

Thurrock Local Plan Site Selection Methodology

July 2026

Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Policy Context.....	4
2.1 National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF').....	4
2.1.1 Five-year supply	5
2.1.2 Small and medium sized sites	5
2.1.3 Larger scale development	5
2.2 Planning Practice Guidance.....	6
3. Site Selection Methodology for Housing	7
3.1 Stage 1 Identifying Sites for Assessment.....	7
3.1.1 Site Size	7
3.1.2 Call for Sites Process	7
3.1.3 Other Sources	7
3.2 Stage 2: Site Suitability	8
3.2.1 Step A - Absolute Constraints – Clipping	9
3.2.2 Step B - Assessment of Constraints - Balance Score	9
3.2.3 Step C - Proximity of Sites to Existing Settlements and New Settlement Opportunities	11
3.2.4 Reasonable Alternatives	12
3.3 Stage 3: Site Availability and Achievability	12
3.4 Stage 4: Delivery of the Spatial Strategy	13
3.5 Stage 5: Identifying Site Allocations.....	14
4. Site Selection Methodology for Employment	16
4.1 Stage 1: Identifying Sites for Assessment.....	16
4.2 Stage 2: Site Suitability	16
4.3 Stage 3: Site Availability and Achievability	17
4.4 Stage 4: Alignment with the Spatial and Economic Strategies.....	17
4.5 Stage 5: Identifying Site Allocations.....	18
5. Conclusion	19

1. Introduction

This report sets out the methodology used to assess sites for allocation in the emerging Local Plan. The allocations will deliver the Borough's future needs for housing, employment and other uses.

Within the Publication Local Plan (Regulation 19), policies will outline what kind of development is to be expected and encouraged on each allocated site. A site allocation policy includes details of proposed uses, capacity, design considerations, key constraints, and indicative timelines for development. Through the allocation of individual sites, development is actively encouraged and a realistic pipeline for employment and housing development can be formed.

The site selection methodology is an important part of the evidence base supporting potential site allocations which must be founded on a robust approach. This methodology sets out the approach used for site selection only and not the detailed outcomes.

The site selection methodology has been broken down into a series of stages to show the clear and transparent approach that was used to identify and assess sites for both housing and employment before taking them forward as site allocations. It takes into account relevant national policy, as set out within National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2025) and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).

The paper is structured as follows:

- Section 2 outlines the relevant national policy and guidance on allocating sites for development
- Section 3 presents the methodology used for housing site selection
- Section 4 presents the methodology used for employment site selection
- Section 5 conclusion

2. Policy Context

2.1 National Planning Policy Framework (‘NPPF’)

The National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024) sets out the government’s planning policies for England and how they are expected to be applied. It provides a framework within which locally prepared plans can provide for sufficient housing and other development in a sustainable manner. The policies of relevance to site selection are set out below, but the Plan has regard to all other aspects of relevant national policy, where appropriate.

At its heart the Framework requires all plans and decisions to apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For plan-making, this means that:

- a) all plans should promote a sustainable pattern of development that seeks to: meet the development needs of their area; align growth and infrastructure; improve the environment; mitigate climate change (including by making effective use of land in urban areas) and adapt to its effects;*
- b) strategic policies should, as a minimum, provide for objectively assessed needs for housing and other uses, as well as any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas...¹*

The NPPF further outlines the responsibility of local planning authorities to plan for and allocate adequate sites through strategic policies, ensuring the delivery of the area’s strategic priorities and meeting objectively assessed needs over the plan period:

Strategic policy-making authorities should establish a housing requirement figure for their whole area, which shows the extent to which their identified housing need (and any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas) can be met over the plan period. The requirement may be higher than the identified housing need if, for example, it includes provision for neighbouring areas, or reflects growth ambitions linked to economic development or infrastructure investment. Within this overall requirement, strategic policies should also set out a housing requirement for designated neighbourhood areas which reflects the overall strategy for the pattern and scale of development and any relevant allocations...²

Broad locations for development should be indicated on a key diagram, and land-use designations and allocations identified on a policies map. Strategic policies should provide a clear strategy for bringing sufficient land forward, and at a sufficient rate, to address objectively assessed needs over the plan period, in line with the presumption in favour of sustainable development. This

¹ Paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework

² Paragraph 69 of the National Planning Policy Framework

should include planning for and allocating sufficient sites to deliver the strategic priorities of the area (except insofar as these needs can be demonstrated to be met more appropriately through other mechanisms, such as brownfield registers or non- strategic policies).³

The process and considerations to be taken into account when identifying and selecting sites for allocation is also set out in the NPPF:

2.1.1 Five-year supply

The NPPF requires the following:

Strategic policy-making authorities should have a clear understanding of the land available in their area through the preparation of a strategic housing land availability assessment. From this, planning policies should identify a sufficient supply and mix of sites, taking into account their availability, suitability and likely economic viability. Planning policies should identify a supply of:

- a. specific, deliverable sites for five years following the intended date of adoption; and*
- b. specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth, for the subsequent years 6-10 and, where possible, for years 11-15 of the remaining plan period.⁴*

2.1.2 Small and medium sized sites

The NPPF expects local planning authorities to plan for small and medium sized sites:

Small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area, are essential for Small and Medium Enterprise housebuilders to deliver new homes, and are often built-out relatively quickly. To promote the development of a good mix of sites local planning authorities should:

- a) identify, through the development plan and brownfield registers, land to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare; unless it can be shown, through the preparation of relevant plan policies, that there are strong reasons why this 10% target cannot be achieved...⁵*

2.1.3 Larger scale development

The NPPF also expects local planning authorities to plan for larger scale development:

³ Paragraph 23 of the National Planning Policy Framework

⁴ Paragraph 72 of the National Planning Policy Framework

⁵ Paragraph 73 of the National Planning Policy Framework

The supply of large numbers of new homes can often be best achieved through planning for larger scale development, such as new settlements or significant extensions to existing villages and towns, provided they are well located and designed, and supported by the necessary infrastructure and facilities (including a genuine choice of transport modes). Working with the support of their communities, and with other authorities if appropriate, strategic policy-making authorities should identify suitable locations for such development where this can help to meet identified needs in a sustainable way. In doing so, they should:

- a. consider the opportunities presented by existing or planned investment in infrastructure, the area's economic potential and the scope for net environmental gains;*
- b. ensure that their size and location will support a sustainable community, with sufficient access to services and employment opportunities within the development itself (without expecting an unrealistic level of self-containment), or in larger towns to which there is good access;*
- c. set clear expectations for the quality of the places to be created and how this can be maintained (such as by following Garden City principles); and ensure that appropriate tools such as masterplans and design guides or codes are used to secure a variety of well-designed homes to meet the needs of different groups in the community;*
- d. make a realistic assessment of likely rates of delivery, given the lead-in times for large scale sites, and identify opportunities for supporting rapid implementation (such as through joint ventures or locally-led development corporations); and*
- e. consider whether it is appropriate to establish Green Belt around or adjoining new developments of significant size.⁶*

2.2 Planning Practice Guidance

Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) provides guidance on the preparation of Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessments, and this has been considered in the preparation of the site selection methodology. The existing database of sites is one of the inputs into the process.

⁶ Paragraph 77 of the National Planning Policy Framework

3. Site Selection Methodology for Housing

The site selection methodology undertaken follows a robust and proportionate multi-stage assessment. However, it is important to note that the site selection process is iterative, with elements running concurrently.

3.1 Stage 1 Identifying Sites for Assessment

The aim of this stage was the identification of potential site options that could be considered for selection and included within the Housing Land Availability Assessment (HLAA) which forms stages 2 and 3 of this site selection methodology.

Sites were identified through several sources: call for sites exercises, development management (sites with approved, refused or withdrawn planning applications in the last 5 years), Council owned assets, and a review of existing urban areas.

3.1.1 Site Size

The HLAA assesses sites that are above a certain threshold. A professional judgement was made to rule out sites that were under 0.15 hectares or were unlikely to yield 5 or more homes.

3.1.2 Call for Sites Process

From years of carrying out the call for sites process, the Council has an extensive list of sites that have been promoted by landowners, site promoters and developers. The most recent call for sites exercise which remained open between 2023 and 2025 enabled those wishing to promote a site to submit details of their site via an online digital platform, PlaceMaker.

Most sites promoted to Thurrock Council in response to the call for sites exercise were not within existing urban area and were within the Metropolitan Green Belt.

3.1.3 Other Sources

The PPG advises that: *'It is important that plan-makers do not simply rely on sites that they have been informed about but actively identify sites through the desktop review process that may assist in meeting the development needs of an area.'*⁷

As such, sites were identified through the development management process through a review of planning approvals, refusals, withdrawn applications, lapsed permissions covering the period April 2017 – March 2025. Where sites met the criteria for inclusion in the HLAA as being capable of delivering 5 or more homes, they were added to pool of sites.

⁷ Paragraph 010 of the Planning Practice Guidance

Officers also undertook a desktop review of existing urban areas to identify sites that were vacant or awaiting redevelopment and included sites on the Brownfield Land Register

Following collation of all site sources, the list was cross checked for duplication of sites where they were found in multiple sources or where sites were submitted multiple times through the call for sites process. An example being Council owned sites with planning permission which were also on the Brownfield Land Register. A total of 238 individual sites were on the list for assessment.

3.2 Stage 2: Site Suitability

To assess each site's suitability for housing development the Council used the analysis software within PlaceMaker as well as using professional judgement to review PlaceMaker's findings.

PlaceMaker uses geospatial data to assess sites against a broad range of criteria and constraints and can also provide information about a site's relationship with physical features mapped within PlaceMaker to provide additional information that does not affect a site's suitability but can be later referred to should the site progress to later stages of site selection.

PlaceMaker applied the following process when analysing sites.

Table 1: PlaceMaker Analysis

Clip					
Any 'clip' constraints will be removed from the suitable area of the site. This is the most basic form of assessment for the most severe constraints. Clip constraints are referred to as absolute constraints within this methodology.					
Balance Scoring					
This is for less severe constraints and considers the cumulative impact of more than one constraint affecting a site. The default approach for PlaceMaker is for all sites to start with a score of 100, and where constraints are applicable apply a penalty. The matrix below shows how the significance of the constraint, which when combined with the percentage overlap of the constraint on the site, creates the penalty score associated with the constraint which is then applied to the site's total balance.					
		Overlap			
		Majority (>50%)	Significant (>25% and <=50%)	Minor (>5% and <=25%)	Negligible (<=5%)
Penalty Level	High	75	37.5	18.75	0
	Medium	50	25	12.5	0
	Low	25	12.5	6.25	0
For Information					

'For Information' constraints have no impact on the balance score, but the overlap is highlighted so that officers can investigate if necessary.

3.2.1 Step A - Absolute Constraints – Clipping

Sites were first assessed against absolute constraints within the Borough, such as Special Protection Areas or land being permanently acquired for the Lower Thames Crossing. They are referred to as absolute constraints because the nature of these constraints is such that that they cannot be overcome.

The absolute constraints are shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Absolute Constraints

Nationally/ Internationally Significant Nature Designations
• Special Area of Conservation • Special Protection Area • Ramsar Sites • Site of Special Scientific Interest • National Nature Reserves • Ancient Woodland
Nationally/ Internationally Significant Heritage Designations
• Scheduled Ancient Monuments • Historic Parks and Gardens
Flooding
• Flood Storage Areas
Open land with national protection
• Registered Parks and Gardens • Town & Village Greens
Amenity Risks
• Blast Zones • HSE Inner Zone/ HSE DPZ Zone/ Comah sites
Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects
• Land within the LTC Permanent Land Acquisition

Sites which were wholly affected by an absolute constraint were ruled out at this stage. If a smaller portion of the site was affected by a constraint, it was 'clipped' by PlaceMaker so only the unaffected part of the site was analysed further.

3.2.2 Step B - Assessment of Constraints - Balance Score

This stage included a consideration of other physical or planning constraints, such as heritage, flooding, land use, or ecological issues. Potential indicative housing capacities were also calculated at this stage with two capacities identified. One was

based on 35 dwelling per hectare (dph) and another which considered the prevailing density of the immediate area. Sites beyond the urban area where there is no existing development the prevailing density was defaulted to 35 dph.

All sites started off with a score of 100 and they were given a penalty (reduction) if the site was impacted by any of the constraints listed in the table below. The significance of the penalty depended on how much of the site was impacted by each constraint and the level of importance placed on the constraint. Table 1 provides more information on the reductions.

Table 3: Balance Score Constraints

Environmental features and designations
• Local Wildlife Sites • Potential Local Wildlife Sites • Tree Preservation Orders • Country Parks • Parks and Gardens • Village Greens • Fields in Trust • Allotments • Local Green Space Recommendations • Historic Landfill sites • AQMA
Heritage features and designations
• Listed Buildings • Listed Building 100m Buffer
Infrastructure
• Existing pylons • Existing overhead lines
Flooding
• Flood Zone 2 • Flood Zone 3
Economic designations and development
• Freeport Tax and Custom Sites • LDO London Gateway • Primary Industrial and Commercial Areas • Employment Broad Location – Urban Extension • Oil Refineries & Oil Refinery Expansion Areas • Oil and Chemical Storage & Oil and Chemical Storage Expansion Areas

Other constraints were assessed within the HLAA as 'For Information' constraints and the findings provided additional information for each site which did not affect the balance score or overall suitability of the site but assisted officers in the final

stage of site selection. The 'For Information' constraints are shown in Table 4 below.

Table 4: 'For Information' Constraints

'For Information' Constraints
• Green Belt • Agricultural Land Classification • Archaeological sites • Conservation Area • Landscape Character Area • Historic Landfill Sites Buffer • Air Quality Management Areas • Potential route for Norwich to Tilbury (electricity transmission project) • High Pressure Gas Pipelines/ Gas Pipeline Buffers • HSE Middle Zones/ HSE Outer Zones LTC Temporary Possession of Land • Secondary Industrial and Commercial Areas • Retail Centres and Parades • Public Rights of Way • Topography • Priority Habitat Inventory • SFRA Critical Drainage Areas

These constraints included the Green Belt. Whilst sites on previously development land are prioritised for selection, it was identified early in this process that there wasn't a sufficient supply of sites on previously developed land to achieve the housing need, and so consideration would need to be given to sites in the Green Belt.

To enable further refinement of sites officers defined a RAG rating which was then applied to the sites' balance scores. The RAG rating is shown in Table 5 below.

Table 5: RAG Rating of Sites

Balance score	RAG Rating
100	Green
25-99	Amber
<24	Red

Sites with a score under 25 (RAG rating red) were considered to be unsuitable and not considered beyond Stage 2 in the site selection process.

3.2.3 Step C - Proximity of Sites to Existing Settlements and New Settlement Opportunities

Sites were also assessed within this stage on their relationship to existing settlements and whether they had potential to create a new standalone settlement. This involved identifying the nearest settlement to each site and noting where the site was located in relation to that settlement. The criteria were as follows:

- Within a settlement,
- Edge of a settlement
- Adjacent to a site that is classed as edge of settlement
- Separate from the settlement
- Potential new settlement

Sites classified under 'separate from the settlement' were considered unsuitable based on their isolated nature and were not considered beyond Stage 2 in the site selection process. Where a site or cluster of adjoining sites that were separate from a settlement were of a size that could create a standalone sustainable settlement, they were classified under 'potential new settlement'.

Sites that were within a settlement, on the edge of one or could form part of a new settlement were retained. Sites that were away from the settlement edge but adjacent to a site that was edge of settlement were also retained as they could have potential to come forward as a larger urban extension.

3.2.4 Reasonable Alternatives

Where the evidence base was still emerging and a preferred spatial strategy had yet to be decided upon, all sites that had passed stage 2 were subject to the IIA as they remained 'reasonable alternatives' at that stage of plan making.

3.3 Stage 3: Site Availability and Achievability

This stage considered the availability and achievability of each site and the potential timeframes for development, based on potential capacity, as set out in the HLAA. Consideration was given to the information provided alongside the site submission on site ownership, any barriers to delivery, and any legal constraints such as covenants or unwilling landowners.

Sites that were not being actively promoted by a developer, landowner or site promoter for housing development were assessed as being unavailable at this stage. This included sites that were submitted through the latest call for sites exercise specifically for other uses such as employment and renewable energy generation and not housing. There were also several sites that were submitted in previous call for sites for housing development but not submitted during the most recent call for sites between 2023 and 2025. To confirm their availability the Council contacted the site promoters using details provided in the original submissions. If no response was received the site was marked as unavailable.

To verify whether sites identified through a planning application search were eligible to be deemed available in the HLAA, the Council contacted the applicant or

planning agent using the contact details provided on the application form and included the address of the site, the planning application reference and the site plan. They were given a set timeframe to confirm whether the site was available and were asked to provide the following information:

- whether they controlled the site
- whether the site is available for development
- the preferred use for the site
- anticipated timeframe for delivery

Where the applicant or agents responded confirming the site was not available, or we did not receive any response, the site was marked as being unavailable.

To verify whether sites identified through the desktop review of vacant sites within existing urban areas were available, the Council obtained the landowner details through Land Registry searches and wrote to them. They were given the same timeframe to respond with the same information that was asked for planning application sites. The letter included the title number, address of the site and was accompanied with the map of the title deeds.

In accordance with the PPG a site was considered achievable for development where there was a reasonable prospect that housing will be developed on the site at a particular point in time. This is essentially a judgement about the economic viability of a site, and whether a developer would be prepared to develop the site during the lifetime of the Plan.

Achievability is affected by market factors, cost factors and delivery factors. A professional judgement has been made on these factors using information known to date to determine the likely achievability of a site. Where any potential issues have been identified that could affect the achievability of a site, these have been recorded in the achievability conclusion.

There were 144 sites considered to be suitable, available and achievable at the end of this stage.

3.4 Stage 4: Delivery of the Spatial Strategy

Sites that do not contribute to the delivery of the preferred spatial strategy were ruled out at this stage. The preferred spatial strategy is a hybrid of spatial options 1, 2 and 4 which were considered at earlier stages in the preparation of the Local Plan and the Integrated Impact Assessment (incorporating the Sustainability Appraisal). The spatial strategy seeks to focus growth in the most sustainable locations which are existing towns, as per the settlement hierarchy, that are well connected and already provide access to key services and facilities, as well as the creation of new settlements at West Horndon and on land north of the A13. Growth within the villages is limited in recognition of them being the least sustainable locations and to protect their rural character.

This stage considered sites against the Borough's hierarchy of settlements. All sites that were associated with the principal urban area and the Borough's towns (Tiers 1 and 2) were aligned with the spatial strategy. Sites associated with the larger villages (Tier 3) that would deliver small or medium scale development (up to 50 homes) were considered to be aligned with the spatial strategy. Sites associated within the larger villages that would deliver more than 50 homes and all sites associated with the smaller villages and the rural settlements (Tiers 4 and 5) were not aligned and were not taken forward.

Sites for the two new settlements were those that had been identified as suitable, available and achievable in the previous stages and specifically categorised as 'Potential new settlement' in Stage 2. A further review of nearby and adjacent sites was also undertaken to ensure all potential sites that could form part of the new settlements were duly considered. Those identified as having potential were included in this stage and taken forward.

The decision to exclude the sites in Stage 4 is supported by the Integrated Impact Assessment findings. Whilst other spatial options scored well against the different IIA objectives, spatial option 7 is a combination of the most effective elements of the other spatial options which score strongly against the objectives and provides the most balanced and deliverable approach to meeting the long-term development needs. It also supports the delivery of strategic infrastructure, makes effective use of transport assets, and directs growth to locations considered less sensitive to development.

The 108 sites remaining at the end of this stage were the preferred housing sites and considered to be suitable, available and achievable and aligned with the spatial strategy.

3.5 Stage 5: Identifying Site Allocations

After the HLAA was undertaken a number of additional and updated technical evidence were produced to provide more information on the sites to inform site selection. The technical evidence included the following:

- Integrated Impact Assessment (incorporating the Sustainability Appraisal)
- Habitat Regulations Assessment
- Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test
- Water Cycle Study
- Stage 2 Green Belt Assessment
- Local Plan Transport Assessment
- Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)
- Viability Assessment
- Heritage Impact Assessment
- Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Analysis
- Playing Pitch and Outdoor Sport Strategy Assessment
- Indoor Sports Assessment

- Open Space Assessment

This final stage involved a review of the preferred housing sites and all the additional technical information to identify which sites should progress to site allocations to meet the Council's housing needs.

The additional evidence identified whether there were any constraints affecting sites and the potential mitigations requirements which could impact on the achievability of sites. This informed whether a site could be considered deliverable within the next five years, or developable over a longer period. This stage also considered the opportunities that could arise from each site such as infrastructure provision and whether it could improve the sustainability of adjacent sites and help overcome existing and future capacity issues. Engagement with infrastructure providers and key stakeholders was undertaken throughout this stage to assist.

Consideration was also given to whether any logical adjustments should be made to site boundaries to create combined sites, as well as refinement of the site capacities. Testing of these sites to identify the necessary supporting infrastructure and demonstrate viability is set out with the IDP, Viability Assessment and Transport Assessment and accompanying site specific assessments.

4. Site Selection Methodology for Employment

The site selection methodology for employment follows the same stages for housing but is based on the Employment Land Availability Assessment (ELAA), which was produced by consultants, Aspinall Verdi. Sites were assessed in the ELAA for their Suitability, Availability and Achievability status, as well as being scored against set criteria to give a RAG rating score and an overall grading between Poor and Very Good.

4.1 Stage 1: Identifying Sites for Assessment

Similar to stage 1 for identifying housing sites, the Council created a list of sites taken from multiple sources including the call for sites exercise and a review of available sites within existing employment areas as part of the Employment Land Availability Assessment (ELAA).

Call for Sites

82 sites were identified as being potential employment sites. This included 70 site submissions through the open call for sites from 2023 to 2025, of which 4 were duplicates and resulted in a total of 68 sites being assessed and 14 sites submitted in earlier call for sites exercises.

The submission information for these sites either stated that a proposed use was an employment one or the proposed use wasn't filled in. If the latter, officers reviewed available information on the site and made a professional judgement as to whether to include it in within the list. Information informing this included whether the site had permission for another particular use, was being considered through the development management process or the site promoters had discussed their intentions for the site with officers.

Sites within existing employment areas

37 sites within existing employment areas were initially identified within the ELAA as potentially being available for development.

4.2 Stage 2: Site Suitability

This stage considered the findings of the ELAA and additional information and advice provided by key stakeholders and site promoters to update each site's suitability. This resulted in sites, initially deemed suitable in the ELAA, being ruled out where it was identified they had constraints that cannot be overcome, i.e. there is no appropriate mitigation. For example, one potential employment site is a former landfill site which was deemed unsuitable for development in this plan period on advice from the site promoter. Sites that were also with the Tilbury Flood Storage Area were considered unsuitable following advice from the Environment Agency.

The ELAA scored several potential employment sites as being unsuitable if they were within the Metropolitan Green Belt. Owing to the limited type and location of available employment land within existing employment areas and urban areas to meet future need, the Council would need to broaden its search and consider sites within the Green Belt. As such, sites which were unsuitable due to the Green Belt policy constraint were identified as potentially suitable within the site selection process.

4.3 Stage 3: Site Availability and Achievability

Sites which were not considered 'available' for development within the ELAA for employment were ruled out as no further information had been provided since it was produced to change this assessment. For potential employment sites, these were sites which were included in previous ELAAs but haven't been resubmitted/updated since.

Sites which had been assessed as not being 'achievable' due to abnormal costs and other potential constraints within the high-level assessment in the ELAA were included in the site selection process as it was considered that further investigation, external funding, or other forms of mitigation could potentially overcome these constraints.

A review of the grading of the remaining sites was undertaken and only potential employment sites which scored Good or Very Good were retained within the sift of sites. Sites within existing employment areas that scored below this were retained as the principle for employment development in these designated employment areas applies and future opportunities to redevelop the site or the wider employment area had potential to improve the site's rating.

4.4 Stage 4: Alignment with the Spatial and Economic Strategies

The economic strategy seeks to facilitate and support the delivery of significant economic growth within the Borough over the plan period which is being driven by national growth ambitions such as the Thames Freeport. It will achieve this by ensuring there is an extensive portfolio of land for economic development across the Borough which meets the needs and locational requirements of the diverse range of sectors and businesses within Thurrock, enables port expansion and supports the delivery of digital infrastructure. The strategy also focuses on delivering inclusive growth by enhancing opportunities for local businesses and residents by support local supply chains, investing in training infrastructure, creating pathways into employment for residents with apprenticeships and training opportunities and helping residents move into higher-skilled and better-paid jobs.

Sites which were aligned with the economic strategy and would meet the identified economic need were retained. To ensure that the new settlements included in the

spatial strategy were self-sustaining, sites that could provide employment within the new settlements were also retained.

The 59 sites remaining at the end of this stage were the preferred employment sites.

4.5 Stage 5: Identifying Site Allocations

After the ELAA was undertaken a number of additional and updated technical evidence were produced to provide more information on sites to further inform site selection. The technical evidence included the following:

- Integrated Impact Assessment (incorporating the Sustainability Appraisal)
- Habitat Regulations Assessment
- Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test
- Water Cycle Study
- Stage 2 Green Belt Assessment
- Local Plan Transport Assessment
- Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)
- Viability Assessment
- Heritage Impact Assessment
- Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Analysis
- Open Space Assessment

This final stage involved a review of the preferred employment sites and all the additional technical information to identify which sites should progress to site allocations to meet the Council's employment needs and the wider growth ambitions.

The additional evidence identified whether there were any constraints affecting sites and the potential mitigations requirements which could impact on the achievability of sites. This stage also considered the opportunities that could arise from each site such as infrastructure provision and was informed by further engagement with infrastructure providers and key stakeholders.

Consideration was also given as to whether any logical adjustments should be made to site boundaries to create combined sites and/or amend overlapping sites. Testing of these sites to identify the necessary supporting infrastructure and demonstrate deliverability is set out with the IDP, Viability Assessment and Transport Assessment and accompanying site specific assessments.

5. Conclusion

This paper explains the methodology that has been followed to identify the 74 housing and employment site allocations included within the Regulation 19 Publication version of the Local Plan⁸. It sets out each stage and identifies how other regulatory requirements such as the IIA has fed into the spatial strategy and site selection process.

⁸ Number of sites allocations excludes Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Sites and Education sites.
