



Huntingdonshire Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Site Summary

Site CfS:34

Final Draft Report

Prepared for
Huntingdonshire District
Council

Date
November 2025

Document Status

Issue date	6 November 2025
Issued to	Frances Schulz
BIM reference	JFI-JBA-XX-XX-RP-EN-0029
Revision	P03
Prepared by	Amy Ewens BSc Analyst
Reviewed by	Mike Williamson BSc MSc CGeog FRGS EADA Principal Analyst
Authorised by	Paul Eccleston BA CertWEM CEnv MCIWEM C.WEM Technical Director

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 [WGAG 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
Address	Phoenix House, Lakeside Drive, Centre Park, Warrington, WA1 1RX
JBA Project Code	2022s1322

This report describes work commissioned by Huntingdonshire District Council by an instruction via email dated 21 July 2025. The Client's representative for the contract was Frances Schulz of Huntingdonshire District Council. Amy Ewens of JBA Consulting carried out this work.

Purpose and Disclaimer

Jeremy Benn Associates Limited ("JBA") has prepared this Report for the sole use of Huntingdonshire 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 Huntingdonshire 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 21 July 2025 and 6 November 2025 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.

The conclusions and recommendations contained in this Report are based upon information provided by others and upon the assumption that all relevant information has been provided by those parties from whom it has been requested and that such information is accurate.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the Environment Agency, Cambridgeshire County Council for their assistance with this work.

Copyright

© Jeremy Benn Associates Limited 2025

Contents

1	Background	1
1.1	Site CfS:34	1
2	Flood risk from rivers and sea	5
2.1	Existing risk	5
2.2	Flood risk management	6
2.3	Impacts from climate change	7
2.4	Historic flood incidents	7
2.5	Emergency planning	7
2.6	Observations, mitigation options, site suitability, sequential approach to development management - fluvial and tidal	8
3	Flood risk from surface water	9
3.1	Existing risk	9
3.2	Impacts from climate change	12
3.3	Observations, mitigation options, site suitability, sequential approach to development management - surface water	15
4	Cumulative impacts assessment and high risk catchments	17
4.1	Level 1 cumulative impacts assessment	17
5	Groundwater, geology, soils, SuDS suitability	18
6	Residual risk	21
6.1	Potential blockage / breach	21
6.2	Flood risk from reservoirs	21
7	Overall site assessment	22
7.1	Can part b) of the exception test be passed?	22
7.2	Recommendations summary	22
7.3	Site-specific FRA requirements and further work	22
8	Licencing	23

List of Figures

Figure 1-1: Existing site location boundary	2
Figure 1-2: Aerial photography	3
Figure 1-3: Topography	4
Figure 2-1: Existing risk	5
Figure 2-2: Natural Flood Management (NFM) potential mapping	6
Figure 2-3: Potential access and escape routes	8
Figure 3-1: Surface water flood extents (NaFRA2 - Risk of Flooding from Surface Water map)	10
Figure 3-2: Medium risk event surface water flood depths (Third generation - Risk of Flooding from Surface Water map)	11
Figure 3-3: Medium risk event surface water flood hazard (Third generation - Risk of Flooding from Surface Water map)	12
Figure 3-4: Low risk event surface water flood extent, as a proxy for the medium risk event plus climate change (NaFRA2 - Risk of Flooding from Surface Water map)	13
Figure 3-5: Low risk event surface water flood depths, as a proxy for the medium risk event plus climate change (Third generation - Risk of Flooding from Surface Water map)	14
Figure 3-6: Low risk event surface water flood hazard, as a proxy for the medium risk event plus climate change (Third generation - Risk of Flooding from Surface Water map)	15
Figure 5-1: JBA 5m Groundwater Emergence Map	18
Figure 5-2: Soils and geology	20

List of Tables

Table 2-1: Existing flood risk based on percentage area of site at risk	5
Table 3-1: Existing surface water flood risk based on percentage area at risk using the NaFRA2 RoFSW map	9
Table 5-1: Groundwater Hazard Classification	19

1 Background

This is a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) site screening report for Local Plan Site CfS:34. The content of this report assumes the reader has already consulted the 'HDC Level 1 SFRA' (2024) and read the 'HDC Level 2 SFRA Main Report' (2025) and is therefore familiar with the terminology used in this report.

1.1 Site CfS:34

- Location: Land to South West of South Farm, Upton
- Existing site use: Garden land
- Existing site use vulnerability: Less vulnerable
- Proposed site use: Residential
- Proposed site use vulnerability: More vulnerable
- Site area (ha): 0.40
- Watercourse: Unnamed unmodelled ordinary watercourse
- Environment Agency (EA) model: N/A
- Summary of requirements from Level 2 SFRA scoping stage:
 - Assessment of surface water flood extent, depths and hazards
 - Assessment of all other sources of flood risk



Figure 1-1: Existing site location boundary



Figure 1-2: Aerial photography




Figure 1-3: Topography

2 Flood risk from rivers and sea

2.1 Existing risk

2.1.1 Flood Map for Planning and functional floodplain

Based on the EA's Flood Map for Planning (accessed July 2025) and Flood Zone 3b (functional floodplain), as updated in this Level 2 SFRA, the percentage areas of the site within each flood zone are stated in Table 2-1 and can be viewed on Figure 2-1. This version of the Flood Map for Planning does not consider flood defence infrastructure (Section 2.2) or the impacts of climate change (Section 2.3).

The whole site is modelled to be within Flood Zone 1 indicating it is at low risk of flooding from rivers. There is an unmodelled ordinary watercourse on the northeastern boundary.

Table 2-1: Existing flood risk based on percentage area of site at risk

Flood Zone 1 (% area)	Flood Zone 2 (% area)	Flood Zone 3a (% area)	Flood Zone 3b (% area)
100	0	0	0




Figure 2-1: Existing risk

2.2 Flood risk management

2.2.1 Flood defences

The site does not benefit from any formal engineered flood defences, according to the EA's spatial flood defences dataset.

2.2.2 Working with Natural Processes

The EA's Working with Natural Processes (WwNP) dataset has been interrogated to identify opportunities for Natural Flood Management (NFM) to reduce flood risk to the site and surrounding areas. These areas are shown in Figure 2-2. Note, the WwNP mapping is broadscale and indicative, therefore further investigation will be required for any land shown to have potential for WwNP. Both within and around the site, there is significant potential for tree planting to reduce runoff.




Figure 2-2: Natural Flood Management (NFM) potential mapping

2.3 Impacts from climate change

2.3.1 Fluvial

The EA's Flood Map for Planning shows the site is not at risk from fluvial climate change.

2.3.2 Tidal

The EA's Flood Map for Planning shows the site is not at risk from tidal climate change.

2.4 Historic flood incidents

The EA's Historic Flood Map (HFM) and Recorded Flood Outlines (RFO) datasets have been considered which show there are no recorded historic flood incidents within the vicinity of the site.

2.5 Emergency planning

2.5.1 Flood warning

The EA operates a Flood Warning Service for properties located within a Flood Warning Area (FWA) for when a flood event is expected to occur. The site is not located within a FWA.

Flood alerts may be issued before a flood warning for properties located within a Flood Alert Area (FAA) to provide advance notice of the possibility of flooding. A flood alert may be issued when there is less confidence that flooding will occur in a FWA. The site is not located within a FAA.

2.5.2 Access and escape routes

Based on available information, safe access and escape routes could likely be achieved during a flood event via Pig Market End in the northwest of the site.




Figure 2-3: Potential access and escape routes

2.6 Observations, mitigation options, site suitability, sequential approach to development management - fluvial and tidal

- Observations:
 - The proposed development of the site would see a change in the risk classification from less vulnerable to more vulnerable, according to the NPPF.
 - The extent of fluvial risk from the unmodelled ordinary watercourse is currently unknown. Using the 0.1% AEP surface water event as a proxy, the risk is very low.
- Mitigation:
 - The site-specific FRA may look to develop a model of the ordinary watercourse to gauge any potential risk.
 - If works are proposed on or near the ordinary watercourse, a separate permission may be required. The type of permission needed and whether it must be sought from the Environment Agency, Lead Local Flood Authority or Internal Drainage Board will depend on the activity and location proposed.
- Access and escape:
 - Safe access and escape routes must be available at times of flood and appear to be available from the northwest of the site, via Pig Markey End.

3 Flood risk from surface water

3.1 Existing risk

The NaFRA2 Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (RoFSW) mapping received a significant update and was published January 2025, including for surface water flood extents and depths. However, at the time of writing, the EA has confirmed that the depth information available is not structured in a way that is suitable for planning purposes. Therefore, this Level 2 SFRA considers the third generation RoFSW depth and hazard mapping in addition to the NaFRA2 extents, as agreed with the EA. Surface water depth and hazard should be modelled at the site-specific FRA stage.

3.1.1 Risk of Flooding from Surface Water - NaFRA2 extents

Based on the EA's national scale RoFSW map, as updated in January 2025, none of the site is at high surface water risk. Less than 1% is at medium surface water risk and less than 1% at low surface water risk. The nominal surface water risk is located at the ordinary watercourse in the northeast extent of the site.

It should be noted that the Pig Market End access road to the northwest of the site is shown to be at high surface water risk. Investigations into safe access and escape routes via this road will be required at the FRA stage.

Table 3-1: Existing surface water flood risk based on percentage area at risk using the NaFRA2 RoFSW map

Very low risk (% area)	Low risk (% area)	Medium risk (% area)	High risk (% area)
>99	<1	<1	0




Figure 3-1: Surface water flood extents (NaFRA2 - Risk of Flooding from Surface Water map)

3.1.2 Risk of Flooding from Surface Water - third generation depths and hazard

The EA's national scale third generation RoFSW map shows the site to not be at risk from surface water flooding. It also shows the area at risk on Pig Market End to be significantly smaller than NaFRA2. Depths are shown to remain predominantly below 0.30m (Figure 3-2) and it should pose a low to moderate risk to the west of the site (Figure 3-3).




Figure 3-2: Medium risk event surface water flood depths (Third generation - Risk of Flooding from Surface Water map)




Figure 3-3: Medium risk event surface water flood hazard¹ (Third generation - Risk of Flooding from Surface Water map)

3.2 Impacts from climate change

The NaFRA2 RoFSW mapping now includes one modelled climate change scenario, the 2050s central allowance for the high, medium and low risk events. However, the upper end allowance on peak rainfall for the 2070s should be assessed in SFRAs. Therefore, at the time of writing, the available national surface water climate change mapping is unsuitable for consideration in development planning. This Level 2 SFRA considers the low risk surface water event as a conservative proxy for the medium risk event plus climate change, as agreed with the EA. The impact of climate change on surface water flood risk should be fully accounted for at the site-specific FRA stage.

Based on the information available, a nominal amount of surface water risk is predicted in the northeast of the site (Figure 3-4). This area of risk is predicted to remain below 0.30m in depth (Figure 3-5) and be a low risk within the site (Figure 3-6). Flooding is now predicted along Pig Market End but this should remain below 0.30m in depths and predominantly be a low hazard. Access should therefore remain achievable via this road.

¹ Based on Section 7.5 Hazard rating. What is the Risk of Flooding from Surface Water map? Report version 2.0. April 2019. Environment Agency

Map of surface water flooding extent in a low risk event as a proxy for medium risk plus climate change




Figure 3-4: Low risk event surface water flood extent, as a proxy for the medium risk event plus climate change (NaFRA2 - Risk of Flooding from Surface Water map)



Figure 3-5: Low risk event surface water flood depths, as a proxy for the medium risk event plus climate change (Third generation - Risk of Flooding from Surface Water map)



Figure 3-6: Low risk event surface water flood hazard, as a proxy for the medium risk event plus climate change (Third generation - Risk of Flooding from Surface Water map)

3.3 Observations, mitigation options, site suitability, sequential approach to development management - surface water

- Current risk to the site is predominantly very low, with over 99% of the site being at very low surface water flood risk. There is no surface water risk in the high risk event and medium and low risk events it is confined to an area of ponding at the ordinary watercourse at the northeast of the site.
- The effects of climate change on surface water have not been modelled for this SFRA, however the low risk surface water event has been used as a proxy for the medium risk event plus climate change. Risk is largely similar to the medium risk event, with a slightly greater extent of ponding in the northeast of the site.
- A drainage strategy will be required given the site is currently greenfield. Greenfield rates will apply, and the developer should follow the National SuDS guidance and any local guidance available from the LLFA.
- The ordinary watercourse should be included in site design.
- The RoFSW map is not suitable for identifying whether an individual property will flood and is therefore indicative. The RoFSW map is not appropriate to act as the sole evidence for any specific planning or regulatory decision or assessment of

risk in relation to flooding at any scale without further supporting studies, modelling, or evidence.

4 Cumulative impacts assessment and high risk catchments

4.1 Level 1 cumulative impacts assessment

A cumulative impact assessment was completed through the Huntingdonshire Level 1 SFRA (2024), which aimed to identify catchments sensitive to the cumulative impact of new development. This site is located within one catchment, namely, the Alconbury Brook catchment. This catchment is ranked as a medium sensitivity catchment. Planning considerations for sites at medium sensitivity to the cumulative impacts of development can be found in Appendix G of the Level 1 SFRA. Cumulative impacts of development should also be considered as part of a site-specific FRA.

5 Groundwater, geology, soils, SuDS suitability

Risk of groundwater emergence is assessed in this SFRA using JBA's 5m Groundwater Emergence Map. This dataset is recommended for use by the EA in the SFRA Good Practice Guide². Figure 5-1 shows the map covering this site and the surrounding areas. Table 5-1 explains the risk classifications.



Figure 5-1: JBA 5m Groundwater Emergence Map

The majority of the site is classified as no risk. Infiltration SuDS should therefore be suitable at this site.

² [Strategic flood risk assessment good practice guide. ADEPT. December 2021.](#)

Table 5-1: Groundwater Hazard Classification

Groundwater head difference (m)*	Class label
0 to 0.025	Groundwater levels are either at very near (within 0.025m of) the ground surface in the 100-year return period flood event. 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.
0.025 to 0.5	Groundwater levels are between 0.025m and 0.5m below the ground surface in the 100-year return period flood event. 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.
0.5 to 5	Groundwater levels are between 0.5m and 5m below the ground surface in the 100-year return period flood event There is a risk of flooding to subsurface assets, but surface manifestation of groundwater is unlikely.
>5	Groundwater levels are at least 5m below the ground surface in the 100-year return period flood event. Flooding from groundwater is not likely.
N/A	No risk. This zone is deemed as having a negligible risk from groundwater flooding due to the nature of the local geological deposits.
*Difference is defined as ground surface in mAOD minus modelled groundwater table in mAOD.	



Figure 5-2: Soils and geology

6 Residual risk

Although a site may be afforded some protection from defences and / or drainage infrastructure, there is always a residual risk of flooding from asset failure i.e. breaching / overtopping of flood defences, blockages of culverts or drainage assets.

6.1 Potential blockage / breach

There does not appear to be any residual risk to the site.

6.2 Flood risk from reservoirs

The EA's Reservoir Flood Maps (RFM) (2021) show where water may go in the unlikely event of a reservoir or dam failure. A 'dry day' scenario assumes that the water level in the reservoir is the same as the spillway level or the underside of the roof for a service reservoir and the watercourses upstream and downstream of the reservoir are at a normal level. A 'wet day' scenario assumes a worst-case scenario where a reservoir releases water held on a 'wet day' when local rivers have already overflowed their banks.

The site is not modelled to be at risk from reservoir flooding.

7 Overall site assessment

7.1 Can part b) of the exception test be passed?

This site is not required to pass part b) of the exception test as it is not located within Flood Zone 3a, however it must still be proven that the development can be safe for its lifetime, which is 100 years for residential development.

7.2 Recommendations summary

Based on the evidence presented in the Level 1 SFRA (2024) and this Level 2 SFRA:

- It should be appropriate to develop this site for more vulnerable purposes given its location within Flood Zone 1 and nominal surface water flood risk.
- Risk from the ordinary watercourse should be investigated at the FRA stage. Modelling may be required. The ordinary watercourses should be included within the site design and layout. Infilling of drainage ditches should be avoided.
- Surface water flood risk on the Pig Market End access road Should be investigated further.
- A drainage strategy will be required given the site is currently greenfield. Greenfield rates will apply, and the developer should follow the National SuDS guidance and any local guidance available from the LLFA.
- Opportunities for NFM features to reduce flood risk to the site and surrounding areas should be explored at the site-specific FRA stage.
- Safe access and escape routes should be considered further to ensure safe evacuation of site users during the low risk surface water flood event.

7.3 Site-specific FRA requirements and further work

At the planning application stage, the following should be considered:

- Potential modelling of the ordinary watercourse to assess site.
- Further consideration of surface water flood risk on Pig Market End, which could impact the availability of safe access and escape routes.
- Drainage strategy including for greenfield runoff rates.
- FRA should be carried out in line with the latest versions of the NPPF; FRCC-PPG; EA online guidance; the HDC Local Plan, and national and local SuDS policy and guidelines.
- Throughout the FRA process, consultation should be carried out with, where applicable, the local planning authority; the lead local flood authority; emergency planning officers; the Environment Agency; Anglian Water; the highways authorities; and the emergency services.

8 Licencing


To cover all figures within this report:

- Contains Environment Agency information © Environment Agency and/or database right [2025]
- Contains public sector information licensed under the Open Government Licence v3.0. © Crown copyright and database rights [2025]
- HDC Ordnance Survey licence number: 100022322 [2025]
- © 2021 Esri, Maxar, Earthstar Geographics, USDA FSA, USGS, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, and the GIS User Community

Our Offices

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

Newcastle
Newport
Peterborough
Portsmouth
Saltaire
Skipton
Tadcaster
Thirsk
Wallingford
Warrington



Registered Office

1 Broughton Park
Old Lane North
Broughton
SKIPTON
North Yorkshire
BD23 3FD
United Kingdom

+44(0) 1756 799919
info@jbaconsulting.com
www.jbaconsulting.com

Follow us on  

Jeremy Benn
Associates Limited
Registered in
England
3246693

JBA Group Ltd is
certified to
ISO 9001:2015
ISO 14001:2015
ISO 27001:2022
ISO 45001:2018

