

Date 08/06/15	Name
08/06/15	
00,00,13	Chris Elliott
01/06/15	Richard Hall
08/06/15	Andrew Jones
08/06/15	Mike Snow
27/05/15	Andrew Jones
08/06/15	Mike Snow
09/06/15	Councillor Moira-Ann Grainger
Engagement	
	08/06/15 08/06/15 27/05/15 08/06/15

No

The following organisations have been consulted -**Environment Agency** Stratford upon Avon District Council

Equality and Sustainability Impact Assessment Undertaken

Natural England Rugby Borough Council

Warwickshire County Council Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council Warwickshire Public Health North Warwickshire Borough Council

Public Health England Coventry City Council

Final Decision? Suggested next steps (if not final decision please set out below)

1. SUMMARY

1.1 The report invites the Executive to adopt an updated Contaminated Land Inspection Strategy which will replace the original document published in 2001.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

2.1 To adopt the updated Contaminated Land Inspection Strategy as contained in Annex 1.

3. **REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDATION**

- 3.1 Within the Constitution, any decision on a function relating to contaminated land must be taken by the Executive.
- 3.2 A recent Internal Audit of environmental protection functions, whilst recording a substantial assurance for the service, identified that the current strategy comes across as unduly elaborate and backward looking. The report recommended that the Contaminated Land Inspection Strategy should be revised to reflect the current approach to discharging the Council's obligations on contaminated land.

4. **POLICY FRAMEWORK**

- 4.1 Policy Framework One of the strategic aims of the Sustainable Community Strategy is to protect and enhance the built and natural environment and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) also presumes in favour of sustainable development. The Council's draft Local Plan contains a policy (NE5) which provides a basis for addressing contamination and pollution locally ensuring that where evidence of contamination exists, the land is made fit for its intended purpose and does not pose an unacceptable risk to sensitive receptors.
- 4.2 **Fit for the Future** The Council's purpose is to improve the quality of life for everyone who lives in, works in or visits Warwick District. With our partners, we aspire to build sustainable, safer, stronger and healthier communities. Ensuring contaminated land is remediated before development will contribute to this objective.
- 4.3 **Impact Assessments** Should enforcement action ever be required under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990, costs to the landowner could be significant and adversely impact those in hardship. In this event, a case-specific impact assessment would be carried out and reported to the Executive for further consideration.

5. **BUDGETARY FRAMEWORK**

5.1 There are no budgetary implications arising from this report. Contaminated land investigation is contained within the core service provision.

6. RISKS

6.1 The current Contaminated Land Inspection Strategy gives a misleading impression about the Council's management approach.

7. ALTERNATIVE OPTION(S) CONSIDERED

7.1 The proposed new strategy reflects current good practice amongst other local authorities who have already updating theirs and, given the Internal Audit report, no alternative is proposed.

8. **BACKGROUND**

- 8.1 Regulations under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 require local authorities to produce a strategy to identify, inspect and remediate contaminated land within their area. The original strategy was adopted in 2001 and was some 71 pages in length which Internal Audit recognised could be much shortened by focussing on the current approach and following an essentially responsive regime linked to the planning process. This approach was adopted in 2011.
- 8.2 As well as external consultees listed above, The Head of Development Services has been consulted and her comments have been incorporated into the new document.
- 8.3 Currently there are approximately 150 sites across the district which have been identified as potentially contaminated but none have been prioritised as posing a significant risk to public health. It is therefore considered that all these sites could be reviewed as they come forward for re-development.