OLDHAM METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

FINAL EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF THE ASSESSMENT OF EMPLOYMENT SITES SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Adopted on 29th October 2007 by Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council





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.

কাউন্সিল, এই দলিলটিকে অনুরোধ সাপেক্ষে এবং যদি উপযুক্ত হয়-অন্যান্য ভাবে পাওয়ার ব্যবস্থা করবে, যার অন্তর্ভুক্ত হল বড় অক্ষরে, ইলেকট্রনিকভাবে এবং কমিউনিটির বিভিন্ন ভাষায়। দয়া করে আরও বিস্তারিত তথ্যের জন্য টেলিফোন করুন 0161 770 4151, 4163 অথবা 4139 এই নম্বরগুলোতে।

اگر مانگ ہوئی اور مناسب ہواتو کوسل اس دستاویز کوموٹی لکھائی ، ٹیپ یاسی ڈی وغیر ہ اور کمیونٹی کی زبانوں میں بھی فراہم کرنے کا انتظام کرے گی۔ مزیدِ معلومات کیلئے 1151 0161 میا 1163 میں 4163 0161 770 0161 میں 139 0161 770 پنون کریں۔ An Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) of the draft Assessment of Employment Sites Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was undertaken by the Council. It was subject to consultation from 19 June 2007 to 31 July 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 adopted Assessment of Employment Sites SPD.

Appendix 1 Pro-forma for the initial assessment

Department	Regener ation	Section Strategic Planning and Information		Person responsible for the assessment		Clare Moran		
Name of the Policy to be assessedAssessment of Employment Sites SPD				21 May 2007	Is this a new or existing policy	New, but relates to UDP policy		
	Describe the aims, objectives and urpose of the policyTo provide guidance on the implementation of UDP Policies B2.2 on how the Council will assess planning applications f development of residential and/or community uses on sites Employment Zones (PEZs) and existing Employment Sites					ns for the ites in Primary		
2. Are there any associated objectives of the policy, please explain			 To make better use of vacant and underused land and buildings in existing employment areas To consolidate the potential of vacant and underused land as centres of future business and industry growth To provide a range of sites for a variety of new employment uses, excluding retail, to meet the needs of new firms in the Borough and existing companies that wish to expand To safeguard the most valuable (in terms of size, location and accessibility), employment land sites To encourage new travel intensive employment uses to take place in areas highly accessible by public transport To realise the maximum benefit of Previously Developed Land and buildings 					

3. Who is intended to benefit from the policy and in what way			 Private Individuals, Community and Interest Groups, Stakeholders, Land Owners, Developers, Councillors, OMBC Officers. Better quality information submitted with planning applications to assist the development control processes and the implementation of UDP policy. 					
4. What outcomes are wanted from this policy?			An efficient and effective use of employment land in the Borough. Better quality information submitted with planning applications to assist the development control processes and the implementation of UDP policy.					
5. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?			Unforeseen/unavoidable circumstances. Complexity of topic.					
6. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the policy	Private Individuals, Com and Interest Groups, Stakeholders, Land Own Developers, Councillors, Officers.	vners,		7. Who implements the policy and who is responsible for the policy?	Strategic Planning and Information. Development Control. Property Development and Investment.			
8. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on racial groups.			N	The SPD provides guidance on UDP policies B2.1 and B2.2.1 does not have any differential impact upon this equalities group.				
What existing evide otherwise) do you h	ence (either presumed or have for this?		1	1				

9. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to gender	Y	N	The SPD provides guidance on UDP policies B2.1 and B2.2. It does not have any differential impact upon this equalities group.	
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 guidance on UDP policies B2.1 and B2.2. It does not have any differential impact upon this equalities group.	
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?		1		
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 guidance on UDP policies B2.1 and B2.2. It does not have any differential impact upon this equalities group.	
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?		<u> </u>		
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 guidance on UDP policies B2.1 and B2.2. It does not have any differential impact upon this equalities group.	
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?		<u>ı</u>		
13. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on people due to their religious belief		YNThe SPD provides guidance on UDP policies B2.1 and E does not have any differential impact upon this equalities group.		

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 guidance on UDP policies B2.1 and B2.2. It does not have any differential impact upon this equalities group.
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 guidance on UDP policies B2.1 and B2.2. It does not have any differential impact upon this equalities group.
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?		I	
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 guidance on UDP policies B2.1 and B2.2. It does not have any differential impact upon this equalities group.
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 loss of employment land within the Borough could lead to a loss of local jobs, which could then lead to an increase in poverty levels within the Borough.
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?		1	1

18. Could the differential impact identified in 8-17 amount to there being the potential for adverse impact in this policy	YES	NO	Any loss of employment land as a result of these policies may be mitigated through a planning obligation to support the local economy and employment.				
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				
20. Should the policy proceed to a partialYESimpact assessmentYES		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) Clare Moran

Signed (Lead Officer) Phil Jobling