

4. Alternatives

- 4.1 A statutory requirement for inclusion in an EIA is the reporting of the consideration of alternatives in the development of a proposal. Schedule 4 of the EIA Regulations states that an EIA is required to provide:

“A description of the reasonable alternatives (for example in terms of development design, technology, location, size and scale) studied by the developer, which are relevant to the proposed project and its specific characteristics, and an indication of the main reasons for selecting the chosen option, including a comparison of the environmental effects.”

- 4.2 This chapter describes the alternatives that were studied by the Applicant for the Proposed Development and the process of design evolution in response to the EIA process.

- 4.3 Firstly, the chapter considers the ‘no development’ option, which describes the likely conditions at the Site in the absence of implementing the Proposed Development.

- 4.4 Secondly, the constraints and opportunities identified in relation to the Site have been considered and have influenced the design of the Proposed Development. The Applicant and the design team have undertaken a continuous review process to improve the design, taking into account the views of key consultees, stakeholders and the public. This design evolution process is described and the reasons for the selection of the preferred option stated.

- 4.5 No alternative sites were considered for the proposed development as the site is earmarked for development by KMBC.

- 4.6 A no development option evaluates the likely environmental conditions at the site in the absence of implementing the proposed development of Cherryfield Drive South. A brief description of the baseline scenario has been presented in Chapter 3: Site Description and further details have been provided within the technical chapters.

- 4.7 In the absence of the proposed development i.e. ‘no develop scenario’ the site would

remain as it is currently.

Environmental Review

Traffic and Transport

- 4.8 The proposed development will result in impacts upon traffic and transport network in the surrounding area to the development. It has been acknowledged that Traffic and Transport will subsequently increase during the construction and operational phases of the development resulting in increased noise, air quality nuisance (construction) and traffic congestion on the local road network. The effects will be managed using measures set out in the CEMP. In the event the development does not progress, these impacts would not occur, and there would be no change to the traffic norms of the local area. In the absence of the proposed development, these effects would not occur, and the site would remain as current.

Air quality

- 4.9 The proposed development will have a direct impact on air quality as a result of the construction phase. The effects of this will be managed using the measures set out by the CEMP. The operational phase will result in an increase of users in and around the site and the local area with subsequent effects on air quality. The site is in an accessible location with access to public transport. In the absence of the proposed development, these effects would not occur, and the site would remain as current.

Noise and Vibration

- 4.10 The proposed development will result in increased noise pollution during the construction phase. These effects of the construction phase will be managed using the measures set out in the CEMP. The development may result in further impacts following the completion of construction due to an increase in area usage, including increased traffic and general use of the development and the surrounding area. In the absence of the proposed development, these effects would not occur, and the site would remain as current.

Heritage

- 4.11 The are no designated heritage assets on site, however, there are a number of listed buildings, gardens and parks located within the local area. It is expected the construction phase will result in an indirect, temporary, adverse effect on heritage assets which is considered to be slight and not significant. These effects will be managed using the measures set out in the CEMP. The completed development would have an indirect and permanent effect on a number of assets, these are considered to be neutral and not significant. These are detailed further in Chapter 9. In the absence of the development the site would remain as current.

Ground Conditions and Contaminated Land

- 4.12 Site ground condition assessments have identified varied land throughout the site including disused petrol station tanks and a historic landfill located beyond the western border. Effects of the construction phase will be managed using the measures set out in the CEMP. In the event the development should not occur, the site would remain as current.

Climate Change

- 4.13 The proposed development will have a direct impact on climate change through emissions to climate gases during construction. The effects of this will be managed using the measures set out by the CEMP and the Applicant is committed to providing increased energy efficient homes. The development will include access to green spaces. The applicant will also provide residents with information regarding sustainable methods of transport. In the absence of the proposed development the site would remain as current, these effects would not occur.

Ecology

- 4.14 This ecological assessment has demonstrated that development of the site to housing is feasible and acceptable in accordance with ecological considerations. The proposals can be achieved with no significant adverse effects on designated sites for nature conservation, Priority Habitat and irreplaceable habitat. Mitigation and compensatory measures to protect nesting birds and to secure habitat connectivity and provisions for use by nesting birds and roosting bats at the site are feasible.

Appropriate and proportionate enhancement measures that aim to maximise the benefits for biodiversity as part of the proposals are included within the proposals. This includes the creation of opportunities for use by roosting bats to contribute to the achievement of net gains for biodiversity. In the absence of development the site would remain as current and these effects and enhancement measures would not occur.

Summary

- 4.14 In the absence of the proposals, the baseline environment is not anticipated to change and would remain as existing for the foreseeable future. In addition, under the no development scenario the socioeconomic benefits associated with the proposals would not be realised. As such, the perceived negative effects of the proposed development should be weighed against the benefits of the scheme and the need to deliver high-quality residential development providing a source of much needed affordable and greener housing and potential direct and indirect jobs fundamental to the local community and economy of Knowsley.

Key Design Drivers and Design Evolution

- 4.16 The Applicant did not consider alternative sites or fundamentally different alternative land uses for the site.

Design Evolution

- 4.17 The Applicant and the design team for the application have regularly liaised with KMBC during a series of pre-application meetings in order to ensure that the evolving designs meet the aspirations for the site's. The Applicant has also engaged with statutory consultees and the public as outlined in the Statement of Community Involvement ("SCI") which is submitted as part of the planning application.
- 4.17 The key points of design evolution which have been explored during the design process include:
- A broad mix of houses designed with emphasis on creating a strong sense of place.
 - Includes areas of open space for public recreation, amenity, landscaping and

SUDS

- 4.18 Overall, the site design and layout has evolved following feedback from key consultees, members of the public and the outcomes of technical assessments which have been undertaken as part of the ES.

Conclusions

- 4.19 The consideration of alternatives has included the evaluation of a “no development” option and alternative design options. The design of the scheme has evolved through consultation with KMBC, key stakeholders and the public and the findings of the series of studies that make up the EIA. A detailed description of the development proposals is presented in Chapter 5: The Proposed Development.