

## 5. Consideration of Alternatives

### Introduction

- 5.1 This Chapter reports the consideration of ‘reasonable alternatives’ considered by the Applicant with respect to the Proposed Scheme.
- 5.2 PPG states that the EIA Regulations do not require the consideration of alternatives<sup>1</sup>, rather that where alternatives have been studied the ES should report these alternatives in line with Schedule 4, Paragraph 2, which states:
- ‘a description of the reasonable alternatives (for example in terms of development design, technology, location, size and scale) studied by the developer<sup>2</sup>, 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.’*
- 5.3 As such, in line with the EIA Regulations, if no reasonable alternatives have been studied the EIA does not need to report or assess them.
- 5.4 Neither the EIA Regulations, nor PPG identify a specific methodology for the study of alternatives, or the criteria to be used to inform the study of reasonable alternatives. Therefore, the methodology adopted for the purpose of the EIA is based on professional experience of similar projects and an understanding of the Proposed Scheme and its characteristics, as well as focus on delivery of a proportionate ES, in line with PPG<sup>3</sup>.
- 5.5 For the purpose of this ES, the consideration of alternatives have followed a two-step approach, set out as follows:
- Step 1: Appraisal of ‘factors’ that constitute alternatives and justification/discussion for the inclusion/exclusion from further assessment; and
  - Step 2: Reporting of factors brought forward from Step 1 and where applicable, comparison of environmental effects.
- 5.6 In addition, although not a requirements of the EIA Regulations or specified within PPG, given the design development that has been undertaken to inform the Proposed Scheme, a section on design evolution has been included to outline the ‘key’ alterations made to the Proposed Scheme for the Application.

---

<sup>1</sup> Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government, National Planning Practice Guidance [Online], Paragraph: 041, Reference ID: 4-041-20170728, available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/planning-practice-guidance>

<sup>2</sup> This Environmental Statement uses the term ‘Applicant’ rather than ‘developer’.

<sup>3</sup> Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government, National Planning Practice Guidance [Online], Paragraph: 035, Reference ID: 4-035-20170728, available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/planning-practice-guidance>

## **Step 1 Appraisal of Alternatives**

- 5.7 Step 1 has concluded that only a description of alternative designs requires further detail within this Chapter as an alternative considered by the Applicant. The 'Do nothing' scenario is considered separately in **Technical Chapters 6 – 12**, which report the Future Baseline (likely evolution of the baseline in the absence of the Proposed Scheme).
- 5.8 **Table 5.1** provides the evidence and rationale for this approach and sets out a summary of Step 1 and its outcomes.

**Table 5.1: Step 1 Appraisal of Alternatives**

Alternative	Considered at Step 2		Justification/Discussion
	Yes	No	
Alternative Sites			The home of Liverpool Football Club is at the Anfield Stadium and the Proposed Scheme delivers additional capacity at the Site in order to deliver required additional capacity.
Alternative Design			The Proposed Scheme has been the subject of detailed design considerations, which has involved modifying plans as they emerged. This is reported further following this table.
Alternative Technology			<p>The Site includes the Anfield Stadium, for which the use of alternative technologies is not considered applicable in this instance as the Anfield Road Stand delivers additional capacity in a similar manner and design solution to the remaining three stands.</p> <p>Therefore, the consideration of alternative technologies is not considered to be applicable in this instance and will not be considered at Step 2.</p>
Do Nothing Scenario			<p>The EIA assesses the likely significant effects, based on a deviation from the baseline environment, in essence the current scenario.</p> <p>Each of the <b>Technical Chapters 6 – 12</b> reports the future baseline scenario under a '<i>do nothing</i>' scenario. The discussion is associated with how the Site and study area may change assuming the Site is not developed and the existing management regime was maintained.</p> <p>Therefore, it is considered that the '<i>do nothing scenario</i>' would ultimately be the likely significant effects identified and reported in this ES not occurring (i.e. no adverse or beneficial effects).</p> <p>Accordingly, the '<i>do nothing scenario</i>' will not be considered further at Step 2 as this is sufficiently covered in each technical chapter.</p>

## Step 2 Reporting of Alternatives Studied

- 5.9 Outline planning consent for the expansion of the Anfield Road Stand was secured in 2014, though that consent has now expired. Using the consented scheme as the benchmark, various studies were carried out during 2018 and 2019 with the aim of improving the proposal whilst avoiding increasing the visual impact on the adjacent Stanley Park.
- 5.10 As indicated in **Table 5.1**, '*Alternative Design*' is the only factor considered relevant for assessment in terms of alternatives. Furthermore, given the nature of the Proposed Scheme, the assessment of alternatives focuses on the requirements of the Applicant in relation to;
- Layout/Arrangement;
  - Scale and materials; and
  - Design Evolution.
- 5.11 The Proposed Scheme has evolved through pre-application discussion with LCC Officers and in response to the results and conclusions of the technical reports submitted as part of the planning application, along with the requirements of the Applicant.
- 5.12 The aspirations of the Applicant in relation to the above points are set out in relation to layout/arrangement and scale and materials with design evolution commentary below. A summary of the scheme evolution from the 2014 consented scheme is also presented.

### Layout/Arrangement

- 5.13 As part of the brief from the Applicant the Proposed Scheme has sought to maintain the current layout of the Stadium; the existing configuration of four separate stands with individual identities.
- 5.14 From the outset, the Applicant has envisaged that the Proposed Scheme would include a well-designed public realm to meet their aspirations as a Premier League team alongside longer term plans to contribute positively to the regeneration of the surrounding area, and provide better local community connectivity with Stanley Park. Following feedback received through the consultation process, the design of the public realm evolved to include the following key elements that allow safe operation of the Stadium and demonstrate a sensitive relationship with Stanley Park:
- Re-routing of Anfield Road around the extended Anfield Road Stand and its integration within the public realm as a flush kerb solution whilst maintaining segregation of users on a non-match day;
  - Inclusion of pedestrian safety and speed reducing measures to establish a pedestrian priority scheme. The previous alignment made it too easy for vehicles to move around the Stadium, encouraging use and potential higher speeds. A Road Safety Review informed the changes to the road alignment and the current design reflects the pedestrian priority scheme;

- Creation of a match day perimeter concourse facilitating necessary crowd movement and emergency evacuation;
- Creation of new access points through the boundary with Stanley Park to aid crowd movement and remove the need for vehicles to use the more residential stretches of Anfield Road;
- Continuation of the existing aesthetics established by the Main Stand works (96 Avenue);
- Reconfiguration of the outside broadcast area;
- Implementation of semi mature trees and ground cover planting;
- Creation of a new waste storage area to enhance wider stadium operations; and
- Inclusion of street furniture, signage and wayfinding elements.

5.15 A number of configurations have been tested during the wind tunnel process, which showed a pre-existing strong wind condition to the north east corner of the Stadium that would be exacerbated by the Proposed Scheme. Landscape focussed mitigation elements were tested, including addition of proposed trees, addition of 50:50 permeable fencing to the outside broadcast area and addition of wind baffles to the outside broadcast fence line. Through adding these elements (as detailed in **Chapter 4**), the quantum of strong wind was significantly reduced.

#### **Scale and Materials**

- 5.16 The aim of the Proposed Scheme is to increase capacity at the Stadium.
- 5.17 The expanded stand aims to maintain a traditional stadium building (as is in keeping with the scale, character and nature of the wider Stadium) and has been designed such that it sits comfortably with the existing stands and take fair account of the surrounding residential area and Stanley Park context.
- 5.18 In line with the requirements of the Applicant, external circulation around the Stadium has been improved, and transport links, public realm spaces and supporting facilities provided which will encourage fans to arrive earlier on match days. Internal facilities will also be brought up to modern standards.
- 5.19 New premium seat hospitality facilities will act as prime match day and non-match day revenue generators and meet LFC's aspiration of them being at the forefront of the Premier League in terms of quality and range of offer. Suites would be linked directly to seating, and maximum advantage taken of pitch view locations.
- 5.20 The selection of hard materials has been based around the following design considerations:
- Maintaining the aesthetic established by the Main Stand works;
  - Creating a cohesive public realm that expands and enhances the quality of the existing stadium environment;

- Respecting the heritage of Stanley Park;
- Ensuring that hard material selection and arrangement meets the needs of all users;
- Respecting existing design conventions for crossings, hazard warning etc; and
- Material selection must also consider durability and longevity criteria ensuring that each material is fit for purpose, easily sourced, has manageable maintenance regimes, meets all applicable B.S and E.N safety/quality standards and considers sustainability credentials.

5.21 The design forms and selection of materials is considered to reflect the existing wider Stadium.

#### **Evolution from the 2014 Consent**

5.22 The main differences from the 2014 consent and the Proposed Scheme are summarised as follows, which predominantly relate to improving the visibility of the building:

- The back of top roof line would be 3.5m lower but project 3m further out towards Stanley Park, and the back of external envelope would project 3m further out towards Stanley Park but would be 5m lower;
- The exposed prismatic roof truss spanning the width of the stand would be omitted and replaced with an encapsulated portal frame with no exposed structure to the benefit of views;
- The Anfield Road highway would be diverted around the expanded stand rather than stopped off (an option which was discounted on accessibility grounds).