



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 July 2025

By Mr Cullum Parker BA(Hons) PGCert MA FRGS MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N2535/W/25/3363211

**Land at Willingham-by-Stow Farm, Marton Road, Stow,
Lincoln, DN21 5BH**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by FRV Powertek against the decision of West Lindsey District Council.
 - The application Ref is WL/2024/00662.
 - The development proposed is '*The installation and operation of a Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) with ancillary infrastructure and landscaping and biodiversity enhancements*'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the installation and operation of a Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) with ancillary infrastructure and landscaping and biodiversity enhancements at land at Willingham-by-Stow Farm, Marton Road, Lincoln, DN21 5BH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref WL/2024/00662, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs has been made. This will be the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. The Appellant and Local Planning Authority (LPA) sought the appeal to be heard by Hearing, as indicated on the appeal and questionnaire forms. On review of the case, the Planning Inspectorate determined that the appeal could be dealt with by the Written Representations procedure. This is because the issues raised are considered to be fairly narrow and it would be possible to fairly understand the cases of all parties from the written representations made. For the avoidance of doubt, this decision takes into account all representations made at the application and appeal stages.
4. On the 26 March 2024, the LPA issued a Screening Opinion under Regulation 6 of the *Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2017*. This confirmed the LPA's view that the proposal was not considered to be EIA development. In considering the totality of the evidence before me, including the scale and type of development proposed, I see no reason to not concur with this Screening Opinion.

Background and Main Issue

5. Put simply, planning permission for the appeal scheme was refused on the basis that the application had not demonstrated that the site was an appropriate location. This is because the Local Planning Authority consider that it is active agricultural land, the appeal site is located some considerable distance from the grid point of connection (POC) and that it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would be deliverable within a reasonable timescale.
6. The main issue in this case is whether or not the proposed development is in an appropriate location.

Policy Context

7. The relevant adopted local plan is the *Central Lincolnshire Local Plan – Adopted April 2023* (CLLP). In particular the Decision Notice sets out that the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policy S5 (Part E) and Policy S16 of the CLLP.
8. More specifically, **Policy S5**: Development in the Countryside of the CLLP, sets out, at Part E: Non-residential development in the countryside, that:
'Proposals for non-residential development will be supported provided that:
 - a) *The rural location of the enterprise is justifiable to maintain or enhance the rural economy or the location is justified by means of proximity to existing established businesses or natural features;*
 - b) *The location of the enterprise is suitable in terms of accessibility;*
 - c) *The location of the enterprise would not result in conflict with neighbouring uses; and*
 - d) *The development is of a size and scale commensurate with the proposed use and with the rural character of the location.'*
9. **Policy S16**: Wider Energy Infrastructure of the CLLP, sets out that:
'The Joint Committee is committed to supporting the transition to net zero carbon future and, in doing so, recognises and supports, in principle, the need for significant investment in new and upgraded energy infrastructure.

Where planning permission is needed from a Central Lincolnshire authority, support will be given to proposals which are necessary for, or form part of, the transition to a net zero carbon sub-region, which could include: energy storage facilities (such as battery storage or thermal storage); and upgraded or new electricity facilities (such as transmission facilities, sub-stations or other electricity infrastructure.

However, any such proposals should take all reasonable opportunities to mitigate any harm arising from such proposals, and take care to select not only appropriate locations for such facilities, but also design solutions (see Policy S53) which minimises harm arising.'
10. The Appellant and Local Planning Authority refer to the *Sturton by Stow and Stow Neighbourhood Plan* (made 2022; noted as 'adopted 2024' on page 9 of 41 of the Officer's Report to Committee). Whilst not referred to in the reason

for refusal, as it is 'made' it forms a part of the adopted development plan for the area together with the CLLP.

11. The *National Planning Policy Framework* (the Framework) and the national Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) are material considerations and provide national policy and guidance in relation to planning matters.
12. I also note that there are a number of documents which are material considerations, and inform or explain the government's and other bodies approaches to climate change, net zero and energy matters.¹

Reasons

The site and its context

13. The site lies approximately 7km to the south-east of the town of Gainsborough and approximately 13km to the north-west of the city of Lincoln. The nearest settlements are the villages of Stow (approximately 1.3km to the south-east of the site) and Willingham by Stow (approximately 1.3km to the north-east of the site). Both are categorised as 'small villages' under Policy S1 of the CLLP. The 'large village' of Marton is approximately 2.5km to the south-west.
14. The appeal site is located on the southern side, and immediately abuts Marton Road, which is a local unclassified road and connects the village of Willingham by Stow to the A156. There are a small number of isolated properties on the north side of the road, approximately 400m to the west of the site (Sandebus Farm), and the Old Nursery / Nursery House approximately 700m to the west.
15. The site currently comprises an undeveloped agricultural field most recently used for arable farming. It is enclosed by hedgerow boundaries; which I saw are typical of this part of the Lincolnshire Countryside. Beyond its boundaries, the site is surrounded by agricultural fields in all directions. Furthermore, with no planning designations otherwise and based on its appearance and character designations I find that it is within the 'open countryside' for the purpose of this appeal.
16. There is a Public Right of Way (Stow/70/1), approximately 170 metres to the east of the site. The PRoW runs in a north-south alignment, connecting Wooden Lane (track) to Marton Road.
17. The site is not subject to any site-specific policies or allocations within the CLLP. An Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV) is located approximately 1.7km to the west, on the opposite side of the Gainsborough-Lincoln railway line. However, the railway line acts as a defined boundary between land within that part of the AGLV and the appeal site, the latter of which lies some distance away from the AGLV. Given this I do not find that the proposal would have any discernible effect on the AGLV.
18. The LPA have been subject to five separate applications seeking consent for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (aka NSIPs) relating to renewable energy. All of the projects contain solar PV arrays and battery energy storage systems (BESS). These are summarised in the table below²:

¹ A list of these can be found in the Appellant's *Statement of Case, Issue V2, dated March 2025*, pages 11 to 15

² *WLDC Statement of Case*, pages 9 and 10

Project Name	Approximate Solar Capacity (MW)	Approximate battery storage capacity	Extent of Order Limits(Ha)	Consent Process Stage
Gate Burton Solar Project	531MW	500MWh	824	DCO Granted (July 2024)
Cottam Solar Project	600MW	1357MWh/2773MWh	1,451	DCO Granted (September 2024)
West Burton Solar Project	480MW	159MWh	886.4	DCO Granted (January 2025)
Tillbridge Solar	500MW	tbc	1,345	Recommendation (decision due by October 2025)
One Earth Solar Farm	740MW	tbc	1,409 (1203Ha in Nottinghamshire;	Pre-examination
			206Ha in Lincolnshire)	

19. It should be noted that the appeal site is situated immediately south and on the opposite side of the road to the Gate Burton NSIP. The route corridor, to be shared between Cottam and Tillbridge, is proposed to run immediately south of the application site. The appeal site is located between these two projects.

The Proposal

20. The proposed development comprises the construction and operation of a 400MW BESS, together with switchgear container, inverter/transformer units, a substation, a water tank, access, internal access tracks, security measures, access gates, other ancillary infrastructure and landscaping and biodiversity enhancements. The BESS compound is around 3.71 ha in area and includes³:
- 160 battery modules, (2.89 (W) x 6.58(L) x 3.2 m (H));
 - 80 MVS inverter skids (2.89 (W) x 6.58(L) x 3.2 m (H));
 - 400kV substation compound (97m (W) x 82m (L) x 13m (H (maximum)));
 - 132 kV substation compound (94m (W) x 59m (L) x (6.45m (H (maximum)));
 - 1 metering building (2.6m (W) x 12.2 m (L) x 3.2m (H));
 - 9 car parking spaces (total 14.5m (W) and 5m (L));
 - 1 welfare / office building (2.6 (W) x 12.2m (L) x 3.2 (H));
 - Stores building (2.6m (W) x 12.2m (L) x 3.2m (H));
 - Fire water storage tank;
 - CCTV cameras;
 - Locked access gate;
 - Sensor-controlled lighting;

³ Figures and bullet point list from Appellant's *Statement of Case, Issue V2, dated March 2025*, pages 7 to 8

- Temporary lay down area, approximately 2,500m² (to be used during construction period); and,
 - Perimeter palisade fencing around the Site boundary, 2.5m in height.
21. The remainder of the site is identified as wild meadow and biodiversity planting. The submitted details indicate that the BESS would be in operation for a period of 40 years.

Whether an appropriate location?

22. As set out in the cases of both main parties, the appeal site is located almost adjacent to part of the Gate Burton Energy Park NSIP as shown in the Council's *Statement of Case, Appendix A – West Lindsey Solar NSIPs overview* and *Appendix C.2 Gate Burton Indicative Layout*. In the latter Appendix it is possible to see the area of the appeal site located under plot C12 (on Marston Road). Both appendices also demonstrate that there is consented a number of other energy creating infrastructure planned for this location.
23. To support this, and the regularisation of energy supply to homes and businesses, the Appellant is seeking permission for the creation of a BESS, which would store the energy generated from these and more generally the wider electrical transmission network. At times, such as night-time, when energy is not being generated by solar panels or when excess energy is being generated and cannot be passed directly into the transmission network, the BESS would temporarily store this energy. In doing so, BESS plays an important part in ensuring that the 'lights stay on' and that the flow of energy into the grid from when it is generated to when it is needed is balanced.
24. The Council considers that the distance of around 6km to the nearest Point Of Connection (POC) means that this location is not an acceptable one for this development. Respectfully, I disagree. Firstly there is no requirement for any form of 'sequential test' or field-by-field analysis within local or national planning policy. Secondly, the distance involved here is not atypical to many other examples; including those found locally. This can be seen from Table 4.2 within the Appellant's *Statement of Case, March 2025*, where distances from BESS/Solar farm to POC range from 4.2km to 11.8km. Thirdly, the proposal in this case is directly opposite where the Gate Burton NSIP development has been consented. In this respect, the proposal has the ability to enhance this consented scheme when it is built out; in addition to the general electricity transmission network.
25. At the same time, I acknowledge that the proposal would be located within the countryside and therefore Policies S5 and S16 of the CLLP are especially relevant in this case; as indicated by the Council in its reason for refusal.
26. In this respect, the rural location of the enterprise is justifiable in this case to maintain or enhance the rural economy - as it would contribute to the regularisation of the energy generated at nearby renewable energy schemes and /or other energy within the wider electricity transmission network.
27. The location is acceptable in terms of accessibility; with access achievable off Marton Road, with improvements to the proposed / existing access able to be secured by imposition of a planning condition. Moreover, once constructed, journeys and visits to the BESS are likely to be infrequent and of an irregular nature; mainly revolving around maintenance of the BESS, associated

infrastructure and the monitoring of biodiversity areas within the site. This is unlikely to involve more than two vehicles for most visits, and would not result in any severe traffic or highways impacts.

28. In terms of conflict with neighbouring uses, these are mainly agricultural fields used for agriculture or to be used as part of the NSIP consented solar farms. In relation to the former, access to adjoining fields would still be possible and it is unlikely that a BESS would create pollution or other disturbances which would result in a conflict with fields use for agriculture. In relation to the latter, the proposal is likely to be complimentary to the operation of that use, for the aforesaid reasons. I note that there are residential buildings located to the west and east of the site (along Marton Road and in Normanby by Stow). However, in both cases these are located some distance away from the appeal site. As such, I consider that it is unlikely that the proposal would result in noise, light or other forms of pollution or nuisance which would be intolerable with these neighbouring uses.
29. In terms of scale and size, the proposal would be commensurate with the proposed use; occupying a small part of the wider field network. Moreover, as is possible to see on the submitted drawings, including Drawing numbered FRV1004/02/05 Aerial Overview, the site could be landscaped in a way to minimise the visual effects of the proposed BESS and associated infrastructure on its rural location. This could be reasonably secured by condition. I am reinforced in this view, given that the Council did not cite landscape or visual impact within its reason for refusal⁴.
30. I note the Council points to the visual impacts arising from the appeal scheme in relation to the nearby consented NSIPs raised in its Statement of Case. However, this did not form a reason for its refusal of permission as set out in its Decision Notice. Furthermore, whilst I note that a BESS would be visually at odds to some infrastructure found in rural areas; such as barns and farmhouse for example, rural areas also have many features such as electricity transmission towers, industrial sized greenhouses and polytunnels, and locally the solar farm located near to Stow Park. In this respect, the development of one small field, which can be landscaped in a way so as to minimise any visual impacts, with a BESS which by its nature would be relatively self-contained and be low in height and scale, would not result in a proliferation of utilitarian infrastructure that would be discordant with this part of the countryside.
31. With regard to Policy S16 of the CLLP, indicates that support will be given to proposals that a necessary or form part of the transition to net zero carbon. The proposal in this case forms part of the transition to net zero, by helping regularise energy supply. Indeed, the Policy specifically cites energy storage facilities (such as battery storage); which is the proposal here, in its text. The Policy also sets out that such proposals should take all reasonable opportunities to mitigate any harm arising and take care to select appropriate locations and also design solutions which minimise harm arising.
32. In this case, the harm arising in the Council's view, is articulated in the Decision Notice as; the site being in agricultural use, that it has not been demonstrated why this site has been chosen above previously developed land,

⁴ The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, Article 35 sets out at (1)(b): 'where planning permission is refused, the notice must state clearly and precisely their full reasons for the refusal, specifying all policies and proposals in the development plan which are relevant to the decision'

and insufficient detail has been provided to demonstrate that the project would be deliverable within a reasonable timescale. In terms of the agricultural use of the land, the site is graded as 3b agricultural land, which means it does not fall within the definition of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land (BMVAL). In other words, it is logical to consider it as 'poorer quality' agricultural land, which the Framework sets out in footnote 65 should be preferred to those of a 'higher quality'.

33. I have considered the preference of previously developed land above, but I find no planning policy basis which requires an Appellant to undertake a potentially limitless sequential assessment of every single alternate site that should be used in preference to the appeal site. Similarly, with regard to deliverability within a timescale I have not been directed to any specific policy where this is a matter that should be specifically considered. Moreover, it is for the developer of the site to satisfy themselves that they are able develop the site as set out in their application for which they are seeking planning permission. I have not been provided with any substantive evidence that the implementation of the permission sought in this case would not be able to be built out as sought within the five year period suggested.
34. Accordingly, I find that, in planning policy terms, the proposal would be located within an appropriate location. As such, it would accord with Policies S5 and S16 of the CLLP, the aims of which I have stated above.

Biodiversity

35. The appeal scheme would provide a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) comprising 77.76% in habitat units, 17.98% for hedgerows and 10.47% for watercourses⁵. This would be in excess of the statutory minimum 10% BNG required for most developments in England. A condition would be necessary to safeguard biodiversity during construction (Condition 4) and to secure biodiversity net gain (Conditions 15 and 16).
36. Subject to these conditions the proposal would comply with Policies S60, S61 and S66 of the CLLP, which, amongst other aims, deal with the protection of biodiversity, require all developments deliver at least a 10% measurable net gain, and that existing trees, woodland and hedgerows should be maintained, improved and expanded, with adequate management and maintenance.
37. Furthermore a completed, that is signed and dated 5 August 2025, legal agreement under s106 TCPA has been submitted. This is agreed between the local planning authority and two other parties. It secures a sum of £6,637 in relation to a Biodiversity Net Gain Monitoring Contribution. In doing so, it would seek to ensure that the aims of Policies S60, S61 and S66 of the CLLP are achieved.
38. Moreover, I find that the obligation sought by the Council and secured by the s106 agreement in this case would meet the requirements of Paragraph 58 of the Framework and Regulation 122(2) of the *Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010*, as amended, in that it is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms (by ensuring that the BNG sought by planning policy is achieved), is directly related to the development (being specific to the application scheme), and is fairly and reasonably related in

⁵ Appellant's *Statement of Case - March 2025*, Page 21, Paragraph 4.3.24

scale and kind to the development (by being directly related to the scheme and its parameters).

Other Matters

39. I note a number of concerns have been raised by neighbouring occupiers and from local parish councils; Willingham by Stow Parish Council and Stow Parish Council. Some of these are considered above in the main issues section; and therefore I do not repeat them here. Nonetheless, other concerns have also been raised and I consider a number of them here, before considering whether planning conditions could be imposed in order to mitigate concerns raised.
40. I note the concerns raised that the proposal would only provide two hours of battery storage, and therefore it is considered by some objectors that planning permission should not be granted. However, as detailed and considered above, BESS is an important part of the overall regularisation of the electricity network and even a (relatively) small contribution is important. I also note the points raised in terms of the nearby consented NSIP schemes having elements of BESS serving them. However, this does not mean that the contribution to the wider electricity transmission network from the appeal scheme should be ignored. This matter does not provide justification for the dismissal of the appeal proposal.
41. Concerns have been raised in terms of archaeology that may exist under the field. However, this could be reasonably secured by planning condition. As such, it does not provide justification for dismissal of the appeal scheme.
42. With regard to concerns over traffic, I note these. However, no objections have been raised by Lincolnshire County Council, as the local highways authority, in this case; subject to the imposition of planning conditions. Whilst I accept that there will be periods of activities in developing the appeal site, these are likely to be time limited and constrained to a few months. This activity could be controlled by condition to minimise disruption to other highway users. Moreover, the long term maintenance of the BESS and the biodiversity enhancements (including the BNG) are unlikely to necessitate anything more than a few visits to the site by a few people over the year. In such cases, there is unlikely to be any significant traffic movements after the construction period. Accordingly, I do not find that this provides justification for the dismissal of the appeal scheme in this case.
43. With regard to noise and impacts on visual amenity concerns raised, I note that the site is located over 300 metres from the nearest residential dwelling, and over 1km from the settlements of Normanby by Stow and Stow⁶. Given these distances, and the intervening vegetation and other features, I do not consider that the proposal would result in unacceptable harm in this respect. Furthermore, it is possible to use a planning condition to require details of acoustic fences proposed to ensure that these are used as shown on the submitted drawings, to minimise the potential impacts from noise the proposal may result in.
44. With regard to concerns over fire risk from the proposed battery element of the scheme, these are noted. However, it is possible to use suitably worded planning conditions to require the submission and approval of a Battery Safety

⁶ Appellant's *Statement of Case - March 2025*, Page 19, Paragraph 4.3.12

Management Plan. Such a condition would be within broad conformity with the Fire Chiefs Councils guidance on such matters. Whilst there is an ever-present risk of fire from the proposal - as indeed there is from most developments - the securing of a Battery Safety Management Plan by condition would reduce and manage such risks. As such, I do not consider that this provides a reason for dismissing the appeal.

45. In terms of the potential for flood risk, I note that Lincolnshire County Council, as Local Lead Flood Authority, raised no objections on this matter. In the absence of substantive evidence that this would result in unacceptable harm, I see no reason to disagree with that position.
46. I therefore find, whether individually or in combination, that the matters above and all others matters raised by interested parties, do not provide justification for the dismissal of the appeal scheme in this case.

Conditions

47. The Council's Officer Report to committee and the draft Statement of Common Ground, both suggest a list of 19 conditions which are considered should be imposed if planning permission were granted. I have considered these in light of Paragraph 57 of the Framework, and also with regard to the national Planning Practice Guidance and the use of Planning conditions.
48. Conditions requiring the development to begin within five years of the grant of permission (1), and to be in accordance with the submitted drawings (13) are reasonable and necessary to provide certainty.
49. A condition requiring approval of details of the cabling route, which is integral to the proposed scheme, is necessary as the specific route from the proposal to the substation may involve an assessment of highway safety, ecology and/or heritage (2).
50. A condition requiring the submission and approval of a Battery Safety Management Plan is reasonable and necessary in order to reduce the risks to public safety and minimise any environmental impacts from the rare but still present risk of fire(s) occurring at the appeal site (3).
51. For similar reasons, in order to minimise the interests of nature conservation and the local environment, a conditions seeking the submission and approval of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (which includes habitat protection zones) (4) and a Construction Management and Method Statement (5) are necessary and reasonable.
52. Conditions relating to the submission and agreement of a scheme for passing places (6) and a detailed highway condition survey (7) to ensure safe and adequate means of access to and from the site and that the road surface is not unnecessarily degraded from vehicles associated with the proposal scheme, are reasonable and directly related to the development.
53. The four conditions suggested relating to details of an Archaeological mitigation strategy, a Written Scheme of Investigation, notice of the intent to start archaeological investigation, and associated findings reports being submitted, are necessary and directly related to the proposal in this case (8, 9, 10, 11, 12). Their imposition will ensure that any archaeological finds present on the appeal site can be recorded and added to the local historical

records. This would ensure that the development complies with Policy S57 of the CLLP which seeks such aims.

54. A condition relating to a scheme for the disposal of surface flood water is necessary to ensure that adequate drainage facilities are provided and to reduce the risk of flooding and/or pollution of the local water environment, as sought by Policy S21 of the CLLP (14).
55. A condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal is necessary and reasonable in order to protect and enhance the biodiversity value of the site, in accordance with Policy S66 of the CLLP (15). Similarly, a condition requiring the delivery of the BNG onsite via a Biodiversity Gain Plan and in accordance with the Statutory Biodiversity Metric received by the Council on 09/01/2025 and prepared by Tyler Grange (16509_R01e_9th January_DP) is necessary to provide clarity and ensure that the development delivers the biodiversity on site in accordance with the Framework, Schedule 7A of the *Town and Country Planning Act 1990*, and local plan Policies S5, S16 and S61 of the CLLP (16).
56. A condition requiring the submission of details for approval of any other battery design other than those shown on the submitted drawings is reasonable and necessary (17). This is because it provides a pragmatic way to ensure that the permission is flexible so that the developer can use the most beneficial battery design at the point of implementation, whilst also ensuring that the Local Planning Authority is able to consider what impacts, if any, require further consideration at that stage. I have, however, reworded it so that it requires a revised Battery Safety Management Plan to be submitted and approved, if one has not already been approved under Condition 3, so that it can consider any implications from the alternate battery design sought.
57. A condition requiring the submission and approval of any acoustic fencing (as recommended in the submitted noise survey) is necessary and reasonable in order to reduce any noise impacts on local residents, and as sought by Policy S53 of the CLLP (18).
58. Lastly, conditions in relation to the removal of the BESS and associated infrastructure on or before 41 years from the date of operation (19), and details and approval of a decommissioning and restoration scheme (20) are reasonable to provide certainty and to ensure that the proposal accords with Policies S5, S16 and S53 of the CLLP.
59. However, I also consider that it is reasonable to impose a further condition, numbered 21, requiring the developer of the site to notify the Local Planning Authority within three months of the start of electricity being imported, exported or transported through the site (21). This would be the 'date of operation' and provide clarity to all parties of when the 41 years period starts.

Conclusion

60. The proposed development would accord with the adopted development plan for the area, and there are no material considerations indicating a decision otherwise. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

C Parker

INSPECTOR

Conditions Schedule: 3363211

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of Five years from the date of this permission.
2. No site preparation (including site clearance) or any development hereby approved shall take place until the details of the proposed cabling route to connect the Battery Energy Storage System to the Cottam Substation have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The cabling route shall be completed in accordance with the approved scheme.
3. No development shall take place until a detailed Fire Safety and Battery Management Plan (FSBMP) based on the principles within the Outline Battery Safety Plan that has been submitted with the application have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority; in consultation with the local fire and rescue service as appropriate. The FSBMP must prescribe measures to facilitate safety during the construction and operation of the battery storage system. The FSBMP shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.
4. No development shall take place until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The CEMP protection plan shall include the following;

- A plan showing habitat protection zones;
- Details of development and construction method measures to be taken to minimise the impact of any works on habitats/ wildlife;
- Details of any precautionary method statements for protected species;
- Details of a sensitive lighting strategy.

The development shall only proceed in accordance with the approved CEMP.

5. No development shall take place until a Construction Management and Method Statement (CMMS) has first been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CMMS shall indicate measures to mitigate the adverse impacts of vehicle activity and the means to manage the drainage of the site during the construction stage of the permitted development. It shall include:
 - the phasing of the development to include access construction;
 - the on-site parking of all vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
 - the on-site loading and unloading of all plant and materials;
 - the on-site storage of all plant and materials used in constructing the development;
 - wheel washing facilities;
 - the routes of construction traffic to and from the site including any off-site routes for the disposal of excavated material; and,

- strategy stating how surface water run off on and from the development will be managed during construction and protection measures for any sustainable drainage features. This should include drawing(s) showing how the drainage systems (temporary or permanent) connect to an outfall (temporary or permanent) during construction.

The development shall only proceed in accordance with the approved CMMS.

6. No development shall take place before a scheme has been agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority for the construction of three passing places along Marton Road, between the development site and the junction of the A156, together with arrangements for the disposal of surface water run-off from the highway. The agreed works shall be fully implemented before any of the works associated with the development has commenced, or in accordance with a phasing arrangement to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
7. Prior to construction a detailed highway condition survey (dilapidation survey) of Willingham Road/Marton Road has been carried out with the Local Highway Authority and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The condition of the road shall be documented and agreed, and any damage, shown to be over and above normal wear and tear, shall be repaired or made good by the developer of the site in accordance with the approved highway condition survey.
8. No development shall take place other than in accordance with an Archaeological Mitigation Strategy for the protection of archaeological remains in sensitive areas, submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the start of development. Where development will result in an archaeological impact to one of the identified areas of archaeological interest, a Written Scheme of Archaeological Investigation must be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. This scheme shall include the following:
 - i. An assessment of significance and proposed mitigation strategy (i.e. preservation by record, preservation in situ or a mix of these elements).
 - ii. A methodology and timetable of site investigation and recording;
 - iii. Provision for site analysis;
 - iv. Provision for publication and dissemination of analysis and records;
 - v. Provision for archive deposition; and
 - vi. Nomination of a competent person/organisation to undertake the work
9. The Local Planning Authority shall be notified in writing of the intention to commence the archaeological investigations in accordance with the approved written scheme referred to in condition 8 at least 14 days before the said commencement.
10. The archaeological site work and any other development works shall be undertaken only in full accordance with the written scheme required by condition 8.
11. Following the archaeological site work referred to in condition 10, a written report of the findings of the work shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, within a timescale to be agreed in consultation with the Lincolnshire County Council Historic Environment Officer (or equivalent

or replacement historic records service) and as set out in the approved Written Scheme of Investigation.

12. The report referred to in condition 11 and any artefactual evidence recovered from the site shall be deposited within a timescale as set out in the approved Written Scheme of Investigation, and in accordance with a methodology and location agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with the Lincolnshire County Council Historic Environment Officer (or equivalent or replacement historic records service).
13. With the exception of the detailed matters referred to by the conditions of this consent, the development hereby approved must be carried out in accordance with the following proposed drawings:

- Site Location Plan FRV1004/02/02 Rev 0;
- Proposed Block Plan FRV1004/02/04 Rev 0;
- Battery Unit Details FRV1004/02/07 Rev 0;
- MVS Skid Details FRV1004/02/08 Rev 0;
- Substation Metering Building Details FRV1004/02/09 Rev 0;
- Stores Building Details FRV1004/02/10 Rev 0;
- Welfare and Office Building Details FRV1004/02/11 Rev 0;
- 132Kv Substation Details FRV1004/02/12 Rev 0;
- 400kV Substation Details FRV1004/02/13 Rev 0;
- CCTV Details FRV1004/02/14 Rev 0;
- Paladin fencing details FRV1004/02/15 Rev 0;
- Palisade fencing details FRV1004/02/16 Rev 0;
- Fire Water Tank Details FRV1004/02/17 Rev 0;
- Temporary Construction Compound FRV1004/02/18 Rev 0;
- Site Access FRV1004/02/19 Rev 0;
- Site Access Construction Details FRV1004/02/20 Rev 0;
- Contextual Sections FRV1004/02/06 Rev 0;
- General Arrangement Plan UG_2392_LAN_GA_DRW_01 Rev P07;
- Landscape Strategy Plan UG_2393_LAN_GA_DRW_01 P03.

The works must be carried out in accordance with the details and materials shown on the approved plans and in any other approved documents forming part of the application.

14. No development above ground level must take place until a detailed scheme for the disposal of surface water from the site based on the principles contained within the submitted Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy by RMA Environmental dated May 2024 have been submitted to and approved in writing

by the Local Planning Authority. No operation of the development must take place until the approved scheme has been fully completed.

15. The development hereby permitted shall proceed in accordance with the ecology mitigation measures as detailed within the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal by Tyler Grange dated Jan 2025.
16. The Biodiversity Gain Plan shall be prepared in accordance with the Statutory Biodiversity Metric received on 09/01/2025 and prepared by Tyler Grange (16509_R01e_9th January 2025_DP).
17. Notwithstanding the battery container plans referred to in Condition 13 of this consent, if an alternative battery design is to be installed on site, prior to their installation, full details, including scaled plans shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall proceed in accordance with the approved plans unless otherwise agreed in writing.

Furthermore, notwithstanding condition 3 of this permission, if an alternative battery design is submitted and approved, a revised detailed Fire Safety and Battery Management Plan (revised FSBMP), based on the principles within the Outline Battery Safety Plan, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The revised FSBMP must prescribe measures to facilitate safety during the construction and operation of the battery storage system in relation to the alternate battery design approved. The revised FSBMP shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

18. The development hereby approved shall not be brought into operation until details/specifications of the acoustic fencing, including its positioning in relation to site boundaries (as recommended in the Noise Survey) has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

If an alternative battery type is approved under condition 17, then details of the decibel levels of the proposed battery type shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

19. The Battery Energy Storage System and all associated infrastructure must be removed from the site and the site must be restored to its former state prior to the commencement of development, on or before 41 years from the first date of operation (except for the biodiversity gain and ecological measures implemented, which shall be retained as approved by the Local Planning Authority within the restoration scheme of condition 20).
20. No later than 6 months prior to the date of 40 years from the first date of operation a decommissioning and restoration scheme shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. The decommissioning scheme shall include a programme and a scheme of works for the removal and restoration of the site; and also detail which aspects of landscaping, biodiversity and/or ecological measures at the site will be retained.

The decommissioning of the site shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details. All buildings, structures and associated infrastructure shall be removed, and the land restored, in accordance with the approved details of the decommissioning scheme within 12 months following the period of 40 years from the first date of operation.

21. Within three months of the start of electricity being stored, or imported, or exported, and/or transported through or on the site's Battery Energy Storage Systems, for which permission has been granted here, confirmation of the date that this activity started on site (otherwise known as the first date of operation) shall be submitted to and confirmed by the Local Planning Authority in writing.

***** END OF CONDITIONS *****