



**DEVELOPMENT OF A SUSTAINABLE ENERGY
PLANT.**

KEMSLEY PAPER MILL,

**ST REGIS PAPER COMPANY LIMITED & E.ON
ENERGY FROM WASTE UK LIMITED**

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

CHAPTER 14:

SOCIO ECONOMIC

Prepared by:
David Conway

Checked by:
Jonathan Standen

34 Lisbon Street
Leeds
LS1 4LX

Tel 0113 220 6190
Fax 0113 243 9161
Email rpsld@rpsgroup.com

Contents

14.1	Introduction	14-7
14.2	Legislation and Policy Context	14-7
14.3	Assessment Methodology	14-8
14.4	Baseline Conditions	14-13
14.5	Identification and Evaluation of Likely Significant Effects	14-21
14.6	Mitigation	14-22
14.7	Residual Impacts	14-28
14.8	Conclusions	14-29
14.9	References	14-30

Tables, Figures & Appendices

Tables

Table 14.1	Sensitivity Definitions
Table 14.2	Definitions: Magnitude of Impacts
Table 14.3	Definitions: Significance of Effects
Table 14.4	Significance Determination
Table 14.5	Sensitivity of Identified Receptors
Table 14.6	Significance of Effects of Employment During Remediation and Construction Phase.
Table 14.7	Significance of effect of Employment During Operational Phase
Table 14.8	Significance of effect of Economic Multiplier
Table 14.9	Significance of Effect of Landfill Diversion
Table 14.10	Significance of Effect associated with the Impact on Property Prices
Table 14.11	Cumulative Impacts
Table 14.12	Summary of Residual Impacts

Appendices

Appendix 14.1	Population (Table UV01)
Appendix 14.2	Migration Data (Table KS24)
Appendix 14.3	General Health Data (Table UV20)
Appendix 14.4	Long Term Limiting Illness Data (Table UV22)
Appendix 14.5	Car Ownership Data (Table UV62)
Appendix 14.6	Types of Industry Data (Table UV34)
Appendix 14.7	Industrial Sector of Employment Data (Table KS11A)
Appendix 14.8	Occupation (Table UV30)
Appendix 14.9	Economic Activity Data (Table UV28)
Appendix 14.10	Unemployment/Worklessness Data (Summary Stats - 2007)
Appendix 14.11	Qualifications Data (Table UV24)
Appendix 14.12	Socio-Economic Classification Data (Table UV31)
Appendix 14.13	Modes of Travel to Work Data (Table KS15)
Appendix 14.14	Distance Travelled to Work Data (Table UV35)
Appendix 14.15	Earnings Data (ASHE - 2009)
Appendix 14.16	Job Density Data (Table 5.29 - 2001)
Appendix 14.17	Indices of Multiple Deprivation Data (IMD - 2007)
Appendix 14.18	Stakeholder Engagement Report

14. Socio-Economic

14.1 Introduction

14.1.1 This chapter identifies and assesses the likely significant socio-economic effects of the proposed development of a Sustainable Energy Plant at Kemsley Paper Mill, Sittingbourne.

14.1.2 This chapter considers the socio-economic effects of the development relating to employment generation, the economic multiplier effect, and the diversion of waste from landfill including the generation of renewable energy. Its scope and methodology have been agreed with Kent County Council.

14.2 Legislation and Planning Context

14.2.1 A detailed review of the development plan documents and planning context in relation to the development proposals is provided in Chapter 3.

14.2.2 This section summarises those policies that are directly relevant to socio-economic issues.

National Policy & Legislation

14.2.3 PPS1 sets out that amongst its key principles is to promote outcomes in which environmental, economic and social objectives are achieved over time.¹

14.2.4 In addition it sets out that the government is committed to promoting a strong, stable, and productive economy that aims to bring jobs and prosperity to all.²

14.2.5 PPS10 sets out that in identifying suitable sites for waste management facilities planning authorities should assess suitability against the cumulative effect of previous waste disposal facilities on the well being of the local community, including any significant adverse impacts on environmental quality, social cohesion and inclusion or economic potential.³

14.2.6 The Regional Vision of the South East Plan (May 2009) sets out that:

¹PPS1, para 13

² PPS1, para 23

³ PPS10, para 21

“A socially and economically strong, healthy and just South East that respects the limits of the global environment. Achieving this will require the active involvement of all individuals to deliver a society where everyone, including the most deprived, benefits from and contributes to a better quality of life. At the same time the impact of current high levels of resource use will be reduced and the quality of the environment will be maintained and enhanced.”

14.2.7 It goes on to set out that this will be achieved through, amongst other matters, the integration of:

- the physical and mental health of its citizens, their wellbeing and productivity
- the health of the environment around us, including water and air quality, vegetation, habitats, wildlife and landscape
- the health of our neighbourhoods, underpinned by a sharing of the benefits of growth, good quality housing and the provision of community facilities with sustainable transport links between them, green space and a feeling of security
- the health of the region’s built environment and historic buildings.

14.2.8 The South East Plan sets out the following Sub Regional Core Strategy for the Kent Thames Gateway through policy KTG1.

14.3 Assessment Methodology

14.3.1 There is currently no definitive guidance or regulation setting out the preferred methodology or content for assessing socio-economic effects as part of Environmental Impact Assessment. This Chapter provides a qualitative assessment of the potential impacts and has been prepared using specialist knowledge and professional experience gained through carrying out studies in respect of other projects. Although there are limitations with this approach, it has been adopted in the absence of definitive or universally accepted guidance, to ensure greater consistency with the methodologies of the other Chapters within the Environmental Statement.

14.3.2 The “Guidelines and Principles For Social Impact Assessment 1994” have not been followed as although they identify a range of social issues that it may be appropriate to consider it does not advocate a methodology for assessment. Regard has been

had to the range of social issues identified, but the focus of the study has been agreed through the scoping process to ensure that it responds to local circumstances.

14.3.3 The significance of effects will, therefore, be determined by the interaction of two factors:

- The value, importance or sensitivity of the receptor; and
- The magnitude, scale or severity of the effect or change.

14.3.4 The sensitivity of a receptor is determined by how sensitive a resource or group is to environmental change, and its ability to absorb an environmental effect.

14.3.5 The sensitivity of receptors will be defined as identified in Table 14.1 below:

Sensitivity	Description
Very High	Very high importance and rarity, international scale and very limited potential for substitution
High	High importance and rarity, national scale, and limited potential for substitution
Medium	High or Medium importance and rarity, regional scale, limited potential for substitution
Low	Low or medium importance and rarity, local scale.
Negligible	Very low importance and rarity, local scale

Table 14.1 Sensitivity Definitions

14.3.6 The sensitivity of receptors in respect of the amenity effects will be determined by the size of the population, and the proximity to the effect. For example, the further away from any change in socio-economic circumstances the receptor is, and the further away from the change, the less sensitive it will be to the environmental effect.

14.3.7 The magnitude of impact is the actual change taking place to the environment, and will be defined as identified in Table 14.2 below:

Magnitude of Impact	Typical criteria descriptors	
	Adverse	Beneficial
Major	Loss of resource and/or quality and integrity of resource; severe damage to key characteristics, features or elements.	Large scale or major improvement of resource quality; extensive restoration or enhancement; major improvement of attribute quality.
Moderate	Loss of resource, but not adversely affecting the integrity; partial loss of/damage to key characteristics, features or elements.	Benefit to, or addition of, key characteristics, features or elements; improvement of attribute quality.
Minor	Some measurable change in attributes, quality or vulnerability; minor loss of, or alteration to, one (maybe more) key characteristics, features or elements.	Minor benefit to, or addition of, one (maybe more) key characteristics, features or elements; some beneficial impact on attribute or a reduced risk of negative impact occurring.
Negligible	Very minor loss or detrimental alteration to one or more characteristics, features or elements.	Very minor benefit to or positive addition of one or more characteristics, features or elements.
No change	No loss or alteration of characteristics, features or elements; no observable impact in either direction.	

Table 14.2 Definitions: Magnitude of Impacts

14.3.8 14.3.8 The significance of environmental effects will be defined as identified in Table 14.3 below:

Significance Category	Typical descriptors of effect
Very Large	Only adverse effects are normally assigned this level of significance. They represent key factors in the decision-making process. These effects are generally, but not exclusively, associated with sites or features of international, national or regional importance that are likely to suffer a most damaging impact and loss of resource integrity. However, a major change in a site or feature of local importance may also enter this category.
Large	These beneficial or adverse effects are considered to be very important considerations and are likely to be material

	in the decision-making process.
Moderate	These beneficial or adverse effects may be important, but are not likely to be key decision-making factors. The cumulative effects of such factors may influence decision-making if they lead to an increase in the overall adverse effect on a particular resource or receptor.
Slight	These beneficial or adverse effects may be raised as local factors. They are unlikely to be critical in the decision-making process, but are important in enhancing the subsequent design of the project.
Neutral	No effects or those that are beneath levels of perception, within normal bounds of variation or within the margin of forecasting error.

Table 14.3 Definitions: Significance of Effects

14.3.9 Significance of effect will therefore be determined as identified by Table 14.4 below:

		MAGNITUDE OF IMPACT (DEGREE OF CHANGE)				
		No Change	Negligible	Minor	Moderate	Major
ENVIRONMENTAL VALUE (SENSITIVITY)	Very High	Neutral	Slight	Moderate or Large	Large or Very Large	Very Large
	High	Neutral	Slight	Slight or Moderate	Moderate or Large	Large or Very Large
	Medium	Neutral	Neutral or Slight	Slight	Moderate	Moderate or Large
	Low	Neutral	Neutral or slight	Neutral or Slight	Slight	Slight or moderate

Negligible	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral or Slight	Neutral or Slight	Slight
-------------------	---------	---------	-------------------	-------------------	--------

Table 13.4 Significance Determination

14.3.10 As it is difficult to quantify the significance of effects in relation to amenity impacts, a qualitative assessment based upon professional judgement will be made. Using this methodology, the greater the sensitivity of the receptor, and the greater the magnitude of impact, the more significant the effect will be.

14.3.11 The identification of socio-economic issues has been made through the application of professional judgement and experience, and has also been informed by engagement with the local community, in addition to that made through community consultation. Accordingly, the following socio-economic issues have been considered by the Assessment:

- Employment
- Landfill Diversion
- Impact on Property Values
- Cumulative Impacts
- Carbon Footprint
- Mill Competitiveness

14.3.12 Although other issues of concern were identified through community consultation, these have been considered in other chapters of the Environmental Statement, and as such are not assessed in this Chapter.

14.3.13 In summary these issues were as follows:

- Traffic and Transportation – Chapter 6
- Air Quality – Chapter 7
- Potential Health Impacts – Chapter 7
- Potential Odour – Chapter 7
- Contaminated Land – Chapter 11
- Potential Noise – Chapter 12
- Proximity to Local Residents – Chapter 15

14.4 Baseline Conditions

Introduction

- 14.4.1 This section provides the local context for the proposed development and discusses the current condition of the social and economic environment indicators which are likely to be affected by the development.
- 14.4.2 The sensitive receptors to socio-economic effects are the populations of Kemsley (Ward), Swale, the South East, and England.
- 14.4.3 The sensitivity of the Sensitive Receptors identified is therefore determined as set out in Table 14.5 below:

Population	Sensitivity to Socio-economic change at the project site
Kemsley	Medium
Swale	Low - Medium
South East	Low
England	Negligible

Table 14.5 Sensitivity of Identified Receptors

- 14.4.4 The sensitivity of receptors to economic change has been reached through subjective judgement on the basis of population size and proximity to the site. As such the greater the population and the further away from the site, it is considered the less sensitive to socio economic change each population will be.

Population

- 14.4.5 The population of the borough of Swale at the 2001 Census (UV01) was 122,801 (Males 60,552/ Female 62,249), of which 5,840 (Males 2,904/ Female 2,936) resided in the Kemsley Ward (See Appendix 14.1). Office for National Statistics (ONS) Key Figures for People and Society (Jun 2007) show population figures for Kemsley and Swale at 6,779 and 130,300 respectively.

Migration

14.4.6 Figures for migration are derived from Table KS24 of the 2001 Census. Summary data is presented in Appendix 14.2. The data shows that whilst 5,560 people moved into the district, 3,990 moved out giving net migration of +1,570. This level of population movement is broadly similar to the regional and national data.

General Health and Limiting Long Term Illness

14.4.7 Tables UV20 and UV22 show the 2001 Census data relating to these indicators. The data provided by the respondent is their own opinion and as such is subjective as it is not known whether or what proportion of exaggeration or underestimation factors in the data. Nonetheless, on aggregate these data should provide a reasonably accurate indication of the health of different geographical areas. The data should be read in the context of the data for economic activity and unemployment which are dealt with below.

14.4.8 For comparison purposes Appendix 14.3 presents General Health data for the Kemsley, Swale, South East region and England. At the time of the Census in 2001, 68.76% of the population of England had good health, 22.21% fairly good health, and 9.03% not good health. The data for Kemsley (73.39%, 20.77% and 5.84% respectively), Swale (68.28%, 23.49%, 8.23% respectively) and the South East Region (71.50%, 21.38%, 7.12% respectively) was broadly similar.

14.4.9 Similarly, the data shown in Appendix 14.4 shows that the number of people with a Limiting Long Term Illness in Kemsley (12.09%) and Swale (17.61%) are broadly similar to the regional (15.47%) and national (17.93% data).

Car Ownership

14.4.10 Figures for car ownership are taken from table UV62 of the 2001 Census and presented in Appendix 14.5. The data shows that the percentage of households in Kemsley (13.99%) with no cars is approximately 8% lower than Swale (22.13%), 5.5% lower than the South East Region (19.43%) and 13% lower than England (26.84%).

14.4.11 Similarly, the percentage of households in Kemsley (33.3%) with 2 cars is approximately 7% higher than Swale (26.52%), and also higher than both the South East region (29.56%) and England (23.56%).

14.4.12 The proportion of houses with 3 or 4 cars portrays a different image, with data showing more comparable patterns across all four population levels.

14.4.13 Car ownership is an indicator of affluence and would indicate that both Kemsley and Swale are relatively evenly matched when compared with the remainder of the region and nationally.

Types of Industry

14.4.14 Data on Types of Industry are drawn from table UV34 of the 2001 Census and are presented in Appendix 14.6. The data shows that the proportion of people within Kemsley and Swale working in most sectors of the economy are relatively similar. When compared with the South East region the population percentage working within manufacturing, wholesale/retail and construction drops, however noticeable increases are seen in Real Estate, Education and Health and Social Work.

Industrial Sector for Employment

14.4.15 Table KS11A of 2001 Census presents these figures in more detail (See Appendix 14.7). As suggested, most figures are similar in proportion, with a few exceptions. The most noticeable are the proportion of people working in manufacturing with the percentage in Kemsley (15.47%) and Swale (16.76%) being significantly higher than the South East (12.13%) and England (14.83%) as a whole.

14.4.16 Similarly, the proportion of people working in construction in Kemsley (9.76%) and Swale (9.49%) is noticeably higher than for the South East (7.13%) and England (6.76%). The proportion of people in Kemsley (7.03%) and Swale (6.28%) working in public administration and defence is also slightly higher when compared with the South East (5.93%) and England (5.66%).

14.4.17 However, the proportion of people in Kemsley (2.97%) and Swale (3.83%) working in hotels and catering is lower than the South East (4.30%) and England. The proportion of people within Kemsley (12.33%) and Swale (11.02%) working in real estate is lower than the South East (15.59%) and England (13.21%). There are also less people involved in health and social work within Kemsley (7.30%) and Swale (8.62%) when compared against the South East (9.83%) and England (10.70%).

Occupation

14.4.18 Data on occupations is drawn from Table UV30 of the 2001 Census and is presented in Appendix 14.8. The extrapolated data shows that the proportion of people in Swale employed in the occupations in Groups 1-4 was marginally lower at 47.1% compared to the rest of the South East (58%) and England (53%). The proportion of people working with skilled trade occupations was constant across the geographical areas at between 10.9% and 13.5%.

Economic Activity

14.4.19 Data regarding economic activity has been taken from Table UV28 of the 2001 Census and is shown at Appendix 14.9. The extrapolated data shows that the level of economically active people whilst broadly similar across the geographical areas, is slightly higher in Kemsley (75.9%) and the South East (70.02%), compared to both the Swale (67.15%) and England (66.86%).

14.4.20 The level of retired persons (7.36%) in Kemsley is significantly lower than that of Swale, (13.63%) the South East (13.4%) and England (13.54%), whereas the number

of permanently sick/disabled people in Kemsley (3.5%) and the South East (3.45%) is lower than Swale (5.01%) and England (5.3%).

Unemployment/ Worklessness

14.4.21 The latest available figures for the number of claimants of Job Seekers Allowance are provided by the Office of National Statistics for July 2007 and are presented in Appendix 14.10. These show that the percentage of people claiming Job Seekers Allowance in Kemsley was 2.43% compared with 2.04% in Swale, 1.26% in the South East and 2.05% in England.

Qualifications

14.4.22 Data for Qualifications are taken from the 2001 Census Table UV24 and are set out at Appendix 14.11. Levels 1 and 2 represent GCSE or equivalent, Level 3 represent A-Level, and level 4 and 5 represent Degree level and above. The relatively small level of people with level 3 qualifications is reflective of the fact that many young people have taken A-levels then go on to higher education.

14.4.23 At the time of the Census, the proportion of the Kemsley population (27.84%) possessing no qualifications was generally similar to that of a national level (28.85%), however, within Swale (34.35%) and regionally (23.92%) there were considerable variances.

14.4.24 The proportion of the Kemsley population to possess Degree Level qualifications at 10.37% was considerably less than the national (19.9%), and regional (21.75%) levels as well as when compared with Swale (12.01%).

14.4.25 The proportion of the Kemsley population to have attained GCSE level qualifications compared well with the other geographical areas.

Socio-economic classification

14.4.26 Figures for the socio-economic classifications have been extrapolated from Table UV31 of the 2001 Census, and are set out at Appendix 14.12. The figures show that the proportion of the Kemsley population falling within the Higher Managerial and Professional Occupations at 7.19% was broadly similar when compared to the national (8.61%) and regional levels (10.79%) as well as the level for Swale (6.2%).

14.4.27 However, the proportion of the Kemsley population falling within the Lower Managerial and Professional Occupations at 22.22% was considerably higher than

the national level (18.73%), and the level for Swale (16.73%) but broadly similar to the region (21.18%).

14.4.28 In addition, the proportion of the Kemsley population falling within the Intermediate Occupations at 13.1% was considerably higher than both the national (9.48%) and regional levels (10.31%) and when compared to the level for Swale (9.52%).

14.4.29 Similarly, the proportion of the Kemsley population falling within the Routine Occupations at 11.04% was considerably higher than both the national (9.02%) and regional levels (7.35%), but broadly similar to the level for Swale (11.56%).

Modes of Travel to Work

14.4.30 Data on this topic is taken from 2001 Census Table KS15 and is presented at Appendix 14.13. The data shows that the proportion of Kemsley residents who travel to work by car (either driving or as a passenger) at 71.3% is significantly higher than that for the region (64.8%) and England (61%), and to a lesser extent Swale (65.8%).

14.4.31 Conversely, the proportion of Kemsley residents that travel by non-car modes (underground/metro, train, bus, bicycle or by foot) is relatively low (18.6%) compared to the other geographical areas (Swale 22.9%), rest of the South East (23.2%) and England (27.7%).

Travel to Work

14.4.32 Data for travel to work information has been taken from the 2001 Census table KS15 and extrapolated from table UV35, and are set out at Appendix 14.14.

14.4.33 The data shows that the average distance travelled to work by Kemsley residents is 22.79 kilometres, similar to that for Swale (17.46km) residents, however, this is significantly higher than regional (14.89km) and national levels (13.31km).

Earnings

14.4.34 Data relating to earnings is taken from the ONS Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings Resident Analysis 2009, and is presented in Appendix 14.15. The data set provided is for residents of Swale, the South East and Great Britain.

14.4.35 The figures indicate that Swale performs lower than the South East average, but residents are earning more than the national average in terms of weekly pay. Residents earn less than the regional and national average in relation to hourly rates.

14.4.36 The following are the most significant points:

- Earnings for Swale are lower than the regional average but slightly higher than the national average
- In terms of gender split, Males in Swale earn lower than the regional average but slightly higher than the national average. Females earn less within Swale against both the regional and national average.
- Male workers in Swale earn more than Female Workers. This corresponds with the data for Great Britain.

Job Density

14.4.37 Data relating to Job Densities is taken from the Office of National Statistics, and is presented in Appendix 14.16. The data set provided is for Swale, the South East and Great Britain.

14.4.38 Job density represents the ratio of total jobs compared with the working population. The figures are less than one, as the denominator is the working age population which includes a significant number of people who are not economically active.

14.4.39 The figure for Swale (0.66) shows a significantly lower Job Density than both the regional (0.87) and National (0.88) figures. This shows the lack of jobs available within Swale.

Indices of Multiple Deprivation

14.4.40 The Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) published in 2007 are primarily based on the 2001 Census Data and are intended to provide a concise summary of the extent of deprivation in the 350 or so local authority districts and unitary authorities in England. They are based on seven domains including income, employment, access to housing and other services, and incidence of crime (See Appendix 14.17).

14.4.41 In the overall weighting greater emphasis is given to income and employment. In the ranking 1 is the most deprived and 350 the least deprived. Swale is ranked 116 and as such is not within the 10% most deprived districts in England. Kent is ranked 104 out of 150 County councils and as such is not within the 10% most deprived Counties.

Summary of Baseline Conditions

14.4.42 The baseline conditions show that the socio-economic characteristics of the study area are broadly similar for Kemsley, Swale, the South East and England/Great Britain, but that the socio economic conditions of Kemsley are generally less favourable. In particular Kemsley:

- Has Lower proportion of population (along with Swale and the Region) than the region and England that works in the tertiary sector, but higher proportion within manufacturing.
- Has a Low proportion of population with Degree level qualifications.
- Possesses a higher proportion of population within Routine Occupations.
- Population travels further to work than the regional and national levels.
- Possesses a higher proportion of population that travels to work by car.

Limitations

14.4.43 The main limitations of the baseline surveys are that they are based upon the 2001 Census Data and are therefore out of date. Information on many of the topics which the census covers is not updated between the Censuses. Although there has been major local housing development since 2001, it is not clear whether the social and economic conditions revealed by the analysis above have changed significantly. However, insofar as the availability of more recent data (for example on unemployment) would enable firm conclusions to be drawn, it is concluded that the baseline conditions will not have fundamentally changed in the intervening period.

14.5 Identification and Evaluation of Likely Significant Effects

14.5.1 As is nearly always the case for major developments for which EIA is required, impacts are considered at both the construction and the operational stages. In this particular case, the principal social and economic impacts at both stages consist of the employment likely to be generated. These are considered in turn.

Employment Generation: Construction Phase

14.5.2 One of the key issues raised by the construction phase of infrastructure projects is the extent to which main contractors and sub-contractors attempt to use local labour or that from outside. Normally this is a combination of the two with imported labour more likely to consist of workers with specialist skills, and locally sourced labour consisting of unskilled and semi-skilled labour, however, this may not be the case due to the legacy of the London 2012 Olympics construction programme.

14.5.3 Construction workers, especially those with specialist skills are known to travel significant distances every day to sites for which the construction period may be no more than a few months. A catchment area for labour of ninety minutes travel time is considered to represent the potential labour market. In this case, the catchment area would include the whole of the south east coast, as far south as Bexhill and as far west as Farnborough (using Google Maps Route Finder as guidance).

14.5.4 Given the numbers of skilled people employed in the construction industry in Swale 2,552 and the South East 138,659 it is considered very unlikely that the number of workers required for the proposed development whatever the skill level required would place any pressure upon the construction labour market. It is, therefore, considered that the capacity of the construction labour market would be able to absorb the impact without difficulty.

14.5.5 It is estimated that up to 500 people will be required during the construction phase. An employment change of this scale is assessed as being of minor benefit. The significance of the environmental effects for the socio-economic impacts of employment during the construction phase is therefore assessed as indentified in Table 14.6 below:

Sensitivity of Receptor				
Magnitude of Impact		Kemsley Medium	Swale Low-Medium	South East Low
	Minor	Slight Beneficial	Neutral/Slight or Slight Beneficial	Slight Beneficial

Table 14.6 Significance of Effect for Employment during Remediation and Construction Phase

14.5.6 In determining the above significance of effects, judgement was used to determine which option was relevant in respect to the effect on the South East. It was determined that the significance of effect was Slight rather than Neutral on the basis that there would be some change to the environment rather than none.

Employment Generation: Operational Phase

14.5.7 It is estimated that the proposed development will create 50 full time jobs in the operational phase. Some of these jobs would need particular management and technical skills to ensure the efficient and safe operation of the plant. In addition an average of 100 contractors will be employed for planned shutdowns.

14.5.8 However, such skills need not be acquired in the waste industry or in a plant of this nature; suitable personnel could be recruited from industries with similar characteristics. Notwithstanding the clear need for people with appropriate skills, it seems likely that the required labour could be identified without difficulty in the immediate area and from within the town itself. This is especially so given the high proportion of manufacturing jobs in the area and Kemsley and the average distance that people already travel to work.

14.5.9 The underlying baseline conditions for Kemsley show that the proportion of people employed in Manufacturing is higher than that for the South East and nationally. Swale also has a higher than average proportion of the population employed in manufacturing. As unemployment rates for both receptors are broadly average, it is anticipated that a large proportion of the operational jobs will be met by people within them.

14.5.10 In terms of magnitude of impact, it is considered that a change of this scale would be minor beneficial.

14.5.11 The significance of the environmental effects for the socio-economic impacts of employment during the operational phase is therefore assessed as identified in Table 14.7 below:

Sensitivity of Receptor				
Magnitude of Impact		Kemsley Medium	Swale Low-Medium	South East Low
	Minor		Slight Beneficial	Slight Beneficial

Table 14.7 Significance of Effect for Employment during Operational Phase

14.5.12 In determining the above significance of effects judgement was used to determine which option was relevant in respect to the effect on Swale and the South East. It was determined that the significance of effect was Slight rather than Neutral on the basis that there would be some change to the socio-economic environment rather than none.

Other Socio-Economic Effects

14.5.13 In addition, to employment effects there are a number of other socio-economic impacts that are likely to occur as a consequence of the proposed development.

Multiplier Effect

14.5.14 It is widely recognised that an increase in employment is also likely to lead to an increase in spending in an area which in turn leads to more spending and becomes and upwards spiral. In this respect, the magnitude of effect for both the construction and operational phases is likely to be similar for Kemsley and Swale which is assessed as minor. For the South East, based on the population size and relationship with the site this is assessed as Negligible.

14.5.15 The proposed development will ensure an increase in a number of other economic activities. Bottom Ash Recovery will increase due to the technology of the development, there will be a greater need for the provision of contract maintenance and other services including the continued requirement for the transportation of produce generated from the Paper Mill.

14.5.16 Accordingly, the significance of environmental effects for the socio-economic impacts of economic multiplier effect during the operational phase is assessed as identified in Table 14.8 below:

		Sensitivity of Receptor		
Magnitude of Impact		Kemsley Medium	Swale Low-Medium	South East Low
	Minor		Slight Beneficial	Slight Beneficial

Table 14.8 Significance of Effect for Economic Multiplier

14.5.17 Again, in determining the above significance of effects, judgement was used to determine which option was relevant in respect to the effect on Swale the South East. It was determined that the significance of effect was Slight rather than Neutral on the basis that there would be some change to the socio-economic environment rather than none.

Landfill Diversion

14.5.18 A direct benefit of operations that derive energy from waste is that they divert waste up the Waste Hierarchy and away from Landfill. In the case of the proposed development this will result in the diversion of approximately 500,000 to 550,000 tonnes of residual waste per annum from landfill.

14.5.19 However, this benefit has to be considered taking into account the construction cost of the development.

14.5.20 In addition to this, the costs of landfilling the waste both in financial and environmental terms, which are widely regarded as unacceptable have to be factored into this analysis. This is predicated on the basis that gate fees will be less expensive than diversion to landfill.

14.5.21 Furthermore, the proposed development will also produce heat and power that will not only be used by the Kemsley Mill, but will be exported from the site to the Grid in the form of electricity. As well as exporting electricity, the potential to provide heat to other neighbouring facilities will be investigated. This has to be seen as a particular environmental benefit as it would negate the equivalent amount of energy being produced by non-renewable sources. Although, it is hard to quantify, this will have a net benefit in terms of socio-economic effect.

14.5.22 Overall, the socio-economic benefit associated with landfill diversion at the scale proposed is considered to be moderate for Swale, Kent and the South East as they benefit both from landfill diversion of waste arising from the population and the generation of renewable energy.

14.5.23 Accordingly, the significance of environmental effects is assessed as identified in Table 14.9 below:

		Sensitivity of Receptor		
		Kemsley Medium	Swale Medium	South East Medium
Magnitude of Impact	Minor	Slight Beneficial	Slight Beneficial	Slight Beneficial
	Moderate	Moderate Beneficial	Moderate Beneficial	Moderate Beneficial

Table 14.9 Significance of Effect for Landfill Diversion

14.5.24 In assessing the significance of effect it was determined that the sensitivity of each of the areas (Swale, Kent and the South East) would be Medium as opposed to Low given the importance of managing waste is high rather than low in socio-economic terms.

14.5.25 Further, in determining the significance of effect for the South East it was determined that the significance of effect was Moderate on the basis that waste is likely to be sourced mainly from the South East Region.

Issues Identified through Consultation

14.5.26 In addition to the above socio-economic issues which are identified through professional judgement and experience, additional issues are identified through the consultation process, as set out in the Stakeholder Engagement Report at Appendix 14.18.

14.5.27 In summary these are:

- Air Quality
- Contaminated Land
- Potential health impacts
- Potential Noise

- Potential Odour
- Proximity to Local Resident
- Transport and Access

14.5.28 However, of these additional socio-economic issues identified through consultation all have already been addressed elsewhere within the Environmental Statement.

Cumulative Impacts

14.5.29 PPS10 identifies that the cumulative impacts of other waste management facilities on the community should be taken into account. In the case of the proposed development another waste management proposal has been highlighted as being imminent, situated close to the site. Table 14.11 below shows details of this proposal.

Development	Location	Developer
Bio flame Power Plant at Ridham Dock	Land at Ridham Dock, nr Sittingbourne	Countrystyle

Table 14.11 Cumulative Impacts

14.5.30 For the purposes of this assessment it is considered that the impacts will be similar to that of the proposed development given the sensitivity of receptors and magnitude of effects.

14.5.31 Accordingly, it is considered that together the significance of the effects of the proposed development as identified above will remain unaltered as the combined scale will not alter the magnitude of impact.

Alternative Scenario: No scheme

14.5.32 If the project were not to go ahead, Kemsley Paper Mill would be reliant upon imported gas which in the future is likely to be subject to significant volatility. It is likely that this would present the potential for the paper mill to close, in the event of energy costs making the business unviable. St Regis employs 645 people directly together with a further 205 third party contractors employed full time at the site. The risks to the paper plant have implications for all those who are associated with it. The proposed Sustainable Energy Plant will aid in the securing of jobs that could otherwise be put at risk by virtue of the volatility of gas prices.

Employment Generation

14.5.33 In terms of employment generation, if the project were not to take place, this would effect the need for approximately 500 potential jobs within the construction sector and the further creation of 50 full-time jobs in the operational phase. In addition, there would not be the need for an average of 100 contractors who would have been employed for planned shutdowns.

Multiplier Effect

14.5.34 It is widely recognised that an increase in employment is also likely to lead to an increase in spending in an area which in turn leads to more spending and becomes and upwards spiral. In direct contrast, were the project not to take place this would further place at risk Kemsley Paper Mill, and the potential loss of its existing workforce.

Other Socio Economic Effects

14.5.35 Since Kemsley Paper Mill is a major UK based paper processor, the absence of the Sustainable Energy Plant would have potentially significant implications for local, regional and national wastepaper suppliers. Closure of the Mill would lead to a shift in the balance of trade, with existing exports becoming imports. Kemsley Paper Mill is also the only plasterboard liner producer in the UK.

14.6 Mitigation

14.6.1 It has been concluded, that there are likely to be no likely significant adverse effects on the environment in socio-economic terms that will require mitigation.

14.7 Residual Impacts

14.7.1 The residual socio-economic impacts related to employment generation, economic multiplier effect, and landfill diversion that are associated with the proposal are likely to range between Slight Beneficial and Moderate Beneficial significance effect.

14.7.2 The range of residual impacts and their significance upon environment are summarised in table 14.12 below:

Phase	Nature of Impact	Magnitude of Impact (Range)	Significance of Effect (Range)
Operation	Employment Generation	Minor	Slight Beneficial
Remediation/ Construction	Employment Generation	Minor	Slight Beneficial
Operation	Economic Multiplier	Minor	Slight Beneficial
Operation	Landfill Diversion	Minor to Moderate	Slight to Moderate Beneficial
Operation	Impact on Property Values	No change to Negligible	Neutral

Table 14.12 Summary of Residual Impacts

14.7.3 As well as the above impacts, due to the current reliance on imported gas and predicted volatility in its cost, the Sustainable Energy Plant will be able to provide a viable alternative energy supply to the Paper Mill securing jobs for the long term. Without the proposed development there is the potential that increased energy costs could lead to the business' loss of viability, and the subsequent loss of 800 jobs.

14.8 Conclusions

14.8.1 The socio economic impacts of the proposed development have been assessed in accordance with a methodology that identifies the likely significance of effects on the environment, in a manner that is broadly consistent with the approach of this Environmental Statement. In the absence of an appropriate assessment of socio economic changes the assessment is based on professional judgement and experience.

14.8.2 This assessment has identified the socio-economic baseline through a review of the statistical information available through sources such census data. The identification of socio economic issues relating to the development has been informed through community consultation.

14.8.3 It is concluded that the proposed development will have beneficial effects on the socio economic structures of the Catchment Area and the Region and as such, there is no requirement for any mitigation measures.

14.9 References

- Communities Local Government Indices of Multiple Deprivation 2007
- Office of National Statistics population census 2001
- Office of National Statistics migration census 2001
- Office of National Statistics general health 2001
- Office of National Statistics car ownership census 2001
- Office of National Statistics industry census 2001
- Office of National Statistics economic activity 2001
- Office of National Statistics unemployment/worklessness 2007
- Office of National Statistics qualifications census 2001
- Office of National Statistics socio economic census 2001
- Office of National Statistics mode of travel to work census 2001
- Office of National Statistics Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings Resident Analysis 2006
- Office of National Statistics Job Density Census 2001