



Appeal Decision

Unaccompanied Site visit made on 13 October 2025

by Helen Heward BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/W/25/3363208

Land at Moat Lane, Wickersley, Thurcroft, Rotherham, S66 1DZ

- 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 Max Design Consultancy Ltd against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application reference is RB2024/0063.
 - The development proposed is a Battery Storage Facility.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a proposed Battery Storage Facility at Land at Moat Lane, Wickersley, Rotherham, S66 1DZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref RB2024/0063, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions in the schedule at the end of this decision.

Preliminary Matters

Clarifications

2. The Appellant was requested to clarify information in a Highways Technical Note by Dart Engineers Ltd, the status of drawing 23099-DR-C-0100-3 and the wording of a planning condition to secure off-site highway works. On 6 November the Appellant provided the required clarifications.

Similar proposals nearby

3. Another planning appeal, APP/P4155/W/25/3365059 proposes a Battery Energy Storage Facility (BESS) on another site at Moat Lane, Wickersley. It is in close proximity to the site for the Max Design Consultancy Ltd proposal which I am addressing in this decision. I deal with APP/P4155/W/25/3365059 in a separate decision letter. In reaching my conclusions on this appeal I have been mindful of the proposals in APP/P4155/W/25/3365059 but I have assessed each proposal on their own merits.

Revised National Planning Policy Framework and withdrawal of a Reason for Refusal in respect of Green Belt policy

4. The Decision Notice included two Reasons for Refusal. The first related to inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The Council determined the application in November 2024. The National Planning Policy Framework

(Framework) was revised in December 2024. It sets out the Government's new policy in respect of the Green Belt. Further guidance was provided on the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) website in February 2025.

5. In the Appellant's Statement of Case, March 2025, the Appellant argued that the appeal site falls within Grey Belt and that the proposed battery storage facility definition no longer represents inappropriate Green Belt development having regard to advice in the Framework.
6. At a Planning Board meeting, 12 June 2025, the Council considered the change in circumstances. A Report provided a detailed analysis of the proposal in relation to the new policy advice and concluded that the proposal was on grey belt land and would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The Board resolved to withdraw the first reason for refusal.

Main Issue

7. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of construction traffic on highway safety with particular regard to pedestrians on Green Lane

Reasons

8. The second Reason for Refusal states that *"Green Lane by virtue of its restricted width and lacking in separate pedestrian facilities is inadequate to cater for the proposed construction traffic associated with the battery storage facility. As such the proposal would be detrimental to both highway and pedestrian safety"*.
9. At appeal the Council's Highway Development Manager states that the project is expected to take 18 months in total to construct, and months 11 and 12 of the construction period would have the highest number of daily two-way HGV movements, slightly more than one per hour. They advise that Green Lane is subject to the national speed limit, speed survey data shows that the combined two-way 85%ile speed on Green Lane is 24.4mph, and there are no recorded injury collisions on Green Lane within the last available 5-year period.
10. The Council's Highway Development Manager points out that Green Lane from its junction with the B6060 Morthen Road is approximately 4.8m in width, narrowing to 2.9m in width, at a point north of the property named Two Acres. The road then maintains a constant width of 2.9m over a length of 127m, until it's junction with Moat Lane at which point construction traffic will turn onto the unadopted section of Moat Lane. A drainage ditch runs alongside the east side of Green Lane along it's narrowest part, and on the west side of Green Lane, is a small verge and adjacent field hedgerow. There are no vehicle passing points along this section of Green Lane and the limited width of the existing verge and presence of a ditch does not provide a suitable step off for pedestrians.
11. Even so, the Council's Highway Development Manager raised no objection to the planning application being approved, subject to conditions and a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) to manage and mitigate impacts. And there is no evidence from any other suitably accredited highway expert to say that this proposal would not be able to provide safe and suitable access for all users.
12. Rather, the Council states that its argument is that the physical constraints represent a significant, legitimate planning concern, particularly where HGVs share space with pedestrians or other road users.

13. A Highways Technical Note prepared by Dart Engineers for the Appellant argues that Green Lane is noted to have no pedestrian facilities in its existing state and as such is not a pedestrian usable route clearly as only has carriageway. Therefore, they argue, citing the lack of pedestrian segregation to a route that is not intended for pedestrian use we would consider not to be a viable reason for refusal.
14. Objectors argue that the proposal poses a serious risk to both motorists (cars and delivery vans) and pedestrians, many of whom use Green Lane for walking, horse riding, walking their dogs, cycling, and accessing local properties. They submit that increased traffic during the construction phase would significantly heighten the likelihood of accidents or near-misses, especially given the lack of visibility and absence of safe passing points. Objectors argue that the risk of conflict between vehicles and pedestrians - particularly vulnerable users such as children, elderly residents, dog walkers; cyclists and horse riders is unacceptably high.
15. The Local Ward Councillor points out that on the first part of Green Lane six houses have access on Green Lane, there are two small industrial units, three farmers field entrances, access to another BESS site, an entrance to a farm workshop and access to Thurcroft National grid site. The Councillor states that after the road narrows to 2.9m there are ditches and hedgerows on both sides, entrances to two houses, an animal rescue shelter and then further along their training area.
16. On my visit I was able to see vehicles approaching. The few vehicles I saw appeared to be travelling relatively slowly, and the section of road with which the Council is most concerned is quite short. I saw a cyclist, and a couple of pedestrians, and observed people and vehicles moving between the animal rescue centre and the dog exercise field nearby.
17. A Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) would cover a number of traffic management measures during the construction period. Amongst other things, it could cover scheduling of deliveries to/from the site to mitigate against vehicles arriving simultaneously or other conflicting movements. It would include requirements for a banksman to be available and on-site at all times during the construction period to coordinate the movement of vehicles.
18. Amongst other things, the banksman could direct large vehicles in and out of the site, be responsible for ensuring that two large vehicles do not attempt to use Moat Lane/Green Lane at the same time, and for ensuring that pedestrians/cyclists are adequately protected within the vicinity of the junction with Moat Lane.
19. At the time of the application the Council's Highway Development Manager noted that construction traffic would approach and leave the site via Green Lane to the south. They also noted that large HGVs would reverse along the unadopted part of Moat Lane, the surface of which is to be improved. The Council's Highway Development Manager was satisfied that a submitted tracking exercise had demonstrated that such vehicles can negotiate this route.
20. Roughly doubling the construction traffic to allow for the possibility of the proposal subject of appeal APP/P4155/W/25/3365059 would not amount to a significant number of additional large vehicles on this section of road. The CTMP could require details for how traffic management for this scheme and that proposed by APP/P4155/W/25/3365059 could be coordinated to manage the construction traffic for both schemes simultaneously. It is a public highway, other vehicles cannot be

controlled, and the advice of the Highways Development Manager is that Green Lane is lightly trafficked.

21. Highway works to provide for road widening as part of the development could include widening for vehicle over runs on Moat Lane/Green Lane and for the creation of pedestrian refuge facilities along the 127m stretch of Green Lane with which the Council is concerned. Together with the CTMP the works would be a reasonable requirement as part of the package of measures to manage construction traffic and pedestrian interactions.
22. Although local residents refer to Moat Lane being heavily used by walkers and cyclists, it is not intended that construction traffic would use Moat Lane west of the junction with Green Lane. And I note that there are no public rights of way on Moat Lane east of the Green Lane junction. There is no evidence to say that the emergency services have concerns about being able to access the site either.
23. Objectors argue that traffic turning from Morthen Road into Green Lane will significantly increase the probability of accidents or near-misses as well as traffic turning from Green Lane onto Morthen Road (60 mph). However, this does not form part of the Council's reason for refusal, and I find no evidence from a suitably qualified or accredited highway specialist in this regard.
24. I conclude that with the CTMP and planning conditions to require off-site highway works as described, construction traffic from the proposed development would not have an unacceptable impact on the safe use of Green Lane and would not be detrimental to highway and pedestrian safety.
25. The proposal would comply with requirements of the Framework that development should provide safe and suitable access for all users (paragraph 115) and advice that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios (paragraph 116).

Other Matters

26. Local residents suggest there are less harmful locations that are better related to the existing substation, locations which do not appear to have been investigated by Max Design Consultancy Ltd. There is an existing BESS located off Green Lane. Wickersley Parish Council argue that existing capacity should be utilised at less intrusive sites rather than on open land.
27. However, as the proposed development is no longer considered to represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt, there is no requirement for the Appellant to demonstrate Very Special Circumstances.
28. The Development Plan does not require an alternative sites assessment and Framework Paragraph 168 a) includes that when determining planning applications for all forms of renewable and low carbon energy developments and their associated infrastructure, local planning authorities should not require applicants to demonstrate the overall need for renewable or low carbon energy and give significant weight to the benefits associated with renewable and low carbon energy generation and the proposal's contribution to a net zero future.

29. Objectors are concerned that cumulative impact of developments would have a detrimental effect on the quality of life for residents, visitors (e.g. dog walkers; cyclists; joggers; horse riders) and Green Lane's animal rescue centre. However, the Council found the proposal to be acceptable in terms of living conditions and amenity considerations, subject to the imposition of planning conditions.
30. Whilst the site is in the countryside it is close to established electricity infrastructure. In this way the proposal is not out of character. A scheme of landscaping would reduce visibility and landscape impacts over time. The BESS proposed by APP/P4155/W/25/3365059 is on a site close by. The Council did not argue, and I am not persuaded, that the two schemes would result in greater cumulative impacts.
31. The proposal would not significantly harm the visual amenity of occupiers of nearby properties nor the enjoyment of the countryside by local residents and visitors. I find no conflict with Policy CS30 of the Rotherham Core Strategy, which requires the need to consider the landscape's capacity to accommodate renewable energy developments and the cumulative visual impact.
32. Objectors argue that the site is used for food production, that the UK population is growing and land for arable production needs to be maintained. The appeal site is relatively small, and the proposals would not result in a significant development of agricultural land. The proposal would not materially impact upon the availability of agricultural land for food production.
33. External lighting would be subject to a planning condition requiring detail to be approved by the Local Planning Authority.
34. Local residents are disappointed that the Appellant did not hold any preapplication consultation events and feel they had too little time to comment. Whilst I understand feelings of disappointment and disengagement, there is no evidence to say that the statutory requirements for the appeal have not been followed.
35. The Appellant refers to an appeal decision on a smaller part of the site which was dismissed in November 2018 APP/P4415/W/18/3206823. In that case the Inspector did not think the proposal would present a significant highway danger. However, that proposal was for only 20 battery units and I have assessed the appeal before me on its own merits.

Benefits

36. Paragraph 161 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) confirms that the planning system should support the transition to net zero by 2050 and take full account of all climate impacts including overheating, water scarcity, storm and flood risks and coastal change. It should help to shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimise vulnerability and improve resilience; encourage the reuse of existing resources, including the conversion of existing buildings and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure.
37. Paragraph 168 of the Framework states that significant weight should be given to the benefits associated with renewable and low carbon energy generation and the proposal's contribution to a net zero future. Although this proposal does not

comprise infrastructure for energy generation, it very much supports that generation though the storage of energy.

38. The PPG advises that electricity storage can enable us to use energy more flexibly and de-carbonise our energy system cost-effectively – for example, by helping to balance the system at lower cost, maximising the usable output from intermittent low carbon generation (e.g. solar and wind), and deferring or avoiding the need for costly network upgrades and new generation capacity.
39. Battery storage is an essential part of the system services that will enable the National Grid to handle the change in power flows arising from the growth in power from renewable energy sources and the decommissioning of coal and gas power stations.

Conditions

40. The parties submitted an agreed condition list. I have reviewed and amended the conditions where necessary in the light of advice in the Framework and PPG.
41. A standard time limit condition is required, so too a condition requiring all development to be removed and the site restored as the application proposes temporary development, albeit for 35 years. A condition specifying the plans is in reasonably necessary in the interests of certainty and clarity.
42. Particularly important is the need for conditions to require a CTMP to ensure that the development would be operated as described by the Appellant and in the interest of the safety of pedestrians and other road users.
43. The Appellant confirmed in writing that they would have no objection to a requirement for highway works to provide for road widening as part of the development to include pedestrian refuge facilities on Green Lane, but noted that some of the land maybe outside of the Appellant's control and consent for the works would be required from the Highway Authority.
44. To secure provision would require a negatively worded "Grampian" planning condition that would prohibit development from taking place until the approved works had been provided. Grampian conditions derive from *Grampian Regional Council v Aberdeen CC* [1983] P&CR 633, which concerned whether permission should be refused on highway safety grounds or granted subject to a negatively worded condition that would prohibit development from taking place until a road had been closed. The land lay outside of the applicant's control and consent for the works would be required from the highways' authority. It was held that the works would be necessary for the development to proceed and whether any condition is reasonable depends on the circumstances. It was also held that negatively worded conditions are enforceable and imposing such a condition with respect to land outside of the applicant's control would not create unacceptable uncertainty, since there is nothing to compel any applicant to implement a permission in any event.
45. I am satisfied that a planning condition to require highway improvements and provision of pedestrian refuge facilities would be reasonable and necessary.
46. Objectors raise concerns about the safe deployment and operation of battery storage facilities and suggest that the proposal poses a fire risk to Moat Wood. The PPG encourages engagement with local fire and rescue services before applications are submitted. Without evidence of that, planning conditions requiring

detailed plans prior to the commencement of development are reasonable and necessary. Planning conditions requiring submission and approval of a Battery Safety Management Plan, an Emergency Response Plan and a Risk Management Plan are all reasonable and necessary to mitigate the risks of incidents and provide appropriate procedures should an event occur.

47. The Parish Council is concerned about the noise impact on nearby residential properties during the extended construction period. There is no objection from Environmental Health. It would be reasonable and necessary to impose a condition to require a noise validation survey to be undertaken within three months of the development being commissioned to enable a review of compliance with the noise limits set out in other planning conditions. The conditions proposed would provide limits for noise from batteries, transformers and combined noise emissions of all items of fixed or mobile plant and equipment.
48. Various conditions relating to tree protection and landscaping are both normal and necessary to ensure a satisfactory development and to protect visual amenity. A number of conditions are also required to control noise in the public interest. A condition to require details of external lighting is also reasonable to protect ecology and visual amenity interests.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

49. The Council's concerns regarding highway and pedestrian safety on Green Lane have not been sustained. Therefore, and having taken all other matters into consideration, the appeal is allowed subject to conditions.

Helen Heward
INSPECTOR

Condition schedule (23 in total)

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be commenced before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
- 2 The permission shall be valid for 35 years.
- Within 3 months of the batteries ceasing to be used, or the expiry of 34 years after the date of first energisation of the site, whichever is the sooner, a scheme for site restoration, including removal of all on-site built infrastructure, including a decommissioning traffic management plan shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority.
- Within 12 months of the batteries ceasing to be used, or the expiry of 35 years after the date of first energisation of the site, whichever is the sooner, the development hereby approved, including all related on-site built infrastructure shall be removed and the land restored to its former condition and in accordance with the approved site restoration scheme.
- 3 The permission hereby granted shall relate to the area shown outlined in red on the approved site plan and the development shall only take place in accordance with the submitted details and specifications and as shown on the approved plans:

Proposed Landscape Plan 1554 – 005
Welfare & Storage Containers Dwg Rev 1.0
Battery Container Details Rev 1.0
Boundary Fence Rev 1.0
Inverter Unit Rev 1.0
Proposed Site Plan 002 Rev 2.0
Control Room Rev 1.0
Transformer Rev 1.0

- 4 The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be in accordance with the details provided in the submitted application form and approved drawings. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with these details.
- 5 Before the development is brought into use, that part of the site to be used by vehicles shall be constructed with either:
 - a) a permeable surface and associated water retention/collection drainage, or
 - b) an impermeable surface with water collected and taken to a separately constructed water retention/discharge system within the site.The area shall thereafter be maintained in a working condition.
- 6 No development shall commence until a Construction Traffic Management Plan (“CTMP”) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CTMP shall include but not be limited to details regarding the following matters:
 - (1) Details of the proposed access to the site for all vehicles associated with construction of the development hereby permitted;
 - (2) Traffic management measures which shall include measures for managing construction traffic and pedestrians along Green Lane and Moat Lane and the provision of banksmen (or other appropriate measures) during the period of construction including management of all deliveries for abnormal loads and concrete;
 - (3) The location of the site compound and staff parking;
 - (4) Measures to deal with dust;
 - (5) Measures to deal with mud on the highway;
 - (6) All lorries leaving the site shall be securely and effectively sheeted;
 - (7) Details of proposed hours of construction on/deliveries to the site;
 - (8) Management of vehicles used to take spoil and other material off-site,
 - (9) Traffic routing including use of off-site holding areas for delivery drivers if required; and
 - (10) Measures to co-ordinate traffic management by developers along Green Lane and Moat Lane in the event of multiple development sites coming forward at the same time.The approved CTMP shall be implemented in full thereafter.
- 7 No development shall commence until the following details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the approved details implemented in full thereafter:
 - 1) the proposed resurfacing of the unadopted part of Moat Lane

- 2) proposed alterations in the highway at Moat Lane as indicated on plan reference Dwg No drawing 23099-DR-C-0100-3
 - 3) and the provision of pedestrian refuges along Green Lane
-
- 8 Prior to the commencement of development a highway condition survey shall be undertaken by the developer with the Council's Highways Adoptions Officer in Moat Lane to establish the existing condition. Upon completion of the works a further highway condition survey shall be undertaken and any remedial works required as a result of the development shall be implemented.
 - 9 Prior to the first operation of the development all items of noise generating plant shall be positioned as shown on the Proposed Site Layout Plan (Project No. 41, Drawing No.002, Revision 2.0, dated 9th May 2023) provided in support of the application, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
 - 10 The Sound Power Level (LWA) of each item of noise generating plant shall not exceed those set out in paragraph 4.2 of the Noise Impact Assessment by Hepworth Acoustics dated May 2023 (Report No: P23-109-R01v1).
 - 11 The rating noise level due to the combined noise emissions of all items of fixed or mobile plant and equipment installed or in use at the site shall not exceed the representative background noise level as assessed in accordance with the methodology and principles set out in BS 4142:2014+A1:2019 Methods for Rating and Assessing Industrial and Commercial Sound.
 - 12 The combined noise emissions of all items of fixed or mobile plant and equipment installed or in use at the site shall not exceed the noise levels at the façade of any existing dwelling at any time as assessed over a 15-minute averaging period and as set out in Table 1 of the Noise Impact Assessment by Hepworth Acoustics dated May 2023 (Report No: P23-109-R01v1).
 - 13 Within three months of the BESS first being brought into use a noise validation report to demonstrate that the requirements of the noise limits conditions have been complied with shall be submitted to, and approved by the local planning authority. The report shall provide measurements and an assessment made in accordance with BS4142:2014 + A1:2019.
 - 14 Where a verified complaint is received by Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council that suggests that the above criteria are not being met, the operator of the site shall complete an assessment in accordance with the methodology and principles set out in BS 4142:2014+A1:2019, to demonstrate that the above condition is being complied with at all times. The assessment shall be completed by a competent person agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority in advance of the assessment.
 - 15 Landscaping of the site as shown on the approved plan (Weddle Landscape drawing no. 1554- 005) shall be carried out during the first available planting season after commencement of the development and thereafter maintained for the lifetime of the development. Any plants or trees which within a period of 5 years from completion of planting die, are removed or damaged, or that fail to

thrive shall be replaced within the next planting season. Assessment of requirements for replacement planting shall be carried out on an annual basis in September of each year and any defective work or materials discovered shall be rectified before 31st December of that year.

- 16 No work or storage on the site shall commence until all the trees/shrubs to be retained have been protected by the erection of a strong durable 2 metre high barrier fence in accordance with BS 5837:2012 Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction - Recommendations This shall be positioned in accordance with details as shown on the Weddle Tree Protection Plan 1554 - 003. The protective fencing shall be properly maintained and shall not be removed without the written approval of the Local Planning Authority until the development is completed. There shall be no alterations in ground levels, fires, use of plant, storage, mixing or stockpiling of materials within the fenced areas.
- 17 No tree or hedgerow shall be cut down, uprooted or destroyed nor shall any tree or hedgerow be pruned other than in accordance with the approved plans and particulars, without the written approval of the Local Planning Authority. Any pruning works approved shall be carried out in accordance with British Standard 3998 (Tree Work). If any tree or hedgerow is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree or hedgerow shall be planted in the immediate area and that tree or hedgerow shall be of such size and species, and shall be planted at such time, as may be specified in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 18 Notwithstanding the submitted details, before above ground works commence details of external lighting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall clearly demonstrate that lighting will not cause excessive light pollution or disturb or prevent bats or other species using key corridors, foraging habitat features or accessing roost sites.
- 19 No removal of hedgerows, trees or shrubs shall take place between 1st March and 31st August inclusive, unless a competent ecologist has undertaken a careful, detailed check of vegetation for active birds' nests immediately before the vegetation is cleared and provided written confirmation that no birds will be harmed and/or that there are appropriate measures in place to protect nesting bird interest on site. Any such written confirmation should be submitted to the local planning authority.
- 20 No development shall commence until Biodiversity Enhancement & Management Plans (BEMPs) for the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Plans shall provide:
 - i) A description and evaluation of features to be managed and enhanced; including
 - a) A description of new landscape planting incorporating native plant species
 - b) Gaps of suitable dimensions (130mm x 130mm) should be provided at the foot of permanent perimeter and boundary fences at selected points to permit the movement of hedgehogs around the site post construction.
 - c) Measures to ensure that holes are kept open 'Hedgehog Highway' signage should be provided (sourced by Peoples Trust for Endangered

Species and/or British Hedgehog Preservation Society) and secured above the holes.

d) The location and number of bat roosting features should be included within the new residential properties

e) The location and number of bird nest boxes should be integrated into the new residential properties.

ii) The extent and location/area of proposed enhancement works on appropriate scale maps and plans;

iii) Aims and Objectives of management;

iv) Appropriate Management Actions for achieving Aims and Objectives;

v) An annual work programme (to cover an initial 5 year period);

For each of the first 5 years of the Plans, a progress report shall be sent to the Local Planning Authority reporting on progress of the annual work programme and confirmation of required Actions for the next 12 month period.

The Plans shall be reviewed and updated every 5 years to ensure their aims and objectives are being met. The approved Plans will be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

The approved details thereafter shall be implemented, retained and maintained for their designed purpose in accordance with the approved scheme

21 The development shall be constructed in accordance with the submitted drainage plan 23099-DR-C-0101 P1. The proposed measures shall be undertaken prior to the development coming on line.

22 No development shall commence until a Battery Safety Management Plan, an Emergency Response Plan and a Risk Management Plan have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

The Battery Safety Management Plan shall include details about the following:

a) Site wind data, including direction and speed.

b) Size, capacity, and design of water tank(s)/hydrants, along with access provision for emergency services.

c) Details of BESS units design and testing to inform provisions for containment, detection and monitoring, and any deflagration prevention and venting, and suppression systems.

d) A fire water management plan to include provision for fire water run-off to be contained within the Site, tested before release and removed from the Site to be treated.

e) A vegetation control management plan.

f) The fire-retardant properties of the acoustic fence.

The Risk Management Plan shall include hazards and risks not only at the Site, but also to the wider area and to the local community.

The Emergency Response Plan shall include provisions for pollution/spillage of hazardous materials, incident control and exclusion zones that could impact the local community.

The development shall be implemented and operated in strict accordance with the approved Battery Safety Management Plan, Emergency Response Plan and Risk Management Plan.

The agreed plans shall be adhered to for the lifetime of the development.

- 23 Prior to the commencement of development, details of the need for fire water mitigation measures shall be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Where fire water mitigation is required, details of adequate retention of water in the event of a fire shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details before the operation of the equipment hereby approved.