



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 14 October 2025

Site visit made on 14 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/25/3365059

Land off Moat Lane, Wickersley, 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 Harmony TC Limited against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application reference is RB2024/0321.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a 100MW battery storage facility, creation of bund and associated earthworks.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of a 100MW battery storage facility, creation of bund and associated earthworks at land off Moat Lane, Wickersley, S66 1DZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref RB2024/0321, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Applications for costs

2. An application by Harmony TC Ltd against Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council and the response of the Council were made in writing and are the subject of a separate decision.
3. At the Hearing the Legal Representative for the Council advised that the Council was not pursuing a claim for partial costs against Harmony TC Ltd.

Preliminary Matters

Late submissions

4. The Council provided copies of a Report to the Planning Board, 12 June 2025, a copy of the National Fire Chiefs Guidance for Grid Scale Battery Energy Storage System Planning – Guidance for FRS and the full response to the application from South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue (SYFR), dated 02 November 2023. These had not been included with the appeal documents. The Appellant confirmed they had seen the documents and had no objection to their submission.
5. A couple of days before the Hearing sat, the Appellant submitted a response to a Local Highway Authority Memorandum appended to the Council's Statement of Case. The Legal Representative for the Appellant advised the Hearing that the Appellant's response contained nothing more than would be said at the hearing. The Council had considered the document prior to the Hearing. The Hearing was

adjourned for 30 minutes to allow interested parties to read it. With that, the Council raised no objection. No other objections were raised.

6. The Appellant advised that submitted swept path drawings, LTP/5416/P1/01/02 Rev A & LTP/5416/P1/01/01 Rev A indicated that land outside of the red line would be required. Revised drawings LTP/5416/P1/01/02 Rev B & LTP/5416/P1/01/01 Rev B were submitted to demonstrate that works could be achieved within the red line. The Council raised no objection.
7. A statement from the Appellant's Heritage Expert was submitted and read out. The statement provided clarification in relation to a Heritage Impact Assessment which I had requested.
8. A local resident who organises local walking groups, including the Winthrop Walkers, marked up a photocopied Ordnance Survey map extract of the local area to illustrate routes that walkers took. It provided a useful visual representation of the verbal evidence given and the Appellant raised no objection to its submission.
9. These documents did not raise any new material considerations and were of assistance to the Hearing. I was satisfied that no one would be prejudiced. I accepted all the documents and have taken their contents into consideration.

Similar proposals close by

10. Another planning appeal, APP/P4155/W/25/3363208, proposes a Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) facility on other land at Moat Lane. I deal with that appeal in a separate decision letter. The relevance of that proposal to this decision was discussed by the main parties at the Hearing. In reaching my conclusions on this appeal I have been mindful of the proposals in APP/P4155/W/25/3363208 but have determined each appeal on its own merits.

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

11. The Decision Notice included two Reasons for Refusal. The first related to inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The Council determined the application 28 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.
12. The Appellant's Statement of Case argued that, applying the new Framework and PPG, the appeal site falls within grey belt and that the proposed battery storage facility no longer represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
13. 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 Council formally resolved to withdraw the Green Belt reason for refusal.

Heritage

14. Moat Farmhouse and the Dovecote are Grade II Listed buildings at Moat Farm, a short distance from the appeal site.

15. Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, requires that in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
16. There was no reason for refusal in this regard, however, in order to ensure the proper discharge of my duties under S66(1) the Appellant was asked to clarify effects upon the significance of the identified heritage assets by way of change to setting, and whether the landscaping and screen bunding proposed in mitigation would impact the setting and heritage significance of the grouping. The Appellant's Heritage Expert did not attend the hearing but provided a statement.
17. Having studied the statement, a Heritage Impact Assessment, and from observations on my site visits, I am satisfied that the residual effect would be a neutral impact upon the significance of the Listed Buildings.

Main Issue

18. The remaining 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"*.
19. The main issue is the effect of construction traffic on highway safety with regard to pedestrians on Green Lane.

Reasons

20. At the planning application stage, the Council's Highways Development Manager (Highways Manager) raised no objection. This was in the knowledge of an existing BESS facility accessed off Green Lane and a proposal for another BESS Facility on other land at Moat Lane which would utilise the same access route.
21. The Highway's Officer attended the Hearing. They explained that the submitted scheme provides for off-site works to upgrade of the Moat Lane/ Green Lane junction to accommodate the largest vehicles entering and exiting the site in forward gear. The detailed junction improvements would need to be agreed with the Highway Authority, but they were satisfied that the submitted plans demonstrated that a scheme was achievable in principle, and that the works could be secured by way of a planning condition. With this, it was their professional opinion that the proposal was acceptable.
22. The Reason for Refusal refers to the suitability of Green Lane. The Highways Manager informed the Hearing that Green Lane is 530m long and the first 280m can accommodate 2-way traffic. The last 230m, they advised, is only 2.9m wide and of that a section of roughly 127m has no cut verge and a ditch on one side. It is an adopted two-way single carriageway and subject to the national speed limit.
23. In their Memorandum for the appeal the Highways Manager states that there are no vehicle passing points along the 127m section and that the limited width of the existing verge and presence of a ditch does not provide a suitable step off for pedestrians. Even so, the Highways Officer did not raise an objection in this regard, and there is no evidence from any other suitably qualified highway expert to

- say that the proposal would not be able to provide safe and suitable access for all users.
24. 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.
 25. At the Hearing, the Council's case was, in the main, presented by the Ward Councillor, who is also a Member of the Planning Board. The Councillor runs a haulage company and has extensive local knowledge. They had used one of their vehicles to test the suitability of the route. I also heard from other objectors, who state that Green Lane is used for walking, horse riding, dog walking, cycling, and accessing local properties, and that pedestrians and cyclists use Moat Lane/Green Lane because it is safer. They report three accidents in three years.
 26. One objector organises local walking groups. They informed the Hearing that walks can involve large groups and take place regularly and frequently. I was told that one popular circular walk was along Moat Lane past the appeal site, then following a field edge to Moat Wood, and onto public footpaths beyond. Some of these sections are not formal Public Rights of Way and permissive rights were not evidenced. This limits the weight I attach to concerns about interactions between walkers and vehicles on Moat Lane. Moat Lane is not cited in the Reason for Refusal and does not form part of the Council's evidence.
 27. The plan of the walking routes identifies Green Lane as part of a constantly used route. The Ward Councillor points out that on the first part of Green Lane six houses have access, 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 where the road narrows to 2.9m there are ditches, hedgerows, entrances to two houses, an animal rescue shelter and, further along, an exercise area used by the rescue shelter.
 28. The construction period for the proposed BESS would be roughly 16-18 months. If this scheme was constructed concurrently with the BESS proposed on other land at Moat Lane, APP/P4155/W/25/3363208, construction vehicles for both schemes would use the same route. Objectors argue that the increased traffic during the construction phase would significantly heighten the likelihood of accidents or near-misses on Green Lane, especially given a lack of visibility and safe passing points.
 29. The Appellant's Transport Assessment states that 2,520 movements are anticipated with a maximum of 260 HGV movements in a monthly period. Peak construction traffic would generate roughly 12x 2-way HGV movements per day. The evidence of the Highways Manager is that there are no official recorded injury collisions on Green Lane or Moat Lane (unadopted) within the last available 5-year period and that speed survey data shows that the combined two-way 85%ile speed on Green Lane is 24.4mph. At the Hearing the Highways Manager agreed that Green Lane is lightly trafficked.
 30. On my site visit, I observed a cyclist and a couple of pedestrians, and saw people and vehicles moving between the two sites of the rescue shelter. I noted that the metalled carriageway of the 127m stretch looks and feels narrow, but it is only a short stretch that has these characteristics. Stood on this stretch I could see vehicles parked near the junction with Moat Lane where construction vehicles

would turn into and exit from the site. Looking in the other direction I was also able to see vehicles approaching, and I observed vehicles moving relatively slowly.

31. At the Hearing the Highways Manager suggested that the highway works to provide for the junction improvements as part of the development could also include for the creation of pedestrian refuge facilities along this 127m stretch of Green Lane. The Appellant thought it achievable and had no objection. It would help allay pedestrian fear of conflict along the narrowest stretch. In this way would be a reasonable requirement as part of the package of measures to manage construction traffic, pedestrian interactions and allay fears.
32. The land is outside of the Appellant's control and consent for the works would be required from the Highways' Authority. To secure provision would require a negatively worded "Grampian" planning condition that would prohibit development from taking place until pedestrian refuge facilities had been provided.
33. A Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) could cover a number of traffic management measures. Deliveries could be restricted to weekday daytime and outside of network peak periods. The CTMP could include requirements for deliveries to/from the site to be pre-planned and scheduled to avoid vehicles arriving simultaneously and mitigate against conflicting movements. It could require a "banksman" to be available and on-site at all times during the construction period to coordinate the movement of vehicles. The banksman could be responsible for ensuring that two large vehicles do not attempt to use Moat Lane/Green Lane at the same time and directing large vehicles in and out of the site, within the vicinity of the junction with Moat Lane and Green Lane and the 127m section, to ensure that highway and pedestrian safety are not compromised.
34. At the Hearing the Appellant advised that cut material from the site would be used within the site to create a mound as part of the proposals. The development would not require a particularly large concrete base and in any event, the parties agreed that the CTMP could cover a broad spectrum of vehicular movements.
35. Roughly doubling the construction traffic to allow for the possibility of another similar proposal being under construction at the same time would not amount to a significant number of additional large vehicles on this section of road. Nor is their evidence to say it would result in a constant stream of fast-moving traffic.
36. At the Hearing the Highways Manager and Appellant agreed that the CTMP could require details for how traffic management for this scheme and that proposed by APP/P4155/W/25/3363208 could be coordinated to manage construction traffic for both schemes simultaneously.
37. Green Lane is a public highway. Other vehicles cannot be controlled, but Green Lane is lightly trafficked, for most of it two vehicles can pass, and the Appellant has the ability to control the construction traffic for the appeal proposal.
38. Green Lane connects with Morthen Road via a simple priority T junction. Morthen Road is a two-way single carriageway approximately 7.3m wide, subject to a 60mph speed limit within the vicinity of the junction with Green Lane. Objectors argue that traffic turning at this junction would significantly increase the probability of accidents or near-misses. They claim traffic turning from Green Lane onto Morthen Road edges out slowly into because of poor visibility raising serious safety concerns.

39. There is some potential for minor vehicle overrun when an AILV would navigate the Green Lane/Morthen Road junction. The number of AILV movements is expected to be minimal. The Ward Councillor had carried out his own test with a haulage vehicle and concluded that part of the garden of a property adjacent to the junction would be needed to enable large vehicles to access and egress Green Lane. Nonetheless, the Highways Manager raised no objection and did not dispute that the Appellant's Swept Path Analysis had demonstrated that an AILV and HCV would be able to adequately navigate the Green Lane/Morthen Road priority junction.
40. The Ward Councillor had a video recording of their tests, and it was clear from oral evidence that they had much experience. However, there is no evidence from a suitably accredited highways specialist to substantiate concerns about construction traffic using this junction, or Green Lane.
41. The Council did not argue that the proposal was contrary to the Development Plan. Framework paragraphs 115 and 116 provide advice on how proposals should be assessed in relation to highway matters. In response to my questions, the Highways Manager confirmed that their professional opinion was that a CTMP would safely mitigate concerns regarding the highways. Having regard to advice at paragraphs 115 and 116 of the Framework, they added that there is always a level of risk, but that in this case it was at an acceptable level, and that provided that suitable planning conditions were attached, existing highway users would not be put at an unacceptable risk.
42. Drawing this issue to a conclusion, I am mindful that in *Bellway Homes Ltd v SSCLG & Cheshire East Council* CO/302/2015 it was held that it must be more than unlikely or uncertain that the action would be achieved to justify refusing permission for development which would be acceptable with a condition in place.
43. I conclude that with a scheme for the proposed improvements for the Moat Lane/Green Lane junction, including pedestrian refuge facilities on Green Lane, and the CTMP, construction traffic for the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on the safe use of Green Lane to the detriment of both highway and pedestrian safety.
44. The proposal would comply with advice at paragraph 115 b) of the Framework that developments should provide safe and suitable access for all users. Development would not result in significant impacts on highway safety that cannot be cost effectively mitigated and would not result in the severe impacts on the highway network that Framework paragraph 116 seeks to resist.

Other Matters

45. I have been mindful of other appeal decisions presented, including a BESS proposal dismissed in November 2018, APP/P4415/W/18/3206823. However, I have assessed the appeal before me on its own merits.

Alternative sites

46. There is an existing BESS located off Green Lane. At the Hearing I was told consent has been granted for an extension. Wickersley Parish Council argue that existing capacity should be utilised at less intrusive sites rather than on open land.

At the Hearing one objector argued that the proposal should be located on a field directly adjacent to the substation and which had been formally required for HS2.

47. Objectors disputed the site selection methodology and process set out in a Very Special Circumstances Report regarding alternative brownfield or previously developed land which could accommodate the BESS facility. However, that report had been prepared before the Framework and Green Belt policy was revised.
48. The Council states that the site is close to a substation, the field that had been required for HS2 is also within the Green Belt and that there is a high demand for BESS facilities in the Borough.
49. I find that 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 and no requirement for an alternative sites assessment.

Character and appearance

50. Whilst the site is in the countryside it is close to established electricity infrastructure. In this way the proposal is not out of character. The site is also reasonably contained within and screened by the existing landscape framework, save for a view from a road to nearby residential development. A scheme of landscaping within and around the site would reduce visibility and landscape impacts over time. It would include a bund to provide some instant screening.
51. Topography and vegetation restrict intervisibility and co-visibility. Once fully established, landscaping would provide an effective screen from most localised views and nearby Public Rights of Way. The appellant's landscape and visual impact assessment concluded that with proposed landscaping mitigation, the development would have a moderate visual impact and a minor landscape impact.
52. The BESS proposed by APP/P4155/W/25/3363208 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.
53. 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.

Agricultural Land and Food Production

54. Best and most versatile agricultural land (BMVAL) is graded 1 to 3a. An Agricultural Classification Report advises that the land is of a poorer sub-grade, and the site is assessed as 3b (medium) quality. The appeal site is relatively small, and the proposals would not result in a significant development of agricultural land nor a material loss of BMVAL. The proposal would not materially impact upon the availability of agricultural land for food production.

Benefits

55. 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. This proposal would support energy generation through the storage of energy.

56. Paragraph 168 a) states 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 should give significant weight to the benefits associated with renewable and low carbon energy generation and the proposal's contribution to a net zero future
57. 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.

Conditions

58. After the close of the Hearing the parties submitted an agreed condition list to reflect amendments discussed at the Hearing. I have reviewed and amended the conditions suggested in the light of advice in the Framework and PPG.
59. 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 40 years. I have amended this condition to provide clarity regarding the requirement for the submission and approval of a decommissioning plan, including traffic management.
60. A condition specifying the plans is reasonable and necessary in the interests of certainty and clarity.

Highway Works and CTMP

61. Particularly pertinent are conditions to require the CTMP, junction improvements and pedestrian refuge facilities, to ensure that the construction of the development will be operated in the interest of the safety of pedestrians and other road users.

Noise

62. Conditions proposed would provide limits for noise from batteries, transformers and combined noise emissions of all items of fixed or mobile plant and equipment. There is no objection from Environmental Health. The Parish Council is concerned about impacts for nearby residential properties during the construction period. And a resident with contract experience expressed fear that conditions to manage noise were not sufficiently precise and did not set out consequences.
63. The main parties agreed that 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 word façade could

relate to any front or facing wall and would afford the Local Planning Authority flexibility to ensure measurements were taken at the most appropriate locations.

64. I am satisfied that the conditions, are reasonable and necessary and would provide a reasonable planning mechanism to enable the Local Planning Authority to enforce reasonable requirements to protect the living conditions of occupiers of nearby dwellings.

Battery safety

65. The PPG advises that where permission is being sought for development of battery energy storage systems of 1MWh or over, applicants are encouraged to engage with the relevant local fire and rescue service before submitting an application to the local planning authority. This is so matters relating to the siting and location of battery energy storage systems, in particular in the event of an incident, prevention of the impact of thermal runaway and emergency services access can be considered before an application is made. The PPG also encourages Applicants to consider guidance produced by the National Fire Chiefs Council.
66. The Appellant informed the hearing that they had engaged with SYFR prior to submitting the application. The Council provided evidence that SYFR raised no objection. Planning conditions would require submission and approval of a Battery Safety Management Plan, an Emergency Response Plan and a Risk Management Plan to mitigate the risks of incidents and provide appropriate procedures should an event occur.

Other conditions

67. Various conditions relating to tree protection, landscaping and biodiversity are both normal and necessary to ensure a satisfactory development and to protect amenity. A condition to require details of external lighting is also reasonable to protect ecology and visual amenity interests.

Conclusion

68. The Council's concerns regarding highway and pedestrian safety on Green Lane have not been sustained in their appeal submissions. Therefore, for the reasons given, and having taken into all other matters raised into consideration, the appeal is allowed subject to conditions.

Helen Heward

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS (19 in total)

No.	Condition
1	Time Limit The development hereby permitted shall be commenced before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
2	Temporary Consent Within 3 months of the batteries ceasing to be used, or the expiry of 39 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 40 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	Approved Plans 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 following approved plans: Proposed Site Plan _ PA_32_PSP Rev O Proposed Site Layout and elevations TH_SLE_RevB Proposed Landscape Scheme UG_1982_LAN_GA_DRW_01 Revision 08
4	Construction Traffic Management Plan 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.
5	Off-site highway works No development shall commence until details for proposed alterations in the highway at Moat Lane and Green Lane, indicated in draft form on plan reference Dwg No LTP/5416/P/01.01 Rev B and Dwg No LTP/5416/P/01.02 Rev B, and the provision of pedestrian refuges along Green Lane have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and the approved details implemented in full thereafter.
6	Surfacing 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
7	Battery Safety No development shall commence until a Battery Safety Management Plan, an Emergency Response Plan, a Risk Management Plan and Fire Water Mitigation 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 Fire Water Mitigation Plan shall include details of the need for fire water mitigation measures, including details for retention of water in the event of a fire. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details before the operation of the equipment hereby approved. The development shall be implemented and operated in strict accordance with the approved Battery Safety Management Plan, Emergency Response Plan, Risk Management Plan and Fire Water Mitigation Plan. The agreed plans shall be adhered to for the lifetime of the development.
8	Biodiversity No development shall commence until Biodiversity Enhancement & Management Plans (BEMPs) has 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) Description of new landscape planting incorporating native plant species b) Gaps of suitable dimensions (130mmx 130mm) to 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) 'Hedgehog Highway' signage to 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 to be included within the new residential properties e) The location and number of bird nest boxes to be integrated into the new residential properties. ii) The extent and location/area of proposed enhancement works on appropriate scale maps and plans; iii) The Aims and Objectives of management; iv) Appropriate Management Actions for achieving the Aims and Objectives; v) An annual work program (to cover an initial 5 year period); The Plans shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details. For each of the first 5 years of the Plans, a report of the annual work program undertaken and setting out required Actions for the next 12 month period shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

	Thereafter, the Plans shall be reviewed and updated every 5 years to ensure the aims and objectives are being met. The approved details shall be implemented, retained, and maintained for their designed purpose in accordance with the approved scheme.
9	Tree protection No development shall commence until all the trees/shrubs to be retained have been protected by the erection of a strong durable 2m high barrier fence in accordance with BS 5837:2012 Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction - Recommendations The fencing shall be positioned in accordance with details as shown on UG_1982_ARB_TPP_01 Rev 03. The fencing shall be properly maintained and shall not be removed 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.
10	Provision of landscaping During the first available planting season after commencement of the development Landscaping of the site as shown on the approved plan drawing no.UG_1982_LAN_GA_DRW_01 Rev P08, shall be carried out. 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.
11	Finishes Prior to commencement of above ground works precise details of the colours and finishes for all buildings, fixed plant and machinery shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
12	Light Pollution Prior to commencement of above ground works, details of external lighting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include measure and specifications to 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.

13	Noise Mitigation Prior to the first operation of the development, 1) All items of noise generating plant shall have been installed and positioned as detailed in Section 1.2 and Figure 1.1 of the Noise Impact Assessment undertaken by Dragonfly Consulting (Ref: DC4195-NR1v6, dated 21 June 2024) unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. 2) All mitigation measures as identified within the Noise Impact Assessment undertaken by Dragonfly Consulting (Ref: DC4195-NR1v6, dated 21 June 2024) shall have been carried out in full and shall be maintained throughout the lifetime of the consent unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
14	Noise Validation Reporting 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.
15	Noise limits: 1) The cumulative Sound Power Level (LWA) of all transformer units on site shall not exceed those set out in Table 5.2 of the Noise Impact Assessment by Dragonfly Consulting, Ref: DC4195-NR1v6, 21 June 2024, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. 2) The cumulative Sound Power Level (LWA) of all batteries on site shall not exceed those set out in Table 6.9 of the Noise Impact Assessment undertaken by Dragonfly Consulting (Ref: DC4195-NR1v6, dated 21 June 2024) unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. 3) 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. 4) 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 set out in Table 1 below at the façade of any existing dwelling at any time as assessed over a 15-minute averaging period.

16	Noise Complaints Where a verified complaint is received by Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council that suggests that the noise limitations and mitigation are not being met in accordance with approved details, 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 (LPA) in advance of the assessment. A copy of the completed report shall also be forwarded to the LPA for consideration.
17	Tree and Hedgerow Retention 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	Tree and Hedgerow Protection 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, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority prior to works being undertaken.
19	Badger Protection Works which include the creation of trenches or culverts or the presence of pipes shall include measures to protect badgers from being trapped in open excavations and/or pipes and culverts as stated in the ecology report - Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, May 2023, Urban Green End of condition schedule

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT

David Hardy, Solicitor, Partner CMS Sheffield
Tessa Fletcher, Senior Planning Manager, Harmony Energy
Steven Longstaff, Planning Director ELG Planning
Mike Raynor, Associated Local Transport Projects
Mark Evans, Landscape Architect Associate Director, Urban Green Space

FOR THE PLANNING AUTHORITY

Stuart Evans, Solicitor, Partner Anthony Collins Manchester
Andrew West, Planning officer, Development Management RMBC
Emma Ottewell, Service Manager, Development Management RMBC
Simon Gammons, Highways Development Manager RMBC
Councillor Paul Thorp, Ward Councillor and Member of Planning Board RMBC

INTERESTED PERSONS

Vanessa Bryan, resident.
Elizabeth Harwood, Parish Councillor and Leader of Local Walking Groups
Tony Frost, resident.

NEW DOCUMENTS HANDED IN AT THE HEARING

Report to the Planning Board, 12 June 2025.

National Fire Chiefs Guidance for Grid Scale Battery Energy Storage System planning
– Guidance for FRS

South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue, 02 November 2023, consultee response

Marked up OS Extract showing Local Walking Routes from Vanessa Bryan

Heritage Statement clarification.