London Regional Flood Risk Assessment

Part 2: Flood Risk and the Draft New London Plan

July 2026

1. Introduction

1.1 This report is the second part of the London Regional Flood Risk Assessment (RFRA), a high-level strategic flood risk assessment to help inform and support the new London Plan. Part 1 focused on an update to the flood risk picture across London as planned by the 2021 London Plan, using newly available flood risk mapping to update the 2018 RFRA. This part focuses on flood risk associated with the spatial strategy in the draft new London Plan.

1.2 The report sets out how flood risk has been considered through the methodologies used to put together housing capacity and the overall selection of growth options. It then highlights where area-based flood risk remains a significant challenge to be addressed through development in areas where strategic housing capacity is concentrated.

1.3 As with Part 1, the latest National Flood Risk Assessment 2 (NAFRA2) datasets have been applied. These model high and medium flood risk by type (fluvial and tidal and surface water) and in aggregate in two scenarios – baseline and with climate change. The following section sets out the Plan's response - reflected in the spatial strategy and associated list of strategic infrastructure requirements and new London Plan policies, where needed to supplement the National Planning Policy Framework and associated National Planning Policy Guidance (the NPPF and NPPG).

1.4 The final section sets out a statement in response to national Sequential Test and Exceptions Test expectations as they relate to the draft London Plan and subsequent Local Plans which must be prepared in general conformity, given London's particular circumstances.

2. Handling flood risk in strategic assessments of housing capacity

2.1 Given that flood risk is a serious and increasing challenge for London that may be exacerbated by development and result in significant upfront and ongoing mitigation costs, it is preferable to pre-emptively discount housing capacity that would be most affected by it. This is consistent with the national policy position which identifies housing as a more vulnerable use for which exposure to flood risk should be avoided as far as possible. This has been done from the start in our three main SHLAA (Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment) approaches, for brownfield large sites, identification of land suitable for industrial release for housing, and identification of sustainably located land for residential development in the green belt.

2.2 The mapping tools used as part of this assessment integrated NAFRA2 risk mapping and in all cases excluded land in high flood risk[1], or in the case of the industrial release methodology, excluded it if it accounted for more than 25% of the site (being a proportion that would be more significant and less avoidable

[1] This was also the case with the small sites methodology which excluded sites in Flood Zone 3.

through the process of defining the net residential development area). The focus through these methods is the datasets relating to fluvial and tidal flood risk in the brownfield context, though surface water flood risk was additionally integrated in the Green Belt mapping.

2.3 The methodology then further diverges, with a 50% discount to land with medium flood risk in the brownfield large site context, 100% in the greenfield context and a sequential approach (including surface water flood risk) integrated into the ranking approach used to identify suitable land for industrial release as a near primary consideration.

2.4 The different approach to flood risk in the brownfield compared to greenfield context is justified as:

- there is more 'choice' of capacity in the green belt;
- the development of greenfield land, even if landscape-led, is more likely to have floodrisk and drainage consequences unless greenfield runoff rates are achieved; and
- brownfield land is often already well-protected from fluvial and tidal flood risk due to the extent of existing mitigations as set out in the RFRA Part 1, with plans to upgrade key defences along the Thames as part of the Thames Estuary (TE2100) process.

2.5 In addition, the slightly different treatment of flood risk in the two brownfield methodologies is because surface water flood risk on brownfield large sites is mainly expected to be tackled through design approaches that do not affect site capacity, including off-site area-based approaches. This may also be the case with larger industrial release sites, but there is more choice of land initially as not all industrial land will be released, and this can be captured in plan-led release parameters. In contrast, with brownfield large site capacity, the expectation is that all otherwise residentially-suitable sites will be needed to help meet the scale of housing need, with their access to existing infrastructure, particularly transport, justifying a credible Exceptions Test position (see section 6 below).

2.6 It should also be noted that not all land assessed to be suitable for residential development is assumed to yield residential capacity, as all approaches allow for a gross:net reduction in site area in development. In effect, land is 'netted off' for other uses, including infrastructure (grey and green). This provides an allowance through which flood risk mitigation can be provided. In the greenfield context, this reduction is 30% and therefore quite considerable. In the brownfield context a similar approach is incorporated in the densities applied, but the amount netted off is more scale-dependent which aligns with what is seen in practice.

3. Spatial strategy options considered through the flood risk lens

3.1 As set out in the Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) of the draft Plan (IIA) several spatial strategy options were considered as part of plan preparation:

- Option 1 – Urban intensification (delivers approximately 500-560k homes)
- Option 2 – More intensification plus Green Belt release (delivers approximately 560-650k homes)
- Option 2A – More intensification plus NPPF-led Grey Belt development (delivers approximately 560-600k homes)
- Option 3 – Further Green Belt release associated with major new transport investment (delivers approximately 650-700k homes)
- Option 4A – Meeting 850k in 10 years – huge step change in investment and delivery capacity (delivers 850k homes)
- Option 4B – Meeting 850k over longer time frame (delivers 850k homes)

3.2 However, given that flood risk had been considered pre-emptively in the capacity assessments that underpin these options, for the most part, it doesn't result in meaningful differences between them. The clearest influence is in relation to discounting Option 4A from further consideration due to it being unreasonable - given that option is most likely to result in growth and infrastructure (such as flood risk mitigation) being unaligned making it difficult to realise multiple plan objectives. Similarly, Option 2A, given that it involves more dispersed and fragmented grey belt development in the Green Belt is likely to make it more difficult to target infrastructure investment, including in flood risk infrastructure, to best effect – meaning it may be stretched too thinly. It also is less likely to secure an optimal scale of mitigation, including green infrastructure strategies, again affecting effectiveness and therefore impact on flood risk mitigation.

3.3 These considerations have contributed to the options being rejected and shaping of a spatial strategy that focuses greenfield growth rather than letting it come forward sporadically in a more dispersed manner, and ensures sufficient space and attention is given to protecting and enhancing multifunctional green infrastructure. This should support infrastructure alignment and ensure there is scope for strategic scale mitigations which may also help mitigate flood risk.

3.4 While the area-based flood risk of the various residential-led Green Belt BLGs was also assessed (see section 4 below) and considered as part of the IIA process, the IIA explains that this was not used to exclude any so the same set appears in all options involving majority plan-led Green Belt release. This is because all were needed to address the extent of housing need, and they all were sustainably located in other respects. However, the overall extent of flood risk is well within the 30% non-housing land allowance as explained in section 2 above.

4. Flood risk analysis of the new Broad Locations for Growth (BLGs) for housing

4.1 This chapter examines the updated flood risk picture in relation to 3 categories of Broad Locations for Growth: Brownfield First Opportunity Areas; Town centres and other brownfield BLGs with strategic housing capacity (more than 3000 units);

plus Green Belt residential-led mixed use BLGs. While these are not the only locations where growth will happen, they are the locations where the scale of growth will be most concentrated. **Appendix 1** provides the related tables with detailed statistics.

Brownfield First Opportunity Areas (BFOAs)

4.2 The Draft London Plan identifies Brownfield First Opportunity Areas (BFOAs) as locations with significant capacity to accommodate new housing, commercial development and infrastructure that are linked to existing or improved public transport accessibility. These are the places where London will accommodate a significant share of its anticipated growth and where large-scale development is expected to take place over the Plan period. Many are part of the long-established suite of Opportunity Areas, (as they were previously known) but the list has been reduced to account for certainty of necessary infrastructure investment, and the extent to which an area needs intervention/support in order for the strategic scale growth to happen.

4.3 The full extents of BFOAs as areas of strategic change have been assessed for likely flood risk, even though the housing capacities associated with them, as detailed above, do not assume that land with the highest flood risk will be developed for housing. This area-based perspective is important to inform the extent to which flood risk will be a key issue to be addressed as part of area planning frameworks.

4.4 All BFOAs, have some form of identified flood risk. For the baseline scenario Wood Green/Haringey Heartlands, Kensal Canalside, Canada Water, and London Bridge/Bankside have the highest proportion of high flood risk areas from all sources (23%, 22%, 21% and 18% respectively) (**see Table 1a**). White City, London Riverside, and Earls Court/West Kensington follow with more than 15%. In the baseline scenario, 11% of land within BFOAs is at high risk of flooding.

4.5 This changes in the climate change scenario, with London Riverside having the highest proportion of land in high flood risk areas at 32% followed by Wood Green/Haringey Heartlands, Kensal Canalside, Canada Water, London Bridge Bankside, Charlton Riverside, and White City (all over 20%) (**see Table 1b**). In the climate change scenario, 17% of land within BFOAs is at high risk of flooding.

4.6 When reviewing the results of modelling of flood risk from different sources, the baseline scenario shows Canada Water (18%), London Bridge/Bankside (13%), and Bexley Riverside (9%) having the highest proportion of land in high risk flood area from rivers and sea (1 in 30-year event). Wood Green/Haringey Heartlands (23%), Kensal Canalside (22%), White City (16%) have the highest proportion of land in the high risk flood area from surface water flooding.

4.7 The climate change scenario shows a further increase in the risk of flooding with Canada Water (18%), London Bridge/Bankside (13%), and Bexley Riverside (11%) with the highest proportion of land in the high flood risk area from rivers and sea (1

in 30-year event). Wood Green/Haringey Heartlands (28%), Kensal Canalside (25%), Charlton Riverside (21%), and White City (20%) have the highest proportion of land in the high flood risk area from surface water flooding.

4.8 In the baseline scenario, 3% of land within BFOAs is at high risk of flooding from rivers and sea, which increases to 5% in the climate change scenario. For surface water flooding, 7% of land within BFOAs is at high risk, which increases to almost 9% in the climate change scenario.

Town centres and other brownfield BLGs

4.9 Many town centres and high streets present particular intensification and adaptation opportunities that can yield significant additional housing as they evolve as places. The Draft London Plan promotes town centres and other well-connected locations suitable for mixed-use and housing-led intensification. In some areas the scale of growth will be strategically significant, and these are identified as Broad Locations for Growth. In analysing these for flood risk, either the town centre boundaries or other relevant extents (e.g. industrial land designations that are expected to be released and yield strategic scale capacity) have been assessed.

4.10 In the baseline scenario Woolwich (38%) and York Road (22%) have the highest proportion of high flood risk areas from all sources followed by Chadwell Heath, Colindale and Hammersmith with more than 19% (**see Table 2a**). In this scenario 17% of land within town centre and other brownfield BLGs is at high risk of flooding.

4.11 The climate change scenario increases these percentages with Kingston, Woolwich and York Road having the highest proportion of high flood risk areas from all sources (above 36%), followed by Chadwell Heath, Graham Park, Hammersmith, Colindale, and South Wimbledon with more than 20% (**see Table 2b**). In this scenario 21% of land within town centre and other brownfield BLGs is at high risk of flooding.

4.12 When reviewing the results of modelling of flood risk from different sources, the baseline scenario shows York Road (17%) and Kingston (13%) having the highest proportion of land in high flood risk area from rivers and sea (1 in 30-year event). Chadwell Heath (19%), Hammersmith (19%), and Graham Park (18%) have the highest proportion of land in the high flood risk area from surface water flooding.

4.13 The climate change scenario shows a further increase in the risk of flooding with Kingston (29%), Woolwich (24%) and York Road (17%) with the highest proportion of land in the high flood risk area from rivers and sea (1 in 30-year event). Chadwell Heath (25%), Graham Park (24%) and Hammersmith (24%) have the highest proportion of land in the high flood risk area from surface water flooding.

4.14 In the baseline scenario, 3% of land within town centre and other brownfield BLGs is at high risk of flooding from rivers and sea, which increases to 6% in the climate change scenario. In the baseline scenario, 9% of land within town centre and

other brownfield BLGs is at high risk of flooding from surface water flooding, which increases to almost 13% in the climate change scenario.

Green Belt residential led mixed-use BLGs

4.15 Additional land in the Green Belt is required to help meet housing, economic and associated infrastructure needs. The Draft London Plan maintains a brownfield-first approach and higher expectations for greenfield development.

4.16 Broad grid based representations of areas with residential capacity identified by our proactive search and deemed to have enough capacity to be of strategic significance and achieve critical mass (Green Belt residential-led mixed use BLGs) have been analysed for flood risk using baseline and climate change scenarios. While as set out above, the housing numbers are not dependent on any land with a high or medium risk of flooding, it is helpful to understand the extent of broader flood risk in the vicinity that may need to be reflected in landscape and infrastructure strategies.

4.17 The analysis shows that in the baseline scenario East of Ickenham, Northwood and West Ruislip have the highest proportion of high flood risk areas from all sources (10%, 7% and 7% respectively). On average, using the baseline scenario, 5% of land within Green Belt BLGs is at high risk of flooding.

4.18 When reviewing the results of modelling of flood risk from difference sources, the baseline scenario shows that Upminster and East of Ickenham (both at 3%) have the highest proportion of land in high flood risk area from rivers and sea (1 in 30 year event). Northwood (6%) and East of Ickenham (6%) have the highest proportion of land in the high flood risk area from surface water flooding (**see Table 3a**).

4.19 In the climate change scenario East of Ickenham, Northwood and West Ruislip still have the highest proportion of high flood risk areas from all sources but this increases to 12%, 8% and 8% respectively (**see Table 3b**). On average, with the climate change scenario, 6% of land within Green Belt BLGs is at high risk of flooding.

4.20 Analysis of risk of flooding by source in the baseline scenario shows that Upminster (3%) and East of Ickenham (3%) are at greatest risk of flooding from rivers and sea, this remains the same in the climate change scenario.

4.21 Northwood and East of Ickenham (both 6%) have the highest proportion of land in the high flood risk area from surface water flooding in the baseline scenario. In the climate change scenario this increases to 7%.

4.22 In the baseline scenario, 1% of land within Green Belt BLGs is at high risk of flooding from rivers and sea, which remains the same in the climate change scenario. In the baseline scenario, 3% of land within Green Belt BLGs is at high risk of flooding from surface water, which increases slightly to 4% in the climate change scenario.

5. Infrastructure and policy implications

5.1 As set out in Part 1 of the RFRA, there is a continued need for flood risk to be tackled through the location, design (including site layout) and infrastructure investment as part of London's growth strategy. Section 2 and 3 highlights how flood risk matters have informed the overall spatial strategy and quantum of growth, highlighting the importance of a plan-led approach to growth in the green belt and to industrial land release, and a quantum of growth that allows for infrastructure alignment.

5.2 In turn, flood risk mitigation is clearly identified as a strategic infrastructure need associated with growth. This is accordingly reflected in the strategic infrastructure requirements set out in the plan, and a London-specific, plan-led approach to surface water flood risk. The relevant strategic infrastructure requirements are as follows, and the MBUL1 policy expectation is that Local Plans should secure them through site allocations, safeguarding and appropriate developer contributions:

5.3 Flood risk mitigation; accounting for climate change; suitable for the expected lifetime and vulnerability of affected areas – notably those set out in the TE2100 plan and its updates; and the on- and offsite drainage interventions identified to be necessary as part of the London Surface Water Strategy and related action plans.

5.4 On the 'development management' side of this policy, which requires that proposals are located, designed, phased and co-ordinated to ensure infrastructure sufficiency, these requirements are also specified to be referred to and considered as part of the process.

5.5 The London Surface Water strategy referenced puts particular emphasis on nature-based solutions (which are also supported by green strategic infrastructure needs listed in Policy MBLU1) and integrated catchment-based approaches that link consideration of reducing risk at source, (which is to be prioritised) along pathways and at receptors (properties). It also highlights priority locations for intervention in each catchment based on a combined risk-vulnerability methodology. Catchment-based approaches will ultimately identify suitable and prioritised interventions with the aim of reducing surface water flood risk by 75% by 2075. The policy is deliberately flexible and currently non-specific to allow for catchment-relevant interventions to emerge and be appropriately incorporated into development plans and proposals.

5.6 In turn, the Flood risk and Drainage policy (GHR5) provides a further expectation that area-based approaches to sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS) in areas of significant change and prioritisation of interventions are reflected in Local Plan site allocations and policy expectations. This links back into London Surface Water Strategy workstreams. The flood risk analysis in section 4 above should help with this prioritisation and provides a starting point for the work in the 'areas of significant change' referenced (as all BLGs, and particularly BFOAs will be areas of significant change).

5.7 This policy also continues to require more strategically -significant proposals (defined in relation to Mayor of London referability to include all green belt applications) to aim to achieve on-site greenfield runoff rates (GRR). Importantly, and bringing London-specific additionality to national policy (including the proposed revised NPPF) it also introduces the possibility of off-site contributions being an acceptable means to address this. This possibility recognises the justifications for not fully meeting GRR requirements put forward since the 2021 plan expectation was put in place, including physical site constraints and costs of on-site solutions. It also clearly ties into the notion that surface water flood risk may be best addressed through area-based approaches rather than solely at site level, with the Local Plan requirement encouraging these area-based approaches to be set out.

5.8 The Clean and Healthy Waterways Policy (GHR10) likewise reinforces the MBUL1 policy expectations by incorporating reference to the TE2100 expectations regarding mitigation upgrades (river wall heightening) and land safeguarding and providing for access and space between waterways and development to enable flood risk mitigation, maintenance and upgrading.

6. Strategic sequential test and provisional exceptions test statement

6.1 The London Plan has the difficult task of accommodating unprecedented growth needs (in housing defined to be 850k homes) in a way that manages their impacts while also accounting for significant flood risk. In line with national policy, the latter means prioritising development for vulnerable uses on the least vulnerable land all other things being equal (known as meeting the sequential test). The methods, analysis and policy described above are the response to these twin challenges and contribute to a position where a precautionary sequential approach has been followed as far as possible, but where ultimately London does need to use land at risk from flooding in a carefully managed way in order to meet other objectives.

6.2 This is particularly the case in the brownfield context given brownfield land is often best connected to the public transport network and suitable for active travel, meaning travel patterns are more likely to minimise air quality, congestion and carbon impacts and support good health. This land is also typically well-served by other existing infrastructure, including utilities which are costly to extend to lower risk greenfield areas, and social infrastructure. Moreover, given the extent of existing economic activity and investment at risk from flooding, London has a relatively high level of flood protection through a system of tidal and fluvial flood defences, the management of which is proactively accounting for sea level rise in an adaptive manner.

6.3 As such, the spatial strategy prioritises delivery of as much capacity as possible on brownfield land as being most compatible with plan objectives and being more likely to have wider sustainable development benefits that outweigh flood risk.

While there is some suitable land in the Green Belt that is outside of areas of high and medium flood risk, it would be incompatible with wider plan and national objectives to only rely on this land, and its capacity is ultimately limited by existing infrastructure. The SHLAA (Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment) sets out how an exhaustive search has been undertaken for suitable housing capacity that has a reasonably plausible chance of delivery in order to respond to housing needs. Given the extent of need, and finite suitable capacity, this inevitably involves some land affected by flood risk.

6.4 In both the large sites and industrial release brownfield component, this includes land affected by medium fluvial/tidal and/or surface water flood risk, and some affected by high surface water food risk. As the RFRA Part 1 sets out, some is also likely to be affected by reservoir, canal and groundwater floodrisk though this is managed. However, due to the methodologies applied proactively, the proportion of capacity affected is relatively small. Virtually all (over 95%) of sites contributing to large site capacity assessed as developable have less than 10% of site area affected by either high or medium flood risk. And of the industrial release component of capacity, nearly 80% of land is outside areas of high and medium flood risk, with the majority of land affected in the medium flood fluvial flood risk category, (11% or 31ha) and only 8% (24ha) in the high surface water flood risk category. The section 4 analysis also shows that in the most strategically significant Broad Locations for Growth for housing, in aggregate, and individually, a relatively small proportion of the land area in each type of BLG is at high or medium risk from flooding.

6.5 Moreover, application of flood risk policies in the NPPF, and spatial strategy and flood risk management policies in the new London Plan, plus other policies with indirect benefits (e.g. relating to green infrastructure) applied to new development on affected land would likely bring wider flood risk mitigation benefits to existing residents and businesses. This is through their contribution to the realisation of strategic infrastructure needs including flood risk mitigation such as that specified in the TE2100 strategy on and off site that will benefit wider vulnerable uses and populations. Such benefits will also be realised through strong policy support for bringing existing brownfield sites closer to greenfield runoff characteristics as they are redeveloped which will affect overall flood risk, even if some is though off-site contributions.

6.6 From a national flood risk policy perspective this is:

- that suitable land outside of flood risk areas cannot appropriately accommodate all necessary development required within London;
- the need therefore to use flood risk affected brownfield land with its strong sustainability credentials to help meet housing needs; plus
- the policies applicable to this and other growth that will have ‘beyond the site’ flood mitigation benefits.

6.7 This forms the basis of an Exceptions Test in-principle justification for that brownfield capacity. This justification should equally apply to Local Plans that are produced in conformity with it, given that the London Plan sets the expected distribution of growth and development plan policies for all in London. The detail of managing the flood risk to an acceptable level will also however need to be advanced by Local Plan site allocations, locally specific policies and design responses to complete the justification.

Appendix 1: Flood risk tables

Brownfield First Opportunity Areas (BFOA)

Table 1a: Risk from flooding by BFOA 2025 – baseline scenario

BFOAs – baseline scenario	% of area at high flood risk - river and sea	% of area at high flood risk - surface water	% of area at high risk (1 in 30) - total	% of area at medium risk (1 in 100) - total
Bell Green/Lower Sydenham	2%	5%	7%	14%
Bexley Riverside	9%	4%	13%	19%
Brent Cross/Cricklewood	1%	10%	11%	17%
Bromley	0%	4%	5%	8%
Canada Water	18%	3%	21%	24%
Charlton Riverside	1%	11%	12%	23%
City Fringe/Tech City	0%	11%	11%	19%
Croydon	0%	4%	14%	22%
Deptford Creek/Greenwich Riverside	3%	5%	9%	14%
Earl's Court/West Kensington	0%	16%	16%	19%
Elephant and Castle	0%	5%	5%	10%
Great West Corridor	4%	7%	11%	16%
Greenwich Peninsula	0%	5%	5%	13%
Harrow and Wealdstone	0%	12%	12%	18%
Hayes	0%	9%	9%	16%
Ilford	0%	5%	6%	11%
Isle of Dogs	2%	4%	6%	10%
Kensal Canalside	0%	22%	22%	26%
Lee Valley	4%	5%	10%	17%
London Bridge/Bankside	13%	6%	18%	24%
London Riverside	2%	12%	16%	23%
New Cross/Lewisham/Catford	4%	5%	11%	19%
Old Kent Road	0%	8%	8%	19%
Old Oak/Park Royal	1%	9%	10%	16%
Olympic Legacy	3%	5%	11%	17%
Poplar Riverside	5%	4%	9%	14%
Royal Docks and Beckton Riverside	3%	4%	7%	11%
Southall	0%	5%	5%	12%
Thamesmead and Abbey Wood	7%	3%	11%	15%
Vauxhall Nine Elms Battersea	4%	5%	9%	15%
Wembley	2%	7%	9%	18%
White City	0%	16%	16%	22%

Wood Green/Haringey Heartlands	0%	23%	23%	30%

Table 1b: Risk from flooding by BFOA 2025 – climate change scenario

BFOAs – climate change scenario	% of area at high flood risk - river and sea	% of area at high flood risk - surface water	% of area at high risk (1 in 30) - total	% of area at medium risk (1 in 100) - total
Bell Green/Lower Sydenham	2%	8%	10%	21%
Bexley Riverside	11%	6%	18%	25%
Brent Cross/Cricklewood	1%	14%	15%	22%
Bromley	0%	7%	7%	11%
Canada Water	18%	5%	23%	27%
Charlton Riverside	1%	21%	21%	31%
City Fringe/Tech City	0%	17%	17%	27%
Croydon	0%	8%	20%	28%
Deptford Creek/Greenwich Riverside	3%	6%	12%	26%
Earl's Court/West Kensington	0%	18%	18%	24%
Elephant and Castle	0%	9%	9%	16%
Great West Corridor	4%	10%	14%	19%
Greenwich Peninsula	0%	12%	12%	18%
Harrow and Wealdstone	0%	16%	16%	22%
Hayes	0%	14%	14%	21%
Ilford	2%	9%	10%	17%
Isle of Dogs	2%	7%	9%	14%
Kensal Canalside	0%	25%	25%	30%
Lee Valley	4%	7%	13%	25%
London Bridge/Bankside	13%	10%	23%	31%
London Riverside	8%	9%	32%	39%
New Cross/Lewisham/Catford	4%	8%	17%	27%
Old Kent Road	0%	16%	16%	25%
Old Oak/Park Royal	1%	13%	14%	20%
Olympic Legacy	4%	8%	16%	23%
Poplar Riverside	5%	8%	13%	18%
Royal Docks and Beckton Riverside	7%	5%	14%	24%
Southall	0%	10%	10%	18%
Thamesmead and Abbey Wood	7%	5%	14%	20%
Vauxhall Nine Elms Battersea	4%	11%	15%	29%
Wembley	2%	12%	15%	22%
White City	0%	20%	20%	27%

Wood Green/Haringey Heartlands	0%	28%	28%	34%

Town centre and other brownfield Broad Locations for Growth (BLGs)

Table 2a: Risk from flooding by town centre and other BLGs 2025 – baseline scenario

Town centre and other BLGs – baseline scenario	% of area at high flood risk - river and sea	% of area at high flood risk - surface water	% of area at high risk (1 in 30) - total	% of area at medium risk (1 in 100) - total
Arnos Grove	1%	6%	9%	14%
Chadwell Heath	0%	19%	19%	27%
Colindale	3%	14%	19%	25%
Dollis Hill	0%	13%	13%	21%
Edgware	4%	4%	10%	15%
Graham Park	0%	18%	18%	26%
Greenford	0%	5%	5%	11%
Hammersmith	0%	19%	19%	25%
Kidbrooke	1%	7%	8%	13%
Kingston	13%	3%	17%	42%
North Wimbledon	2%	3%	7%	42%
Romford	1%	9%	10%	20%
South Wimbledon	0%	11%	11%	22%
Sutton	0%	9%	16%	0%
Woolwich	4%	5%	38%	0%
York Road	17%	5%	22%	38%

Table 2a: Risk from flooding by town centre and other BLGs 2025 – climate change scenario

Town centre and other BLGs – climate change scenario	% of area at high flood risk - river and sea	% of area at high flood risk - surface water	% of area at high risk (1 in 30) - total	% of area at medium risk (1 in 100) - total
Arnos Grove	1%	8%	11%	17%
Chadwell Heath	0%	25%	25%	30%
Colindale	3%	17%	23%	29%
Dollis Hill	0%	19%	19%	25%
Edgware	4%	7%	14%	19%
Graham Park	0%	24%	24%	31%
Greenford	0%	9%	9%	20%
Hammersmith	0%	24%	24%	32%
Kidbrooke	1%	10%	12%	16%
Kingston	29%	2%	38%	56%
North Wimbledon	2%	4%	11%	44%
Romford	0%	16%	17%	0%
South Wimbledon	0%	20%	20%	24%
Sutton	0%	15%	15%	21%
Woolwich	24%	7%	37%	43%
York Road	17%	19%	37%	47%

Green Belt residential led mixed-use BLGs

Table 3a: Risk from flooding by Green Belt residential led mixed-use BLGs 2025 – baseline scenario

Green Belt residential led mixed-use BLGs – baseline scenario	% of area at high flood risk - river and sea	% of area at high flood risk - surface water	% of area at high risk (1 in 30) - total	% of area at medium risk (1 in 100) - total
Crews Hill	1.2%	2%	3%	5%
Dagenham	0.5%	1%	2%	4%
East of Ickenham	2.7%	6%	10%	14%
Eastern Hainault	0%	4%	5%	10%
Harold Park	0.6%	4%	5%	7%
Mill Hill East	0.9%	4%	5%	7%
New Addington	0%	1%	1%	1%
Northwood	0.4%	6%	7%	10%
Upminster	2.8%	1%	5%	7%
West Ruislip	1.7%	4%	7%	9%

Table 3a: Risk from flooding by Green Belt residential led mixed-use BLGs 2025 – climate change scenario

Green Belt residential led mixed-use BLGs – climate change scenario	% of area at high flood risk - river and sea	% of area at high flood risk - surface water	% of area at high risk (1 in 30) - total	% of area at medium risk (1 in 100) - total
Crews Hill	0.4%	7%	8%	12%
Dagenham	2.8%	7%	12%	16%
East of Ickenham	0%	6%	7%	14%
Eastern Hainault	1.8%	5%	8%	11%
Harold Park	1.2%	5%	6%	9%
Mill Hill East	0.8%	5%	7%	9%
New Addington	0.5%	3%	3%	9%
Northwood	1.3%	3%	4%	6%
Upminster	2.7%	2%	6%	8%
West Ruislip	0%	1%	1%	2%