

OLDHAM METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

**FINAL EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENT
OF THE
CONTAMINATED LAND
SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT**

JUNE 2007

OLDHAM 
Metropolitan Borough 



The Council will arrange for this document to be made available in alternative formats including large print, electronically, and community languages if requested, and if appropriate. Please ring 0161 770 4151, 4163 or 4139 for further information

વિનંતી કરવાથી, કાઉન્સિલ દ્વારા આ દસ્તાવેજ વિવિધ રૂપમાં ઉપલબ્ધ કરવામાં આવશે. દા.ત., મોટા છાપેલાં અક્ષરોમાં, સીડી કે ઓડિયો ટેઈપ પર અને વિવિધ સમાજની ભાષાઓનો સમાવેશ થાય છે. કૃપા કરી, વધારે માહિતી માટે, 0161 770 4151, 4163 અથવા 4139 નંબર પર ફોન કરો.

કાર્ડબોર્ડ, એઈ દલિલટિકે અનુરોધ સાપેક્ષે એવં યદિ ઉપયુક્ત હય-અન્યાન્ય ઢાવે પાઠ્યાર વ્યવસ્થા કરવે, યાર અસુરુક્ત હલ વડુ અક્ષરે, ઈલેક્ટ્રોનિકઢાવે એવં કમ્પ્યુટરિઢાવે વિભિન્ન ઢાષાય । દયા કરે આરઠુ વિસ્તારિત તથ્યેર જન્ય ટેલિફોન કરન 0161 770 4151, 4163 અથવા 4139 એઈ નમ્બરઘુલોતે ।

اگر مانگ ہوئی اور مناسب ہو اتو کونسل اس دستاویز کو موٹی لکھائی، ٹیپ یا سی ڈی وغیرہ اور کمیونٹی کی زبانوں میں بھی فراہم کرنے کا انتظام کرے گی۔ مزید معلومات کیلئے 0161 770 4151 یا 0161 770 4163 یا 0161 770 4139 پر فون کریں۔

An Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) of the draft Contaminated Land Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was undertaken by the Council. It was subject to consultation from 31st January 2007 to 14th March 2007. No comments were received on the EqIA. The findings of this draft EqIA are still appropriate and therefore it is not considered necessary to undertake a new EqIA for the final Contaminated Land SPD.

Appendix 1 Pro-forma for the initial assessment

Department	Regeneration	Section Strategic Planning and Information	Person responsible for the assessment	Paul McGrath		
Name of the Policy to be assessed	Contaminated Land SPD	Date of Assessment	16 October 2006	Is this a new or existing policy	New, but relates to UDP policy	
1. Describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the policy		To provide guidance on the implementation of UDP Policy NR1.6 on contaminated land.				
2. Are there any associated objectives of the policy, please explain		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To promote social, economic and environmental well-being and to protect green space and the natural environment. • To conserve soil resources and quality. • To increase the number of contaminated sites available for development. 				
3. Who is intended to benefit from the policy and in what way		<p>Private Individuals, Community and Interest Groups, Stakeholders, Land Owners, Developers, Councillors, OMBC Officers.</p> <p>Better quality information submitted with planning applications to assist the development control processes and the implementation of the UDP policy.</p>				
4. What outcomes are wanted from this policy?		<p>Safe development and future occupancy of contaminated land.</p> <p>Better quality information submitted with planning applications to assist the development control processes and the implementation of the UDP policy.</p>				

5. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?	Complexity of topic. Unforeseen / unavoidable circumstances. Cost of remediating contaminated land may undermine the economic value of development proposals going ahead.		
6. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the policy	Private Individuals, Community and Interest Groups, Stakeholders, Land Owners, Developers, Councillors, OMBC Officers.	7. Who implements the policy and who is responsible for the policy?	Strategic Planning and Information. Development Control. Environmental Protection.
8. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on racial groups.	Y	N	The SPD provides technical guidance on UDP Policy NR1.6 on contaminated land. It does not have any differential impact upon any equalities groups.
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?			
9. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to gender	Y	N	The SPD provides technical guidance on UDP Policy NR1.6 on contaminated land. It does not have any differential impact upon any equalities groups.
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?			
10. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due disability	Y	N	The SPD provides technical guidance on UDP Policy NR1.6 on contaminated land. It does not have any differential impact upon any equalities groups.

What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?			
11. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on people due to sexual orientation	Y	N	The SPD provides technical guidance on UDP Policy NR1.6 on contaminated land. It does not have any differential impact upon any equalities groups.
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?			
12. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on people due to their age	Y	N	The SPD provides technical guidance on UDP Policy NR1.6 on contaminated land. It does not have any differential impact upon any equalities groups.
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?			
13. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on people due to their religious belief	Y	N	The SPD provides technical guidance on UDP Policy NR1.6 on contaminated land. It does not have any differential impact upon any equalities groups.
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?			
14. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on people due to them having dependants/caring responsibilities	Y	N	The SPD provides technical guidance on UDP Policy NR1.6 on contaminated land. It does not have any differential impact upon any equalities groups.
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?			

15. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on people due to their offending past			Y	N	The SPD provides technical guidance on UDP Policy NR1.6 on contaminated land. It does not have any differential impact upon any equalities groups.
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?					
16. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on people due to them being transgendered or transsexual			Y	N	The SPD provides technical guidance on UDP Policy NR1.6 on contaminated land. It does not have any differential impact upon any equalities groups.
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?					
17. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on people due issues surrounding poverty			Y	N	The SPD provides technical guidance on UDP Policy NR1.6 on contaminated land. It does not have any differential impact upon any equalities groups.
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?					
18. Could the differential impact identified in 8-17 amount to there being the potential for adverse impact in this policy	YES	NO	No differential impacts have been identified for Questions 8 – 17, therefore there is no potential for adverse impact from the SPD.		

19. Can this adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? Or any other reason	YES	NO	Please explain for each equality heading (question 8-16) on a separate piece of paper Not Applicable		
20. Should the policy proceed to a partial impact assessment	YES	NO	21. If Yes, is there enough evidence to proceed to a full EIA	YES	NO
			22. Date on which Partial or Full impact assessment to be completed by		

Signed (completing officer) Paul McGrath

Signed (Lead Officer) Pauline Goodhall