

Impact and Needs/Requirements Assessment (INRA)

Initial Screening

Initial screening needs to take place for all new policies, strategies, procedures and functions. This stage must be completed at the earliest opportunity to determine whether it is necessary to undertake an INRA for this activity.

Name of Policy, Strategy or Function:	Contaminated Land Inspection Strategy
Lead Officer (responsible for assessment):	Marcus Bell
Department:	Environmental Services
Others Involved in the Assessment (i.e. peer review, external challenge):	Liz Knox
Date Initial Screening Completed:	20/8/10 (revised 27/10/10)

(a) What is the activity trying to achieve? i.e. what are its aims and objectives? Is it affected by external drivers for change?

Under The Environmental Protection Act 1990, East Cambridgeshire District Council is required to inspect the area within its boundaries for the purpose of identifying contaminated land. This legislation provides a means to require the remediation of land where this is not taking place voluntarily. Local authorities are the primary enforcers and the Council is required to prepare and publish an Inspection Strategy for the identification of contaminated land within its district.

Part IIa of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 ('Part IIa') was inserted by Section 57 of the Environment Act 1995 and came into force in England on 1st April 2000. This created a statutory regime for the identification and remediation of land where contamination is causing unacceptable risks to human health or to the wider environment.

This strategy explains how the Council prioritises its inspection procedures whilst developing and maintaining an overall approach that is rational, ordered and efficient. The key elements of the strategy are:

- 1) To comply with the legal requirements placed on the Council by Part IIa;
 - 2) To maintain a Register of all the land in the District that falls within the description of "contaminated land" as defined in Part IIa;
 - 3) To ensure that land identified as contaminated land is remediated and keep records of the remediation in the Contaminated Land Register;
 - 4) To encourage owners of contaminated land that is due to be redeveloped to carry out voluntary remediation through the planning process;
-

- 5) To encourage the re-use of brownfield sites in order to maximise the use of previously developed land, to reduce the pressure on greenfield sites and to preserve the Green Belt in general; and
- 6) The most serious problems are addressed first, concentrating resources on areas where contaminated land is most likely to be found.

The Contaminated Land Inspection Strategy was initially published in 2002. Since then legislation and guidance have changed, as has case law. In addition to these national changes, ECDC has experienced its own challenges, including budgetary issues, in this field which need to be reflected in how we intend to proceed with our inspection duties.

(b) Who are its main beneficiaries? i.e. who will be affected by the policy and the way the service is delivered?

If any of the sites looked at under the strategy are occupied by residential dwellings (including caravans, temporary accommodation), then the risk posed by land contamination to those people will be reduced/removed, so those occupants would benefit. In cases where this work brings back derelict sites into use, then the residents of East Cambridgeshire as a whole, would benefit.

(c) Does this activity have the potential to cause an impact (positive, negative or neutral) on different groups in the community, on the grounds of:
(please tick all that apply):

Ethnicity	<input type="checkbox"/>	Age	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gender	<input type="checkbox"/>	Religion and Belief	<input type="checkbox"/>
Disability	<input type="checkbox"/>	Sexuality	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please explain any impact identified:

None. In contaminated land assessment the only considerations are whether human receptors are present or not, there is no further distinction of their age, race etc.

For example, even though we were made aware that the elderly residents of one particular site did not use their gardens whereas a younger household used their garden extensively (and therefore the potential exposure to contaminated soil was much higher), they were both treated the same. Because you always assume 'worst case' i.e. if a receptor could be at risk, then they are considered to be.

(d) If you have identified an adverse impact, does it disadvantage or discriminate unfairly against any of the groups in a way that is unlawful? This is more likely to occur in services that are customer facing, particularly where judgements need to be made by Council staff about access or entitlement to services or opportunities. **N/a**

(e) What Information or background data is currently available to assist with making the judgements above?

N/a

If the answer to question (d) is **YES**, then it is necessary to proceed with a full equality impact assessment. If the answer is **NO**, then this judgement and your response to the above questions will need to be countersigned by your Head of Service/Executive Director, and then referred to the Council's Equal Opportunities Working Group (EOWG) for scrutiny and verification. Please forward completed and signed forms to Nicole Pema, Principal HR Officer.

Signatures:

Completing Officer: Marcus Bell **Date:** 27/10/10

Head of Service: Liz Knox **Date:** 27/10/10