

## 4 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

### 4.1 INTRODUCTION

4.1.1 This chapter of the ES identifies the main alternatives to the Proposed Development that have been considered by the Applicant and the reasons why these were rejected.

### 4.2 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

4.2.1 The EIA Regulations (Schedule 4, Part I (2)) require for inclusion in an ES:

***"A description of the reasonable alternatives studied by the developer"***

4.2.2 The main alternatives to the Proposed Development which the Applicant has considered include:

- Site Selection;
- The 'No Development' Alternative; and
- Alternative Design Approaches.

#### **Site Selection**

4.2.3 It is understood that a thorough site analysis and evaluation process was carried out as part of the identification of the site as an allocation 'Site MU1 Land south of Barugh Green Road' in the Barnsley Local Plan (2019). On the basis that the site comprised part of the allocation, it was therefore considered that it formed an appropriate site for the proposed development and other locations were not considered.

#### **The 'No Development' Alternative**

4.2.4 The 'No Development' Alternative refers to the option of leaving the Application Site in its current use and physical state.

4.2.5 Without the Proposed Development, the land would not be able to contribute to the high need to provide employment opportunities or homes for people in the local area, nor would it be able to help deliver the link road, bringing highways benefits to the area.

4.2.6 In addition, the site is not currently publicly accessible, beyond the public rights of way that run within the site. The 'No Development' Alternative would not allow for any new public access to come forward, nor any benefits to the natural environment of the site to through the development of new areas of accessible green space. By contrast, the proposed development would allow for new access to the site and environmental benefits to be carried out alongside delivery of the link road and much needed new employment opportunities and homes.

#### **Alternative Design Approaches**

4.2.7 The Design and Access Statement (DAS) that accompanies the planning application describes in detail the design evolution and concepts. In summary, the design evolved as it took account of the technical and environmental assessment work which was undertaken.

4.2.8 The Masterplan Framework (adopted December 2019) outlined the design evolution process for future proposals. Using this as a starting point, the focus during

design development was to understand the new technical information and its impact on the scheme, whilst retaining the principles and placemaking strategy set out in the Masterplan Framework.

4.2.9 Since the Masterplan Framework was adopted, the key technical update which has resulted in further iteration to the design proposals have been the further information which has become available on the proposed cut and fill levels.

4.2.10 This information was factored into a series of Technical Workshops across the design team to ensure that the proposals retain the integrity of the vision set out in Masterplan Framework.

4.2.11 This process has ensured that what is proposed can be delivered through workable parcels of land for building, roads, paths, infrastructure etc. Some modifications have been made as a consequence of the new information, but the strategy, principles and vision set out in the framework are retained within the developed proposal.

4.2.12 One example of this concerns the refiguration of the size and shape of the drainage ponds along the eastern boundary of the site to reflect the revised site levels.

4.2.13 Similarly, modifications to the link road levels and roundabouts have resulted in a slight reconfiguration of the access to the proposed residential areas, to ensure secondary roads can connect off the roundabouts safely.