore provides an addendum to the Sequential Test performed for the Draft Sheffield Plan, as set out in the Site Selection Methodology (CD56, Paragraph 4.3-4.4). Application of the Sequential Test in respect to Green Belt sites therefore needs to be considered in the wider context of the Plan as a whole.
- 1.3 The *National Planning Policy Framework* (Paragraph 161, September 2023) states that *“All plans should apply a sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development – taking into account all sources of flood risk and the current and future impacts of climate change – so as to avoid, where possible, flood risk to people and property.”* NPPF paragraph 161 then sets out how this should be achieved, and how residual risk is managed (paragraphs (a) – (d)). Paragraph (a) sets out that the Sequential Test should be applied, and then if necessary, the Exception Test.
- 1.4 Paragraph 162 then goes on to state: *“The aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding. The strategic flood risk assessment will provide the basis for applying this test. The sequential approach should be used in areas known to be at risk now or in the future from any form of flooding”*
- 1.5 The PPG (paragraph 023) expands upon this point by confirming that the aim of the sequential approach (i.e. application of the Test) in the plan-making process is:
- “to help ensure that development is steered to the lowest risk areas, where it is compatible with sustainable development objectives to do so”.*
- 1.6 In accordance with paragraph 162 (above), it is only sites that are *“reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development”* that need to be sequentially assessed. Further guidance is provided in the PPG, with the relevant paragraph (Paragraph 028)) being updated on 17th September 2025. It provides as follows,

“Sites should be considered ‘reasonably available’ for the purposes of the sequential test if their location is suitable for the type of development proposed, they are able to meet the same development needs and they have a reasonable prospect of being developed at the same time as the proposal.

In considering whether alternative lower-risk sites (which could, where relevant, be a series of two or more smaller sites) would be capable of accommodating the proposed development, such alternative sites do not need to be owned by the applicant to be considered ‘reasonably available’.”

- 1.7 The outcome of the Sequential Test is a material factor, with the force of national policy, that must be weighed in the balance in determining whether a site should be allocated. However, national policy does not require that allocations cannot be made where sequentially preferable sites (in flood risk terms) are available, and nor does national policy create a presumption to that effect¹. In determining what sites should be allocated, a judgment is required as to the extent to which sites meet wider sustainable development objectives. As already set out, this will include consideration of the outcome of the sequential test, but will also include other factors that are relevant to wider sustainability objectives (for example, making best use of previously developed and non – Green Belt land, sustainable patterns of development and the extent of flood risk, including whether vulnerable development can be excluded from areas at risk of flooding). Having regard to wider sustainability objectives, sites might therefore be proposed to be allocated even where sequentially preferable sites (in flood risk terms) are available.
- 1.8 This approach is consistent with the PPG (paragraph 023) which, as set out above, confirms that the aim of the sequential test (flood risk) is to help ensure that development is steered to the lowest risk areas, **“where it is compatible with sustainable development objectives to do so”** (emphasis added). It also reflects the overarching principle in favour of sustainable development in NPPF Paragraph 11, which sets out that development plans should promote a sustainable pattern of development

¹ As set out above, it is noted that NPPF Paragraph 162 states that development “should not” be allocated if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding. However, in the case of *R (on the application of Asda Stores v Leeds CC and CDP Limited* [2021] EWCA Civ 32, the Court of Appeal confirmed, in relation to similar wording (that applies in relation to the retail sequential test) that the words “should” do not mean “must” and do not create a policy presumption against the proposed development. Instead, the fact that there were sequentially preferable sites available was a negative factor with the weight of national policy to be considered in the balance in the exercise of planning judgment (see paragraphs 36 – 42). In *Mead Realisations Ltd v Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities and Hertsmere BC* [2024] EWHC 279 (Admin), a case dealing with the sequential test (flood risk), Holgate J recognised (at paragraph 173), that in the context of the preparation and examination of a development plan, having carried out the sequential test (flood risk), it remained a matter of planning judgment for the decision maker to determine whether a site should be allocated (note – although *Mead* was subsequently appealed to the Court of Appeal, this point is unaffected).

that seeks to meet a range of objectives. These include aligning growth and infrastructure, improving the environment, mitigating climate change including by making effective use of land in urban areas, and adapting to its effects.

- 1.9 As detailed in NPPF paragraphs 163 – 165, if it is not possible for development to be located in areas with a lower risk of flooding, taking into account wider sustainable development objectives, the Exception Test may also need to be applied.
- 1.10 Further guidance as to the exception test is given in the PPG. Paragraphs 032 and 033 diagram 3 indicate that the exception test should only be applied as set out in Table 2. Table 2 considers fluvial flood risk and the vulnerability of the proposed development. The notes to table 2 indicate that *“Some developments may contain different elements of vulnerability and the highest vulnerability category should be used, unless the development is considered in its component parts”*. In considering whether the exception test should be applied to the proposed allocations, the Council has therefore considered whether it is appropriate to consider proposed development in its component parts. This is explained further below (at paragraphs 5.2-5.3).

Strategic Flood Risk Assessment

- 1.11 The *Strategic Flood Risk Assessment* (SFRA) forms an important part of the evidence base for assessing the impacts of flooding on the potential sites. Information from both the Level 1 (EXAM FR01-FR13) and Level 2 (Exam 38-42D, EXAM 133) SFRA's were used to inform the tests. The SFRA takes account of all potential sources of flood risk across the whole plan area. The impacts of climate change and cumulative impacts are also considered. The SFRA has been produced with full consideration of the latest government and Environment Agency (EA) guidance on flood risk and planning policy. The EA have been closely involved in production of the Level 1 and Level 2 SFRA's and have confirmed its suitability for use in the plan making process via relevant Statements of Common Ground.

National Flood modelling update

- 1.12 During the process of the examination, the EA published an updated National Flood Risk Assessment (NaFRA2). One of the outputs of this was an update to the flood zone data (Flood zones 2 and 3) on the 'Flood Map for Planning'. As this update incorporates surface water flooding to a greater extent than the previous national assessment, it has resulted in some areas of land that were previously only in the national Risk of Surface Water Flooding dataset as now being within flood zones 2 or 3.
- 1.13 The potential implications for the Additional Site Allocations from the updated modelling were discussed with the EA. The EA has advised that they do not consider that it is necessary, or reasonable (given that this would cause further delay to the examination timetable) to incorporate the NaFRA2 updates into the assessments. The EA advised that they do not consider that the new data sets change the level of risk to an extent that overall conclusions in relation to the acceptability of the proposed allocations would change, when taking into account the conservative approach already taken in both the SFRA and the proposed Local Plan policy on Flood Risk (GS9). This is set out in both the EAs comments on the Additional Site Allocations (REF1.2018) and an updated Statement of Common Ground.

2. The Sequential Test and Exception Test Methodology

- 2.1 All 102 sites identified in the Selection of Sites for Green Belt Release Topic Paper (Exam 130) were reviewed to see if they could be considered as being reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development. The NPPF is clear (Paragraph 162) that if a site is not considered to be appropriate for the development, it does not form part of the Sequential Test process.
- 2.2 Findings from both the Sustainability Appraisal and the Selection of Sites for Green Belt Release Topic Paper were used to inform this part of the process. This resulted in 77 sites being removed from the process. The conclusions from these evidence bases demonstrated that those sites could not be considered "reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development" in the context of the NPPF and PPG. It is noted that the PPG (Paragraph 028) confirms that this assessment includes considering whether their location is suitable for the type of development proposed. Sites removed in this part of the process and conclusions on their suitability for development are given in Appendix 3 (Sites ruled out due to fundamental constraints) and Appendix 8 (Individual site assessments for non-shortlisted sites) of the Selection of Sites for Green Belt Release Topic Paper (EXAM 130),
- 2.3 This resulted in 25 sites being considered suitable for inclusion into the Sequential Test process. Site screening reports (EXAM 133B – 133X) were produced for these

sites². This included modelling of climate change with regards to surface water flooding, as the national EA models did not include the upper end climate change allowance recommended in national guidance³. Full details of the screening process and datasets used are set out in the Sheffield Level 2 SFRA (Additional Sites) Main Report (EXAM 133A). Following the Sequential Test guidance set out in the PPG (paragraphs 23 – 26), outputs from these assessments, alongside those previously produced in the Level 1 and 2 SFRA were used to group the sites using the below classifications:

Low risk⁴

- Site is wholly in flood zone 1 (including an allowance for climate change); and
- Site is wholly at the lowest risk of surface water flooding (including an allowance for climate change); and
- Site is not at risk of reservoir flooding

Medium risk⁵

- Areas of the site are in flood zone 2 (including an allowance for climate change); or
- Areas of the site are at a medium risk of surface water flooding (including an allowance for climate change); or
- Site is at risk of (wet day) reservoir flooding

High risk⁶

- Areas of the site are in flood zone 3a or 3b; or
- Areas of the site are at a high risk of surface water flooding (including an allowance for climate change); or
- Site is at risk of (dry day) reservoir flooding

2.4 Once the sites had been grouped using the risk classifications set out above, it was then considered whether there was a variation in risk within each category of risk (see

² A detailed site screening report was not considered necessary for site S03059 (Land to the east of Long Lane and north of Hanson Road), as the existing Level 1 and 2 SFRA data showed it would remain at the lowest risk of flooding from all sources (both now and in the future)

³ [Flood risk assessments: climate change allowances](#)

⁴ This definition also equates to sites described in the Site Selection Methodology as being at “Minimal risk”

⁵ This definition also equates to sites described in the Site Selection Methodology as being at “Some risk”

⁶ This definition also equates to sites described in the Site Selection Methodology as being at “Significant risk”

diagram 2 PPG (paragraph 026). It should be noted that the sites categorised as being at medium or high risk are generally based on a relatively small area of a site falling into those categories. The spatial variation of risk between the sites is relatively low overall. Overall, it was not considered that there was a distinction in terms of risk between sites in each category.

- 2.5 It should be noted that groundwater and sewer flooding are also other potential sources of flood risk. The PPG (paragraph 23) is clear that all forms of flooding need to be treated consistently, with regards to mapping probability and assessing vulnerability. This means that suitable mapping is required for each type of flooding in order to make a logical comparison of the different types of potential risk on a site. The readily available datasets for groundwater and sewer flood risk available to the LPA do not competently define areas of high or low risk of flooding.
- 2.6 As is set out in detail in section 4.4 of the Sheffield Level 2 SFRA (Additional Sites) Main Report (EXAM 133A), it is therefore considered inappropriate to use that data at this phase of the Test. The available datasets are insufficient for conducting a thorough analysis that would demonstrably show that one site is at a lower risk of flooding compared to another. To sufficiently understand and mitigate any potential risks from these sources, the SFRA recommends that it is more appropriate to perform detailed assessment in a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment at masterplan or planning application stage.
- 2.7 A risk-based approach to the location of development was then applied to each site. This identified where land at risk of flooding (or in use as current or future flood management) could be easily removed from the site boundary, or where it fell/could fall within non-developable areas (such as wildlife or watercourse buffers). By gaining this comprehensive understanding of each site's 'developable areas', it was possible to evaluate what the impact on a site's indicated capacity would be if vulnerable development were to be delivered only on areas of lowest flood risk.
- 2.8 This information was used to inform both the wider site selection process (forming part of the assessment into a site's final boundary, developable area, and estimated capacity) and to also identify if the Exception Test would also be necessary on a site (having regard to whether the development could be considered in its component parts – see Notes to Table 2 PPG, above).

3. Findings of the Sequential Test

- 3.1 Details of all the sites forming the Sequential Test and their identified flood risks are set out in Appendix 1. It should be noted that these tables were created using the outputs from the SFRA site screening reports. These screening reports utilised the original full

assessment boundaries, to fully appraise any potential flood risks to the sites. Whilst boundaries to Site Allocations were subsequently adjusted (to take account of impacts such as flood risk) this is not reflected in the Sequential Test tables in this report. The Sequential Test process as set out in the PPG (Diagram 2 - Paragraph 26) was to be followed.

- 3.2 After considering sites at lowest risk (both now and in the future), it was identified that 2 housing sites (Capacity for 99 homes) immediately passed the Sequential Test.
- 3.3 At this point it was identified that a sufficient capacity of development could not be allocated fully on sites at the lowest risk of flooding. In line with the PPG, sites at medium risk were then reviewed (starting with lowest risk sites first). This identified a further 3 housing sites (Capacity for a further 922 homes) and 1 employment site (Capacity for 13.98 Hectares employment land) that passed the Sequential Test.
- 3.4 Again it was concluded that a sufficient capacity of development could not be allocated fully on sites at the lowest and medium risk of flooding. In line with the PPG, sites at high risk were then reviewed (starting with lowest risk sites first). This identified a further 15 housing sites (Capacity for a further 4073 homes) and 4 employment sites⁷ (Capacity for a further 69.61 Hectares employment land).

4. Applying the sequential approach to allocating sites

- 4.1 The outcome of the sequential test was carefully considered by the Council in determining which sites to allocate. Alongside the question of whether there were other sequentially preferable (in flood risk terms) sites available (as established through the Sequential Test - above), wider sustainability benefits were also considered.
- 4.2 Firstly, consideration was given to the implications of applying the Sequential Test across the whole Local Planning Authority area (so encompassing those both in the urban area and the green belt). Whilst there were a number of reasonably available Green Belt sites that are sequentially preferable in flood risk terms as compared to some previously developed sites in the urban area, national policy (NPPF Paragraph 141) is also clear that, before concluding exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the strategic policy making authority should be able to demonstrate that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need. This includes whether the strategy makes as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land in the urban areas. Therefore, it was not considered appropriate to allocate further Green Belt sites in preference to non Green Belt sites, or over and above those necessary to meet the shortfall identified by the

⁷ One site, S03061 (Handsworth Hall Farm) was tested for both housing and employment uses.

Inspectors (including an additional allowance for flexibility), even where it would be sequentially preferable (in flood risk terms) to do so. Whilst the sites performance in terms of the Sequential Test (flood risk) remains an important material consideration, wider sustainability objectives and national policy objectives outweighed them in this instance.

- 4.3 As set out above, in respect of the Green Belt sites, sites were appraised having regard to how they met wider sustainable development objectives. These assessments were carefully considered alongside the outcome of the sequential test (and national policy in relation to the sequential test) to determine which sites should be allocated.
- 4.4 The merits of a site's contribution to overarching wider sustainability objectives was considered with regard to the objectives set by both national policy and within the Local Plan itself. This was established from the Plan's wider evidence bases, such as the Sustainability Appraisal and the Selection of Sites for Green Belt Release Topic Paper (EXAM 130). It included consideration of such factors as the promotion of sustainable patterns of development (including positioning relative to existing settlement boundaries), meeting the development needs of an area, impact on the Green Belt purposes and rural landscape impact.
- 4.5 The actual flood risk present on sites (including the ability for vulnerable development to be located on areas of a site at lowest flood risk) was also considered within the planning balance as a material factor. The risk profiles for the sites show that the areas of sites that are at risk are very small overall, and that any areas that are at risk of flooding (in respect of both fluvial and surface water risks) would be able to remain free from vulnerable development. This further demonstrates, with confidence, that flood risks can be considered as relatively low across the sites as a whole and that, based on the outcomes of the Level 2 SFRA screening reports, development can be made safe for its lifetime. Additional weight is therefore be afforded to this consideration within this process.
- 4.6 In addition, it is also noted that as part of the recent PPG update (17 September 2025) the following text has been added to Paragraph 027, in regards to the application of the Sequential Test in determining planning applications:

"In applying paragraph 175 a proportionate approach should be taken. Where a site-specific flood risk assessment demonstrates clearly that the proposed layout, design, and mitigation measures would ensure that occupiers and users would remain safe from current and future surface water flood risk for the lifetime of the development (therefore addressing the risks identified e.g. by Environment Agency flood risk mapping), without increasing flood risk elsewhere, then the sequential test need not be applied."

- 4.7 Whilst this appears under the section dealing with planning applications rather than policy making, the Council considers that it nevertheless demonstrates that it is material that (based on the risk profiles in Appendix 1 and the conclusions of the SFRA site screening reports that development could be made safe for its lifetime) the Sequential Test would likely not now be applicable to a large number⁸ of these sites for the purposes of decision-making, were a planning application to be made on them. That is, national guidance recognises that it can be appropriate for sites subject to surface water risk to come forward, even where there are sequentially preferable sites available, in the circumstances set out in this paragraph and where (as is the case with the sites proposed for allocation) the development can be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere.
- 4.8 The outcome of this assessment resulted in 3 sequentially preferable (in terms of the Sequential Test alone) housing sites⁹ and 1 sequentially preferable employment site not being recommended for allocation. Whilst this meant that some sites considered not appropriate for allocation were sequentially preferable (in flood risk terms) to other sites, the approach remains consistent with the requirement to take the wider sustainable development objectives into account. A summary of reasons why those sites were not considered to meet wider sustainability objectives is set out in the Proposed Additional Site Allocations: Site Selection – Additional Note. This should be read together with the Council’s wider assessment work, as summarised above, which informed its decisions as to which sites should be allocated.

5. Findings of the Exception Test

- 5.1 The PPG requires (Diagram 2), that where it is established that development can be allocated within the lowest risk sites available in areas of high flood risk, consideration is given as to whether the exception test needs to be applied. The question as to whether the Exception Test is required is answered by considering Table 2 in the PPG (paragraph 079).
- 5.2 As set out in the tables in Appendix 1 below, the Exception Test was not required for any of the sites. This conclusion is based on the NPPF vulnerability classifications (Annex 3), the PPG incompatibility matrix in Table 2 of the PPG, and the notes to that table. As set out above, the notes to Table 2 recognise that some developments may contain different elements of vulnerability, and that the highest vulnerability category should be used, unless the development is considered in its component parts.

⁸ 15 of the housing sites assessed are only at risk from surface water flooding (S03260, S03059, S03028, S03100, S03033, S03038, S03020, S02502, S03004, S04030, GBOM06, S02898, S03061, S03076 & S03035). 4 employment sites assessed are only at risk from surface water flooding. (S03005, S03112, S04639, S03061)

⁹ A further 2 housing sites were also not recommended for allocation, but were also the least preferable options in terms of the Sequential Test.

- 5.3 The risk profiles for the sites in Appendix 1 show that for 3 proposed site allocations ¹⁰ a small area of functional floodplain (Flood zone 3b) is present on site. These areas are located at the external boundaries of the sites. The specific-site allocation policies are clear that these areas must remain free from built development, and would therefore only be suitable for water compatible development (such as local wildlife site buffers (see table at appendix 1). It is therefore appropriate in these instances, based on the proposed policies and the way in which the component parts of the development will be delivered pursuant to those policies, to treat these areas as separate component parts for the purpose of determining whether the Exception Test applies. As all the remaining areas of the proposed site allocations are not within Flood Zone 3a, the Exception Test would not be applicable for More Vulnerable development uses.
- 5.4 None of the other site allocations require the exception test to be applied, applying the guidance in Table 2.
- 5.5 For all sites considered for employment use (a Less Vulnerable use), the risk profiles show that the sites are contained completely within Flood Zone 1 and so would not be subject to the Exception Test, applying Table 2 PPG.
- 5.6 Following the process in the PPG, the individual site assessments within the SFRA (EXAM 133B – R) then establish how development can be made safe throughout its lifetime, would not increase flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall. The PPG process then concludes by identifying that the sites can be considered for allocation.
- 5.7 Whilst this demonstrates that the Exception Test is not required in this instance, the Council is satisfied that, if a contrary view were to be taken and the Exception Test were to be applied, then both parts of the Exception Test in paragraph 164 of the NPPF would be satisfied for the Proposed Additional Site Allocations. As set out in Section 4, the recommended sites would deliver wider sustainability benefits to the community that would outweigh flood risk, satisfying the first part of the test. As set out in paragraph 5.5, above, the individual site assessments within the SFRA then establish how development can be made safe throughout its lifetime taking into account the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall, satisfying the second part of the test.

¹⁰ Site allocations NES37, NWS30 & NWS31

Appendix 1: Sequential test of individual sites

Notes – Sites shaded in orange are not selected for allocation. Flood zone and surface water risk areas overlap in instances where areas of land are at risk from both sources

Table 1.1 – Housing sites

*A precautionary approach is being taken in categorising risk for this site, in order to take account of potential impacts of climate change on surface water flooding.

Sequential Test Risk category	Site	Estimated Capacity	Address	% of site in Flood zone				% of site at Surface water risk			Risk of reservoir flooding	Risk-based approach to development – is the assumed quantum of development is achievable in areas of lowest flood risk?	Exception Test
				1	2	3a	3b	Low	Medium	High			
Low	S03260	67	Land at Stour Lane	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Yes	Not required - Vulnerable development can be contained within Flood zone 1
Low	S03059	32	Land to the east of Long Lane and north of Hanson Road	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Yes	Not required - Vulnerable development can be contained within Flood zone 1
Medium*	NES38 / S03028 & S03100* combined	188	Holme Lane Farm and land to the west of Grenoside Grange	100	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Yes	Not required - Vulnerable development can be contained within Flood zone 1
Medium*	S03033*	185	Land at Brightholmlee Lane	100	0	0	0	2	0	0	No	Yes	Not required - Vulnerable development can be contained within Flood zone 1
Medium	CH05 / S03038	549	Land to the east of Chapeltown Road	100	0	0	0	1	1	0	No	Yes	Not required - Vulnerable development can be contained within Flood zone 1

Sequential Test Risk category	Site	Estimated Capacity	Address	% of site in Flood zone				% of site at Surface water risk			Risk of reservoir flooding	Risk-based approach to development – is the assumed quantum of development is achievable in areas of lowest flood risk?	Exception Test
				1	2	3a	3b	Low	Medium	High			
High	SES30 / S03020 & S02502 combined	868	Land between Bramley Lane and Beaver Hill Road	100	0	0	0	2	1	1	No	Yes	Not required - Vulnerable development can be contained within Flood zone 1
High	S03004	292	Land to the west of Moor Valley	100	0	0	0	2	1	1	No	Yes	Not required - Vulnerable development can be contained within Flood zone 1
High	S04030	357	Land to the west of Moss Way	100	0	0	0	2	1	1	No	Yes	Not required - Vulnerable development can be contained within Flood zone 1
High	SWS19 / GBOM06	82	Land to the north of Parkers Lane	100	0	0	0	6	1	1	No	Yes	Not required - Vulnerable development can be contained within Flood zone 1
High	SS19 / S02898	304	Land to the south of White Lane	100	0	0	0	5	1	2	No	Yes	Not required - Vulnerable development can be contained within Flood zone 1
High	SES29/ S03061	770	Handsworth Hall Farm, Land at Finchwell Road	100	0	0	0	7	2	3	No	Yes - Surface water flow routes and unnamed watercourse across the site. Areas of risk within Local Wildlife Site have been removed from the site allocation. Remaining areas of risk could be incorporated into SuDS scheme and blue/green infrastructure.	Not required - Vulnerable development can be contained within Flood zone 1

Sequential Test Risk category	Site	Estimated Capacity	Address	% of site in Flood zone				% of site at Surface water risk			Risk of reservoir flooding	Risk-based approach to development – is the assumed quantum of development is achievable in areas of lowest flood risk?	Exception Test
				1	2	3a	3b	Low	Medium	High			
High	SWS18/S03076	258	Land between Lodge Moor Road and Redmires Conduit	100	0	0	0	10	2	3	No	Yes - Risk of surface water flooding to portions of the site with significant depths adjacent existing development. Potential for SuDS infrastructure in areas of risk with potential betterment to existing properties.	Not required - Vulnerable development can be contained within Flood zone 1
High	NES39/S03035	148	Land at Wheel Lane and Middleton Lane	100	0	0	0	5	3	4	No	Yes - Surface water flooding to the north of the site, along the watercourse. Areas within the Local Wildlife Site have been removed from the site allocation. Remaining areas of risk will be contained within the Local Wildlife Site buffer and remain free from development.	Not required - Vulnerable development can be contained within Flood zone 1
High	NES37/S03051 & S03034 combined	609	Land south of Wheel Lane between Creswick Avenue and Wheel Lane	99.5	0	0	0.5	4	3	2	No	Yes - Very small area of functional floodplain to the east of the site, along the watercourse. This area of risk will remain free from development within a Local Wildlife Site buffer. The majority of the remaining areas of risk are contained within the Local Wildlife Site (which has been removed from the allocation) and the associated buffer, which will remain free from development.	Not required. Development is considered in its component parts - Vulnerable development contained within Flood zone 1

Sequential Test Risk category	Site	Estimated Capacity	Address	% of site in Flood zone				% of site at Surface water risk			Risk of reservoir flooding	Risk-based approach to development – is the assumed quantum of development is achievable in areas of lowest flood risk?	Exception Test
				1	2	3a	3b	Low	Medium	High			
High	NWS30/ S03032	69	Land at Forge Lane	98	1	0	1	5	3	5	No	Yes - Significant risk of surface water flooding to the south of the site, near the existing pond. This area has been removed from the site allocation. A small area of functional floodplain also adjoins the site. This area will remain free from development.	Not required. Development is considered in its component parts. Vulnerable development contained within Flood zone 1
High	NWS31 / S03483	103	Land between Storth Lane and School Lane	98	0	0	2	3	1	1	No	Yes - Areas of functional floodplain and surface water risk along Tinker Brook. These areas will be contained within a Local Wildlife Site buffer and will remain free from development.	Not required. Development is considered in its component parts. Vulnerable development contained within Flood zone 1
High	S03049	60	Land to the north of Woodhouse Lane	95	0	1	4	5	2	5	No	Yes - Area of functional floodplain to the east of the site. This area should be removed from the site allocation.	Not required. Development is considered in its component parts. Vulnerable development contained within Flood zone 1
High	GBOM01	153	Land to the north of Woodhouse Lane	87	1	1	11	6	3	5	No	Yes - Area of functional floodplain to the east of the site. This area should be removed from the site allocation.	Not required. Development is considered in its component parts. Vulnerable development contained within Flood zone 1

Table 1.2 – Employment sites

Sequential Test Risk category	Site	Estimated capacity	Address	% of site in Flood zone				% of site at Surface water risk			Risk of reservoir flooding	Risk-based approach to development – is the assumed quantum of development is achievable in areas of lowest flood risk?	Exception Test
				1	2	3a	3b	Low	Medium	High			
Medium	S03005	13.98	Land to the east of Eckington Way and south of A57	100	0	0	0	1	1	0	No	Yes	Not required - Less vulnerable use outside Zone 3b
High	CH03 / S03112	18.06	Land bordered by M1, Thorncliffe Road, Warren Lane, and White Lane	100	0	0	0	1	1	1	No	Yes	Not required - Less vulnerable use outside Zone 3b
High	NES36 / S04101	15.94	Land to the south of the M1 Motorway Junction 35	98	2	0	0	2	1	1	No	Yes - Flood zone 2 area covers portion of the site that is already developed (Farm buildings). This has been removed from the site allocation.	Not required - Less vulnerable use outside Zone 3b
High	CH04 / S04639	15.61	Hesley Wood, north of Cowley Hill	100	0	0	0	4	1	3	No	Yes	Not required - Less vulnerable use outside Zone 3b
High	SES29/ S03061	20.00	Handsworth Hall Farm, Land at Finchwell Road	100	0	0	0	7	2	3	No	Yes - Surface water flow routes and unnamed watercourse across the site. Areas of risk within Local Wildlife Site have been removed from the site allocation. Remaining areas of risk could be incorporated into SuDS scheme and blue/green infrastructure.	Not required - Less vulnerable use outside Zone 3b