

From: [Andrew Batson](#)
To: [Declan Cleary](#)
Cc: [Planning \(SMDC\)](#); [Ben Haywood](#); [Ben Adams](#); [Bagnall Clerk](#)
Subject: Newfields Farm; BESS planning application SMD /2024 /0019
Date: 15 September 2024 18:32:14

Declan

I am writing further to previous contact with the Planning Authority in my capacity as Vice Chair of Bagnall Parish Council.

I consider that the Planning Applications Committee report for Agenda Item 7, recommending approval of the BESS installation, has been made prematurely.

In the report I note that there is reference to “Further Comments” made by Staffordshire Fire and Rescue Authority however these and two further responses made by them and mentioned in your report do not appear on the SMDC planning website for the Newfields Farm BESS application.

I note that reference is also made to a water storage tank however there is no mention of this or the location of the tank on any of the submitted plans that I can access.

I further note that mention is made of a “completed checklist and suggestion of conditions” however as previously stated these do not appear to be reproduced in the public domain. This cannot be acceptable.

I note at 7.131 of your report the important aspect of water run off the site is mentioned- why are full details of the installation not available now? The size and location of the system to capture water run off the site is extremely important particularly with the potentially large volumes of contaminated fire fighting water should an incident occur.

7.136 Consultation with SFRA has taken place and a document (which Bagnall PC have not seen) has been reviewed by them. I note that neither the document or the SFRA response has been published on the SMDC planning website.

Para 7.140, I am unable to make a substantive comment based on the information provided. There is no firm indication to confirm that a hydrant will be able to supply the required volume of water. I note the observation “it may be possible that water could be recycled by connecting to the proposed drainage storage “. (My emphasis.)

Regarding para 7.141. Again the writer is unable to make a reasoned comment. Without any available details of the attenuation system I cannot possibly comment on the suitability. The statement “ provided the water is not contaminated it is possible that the water could be recycled by SFRA during the incident”. (again my emphasis). I make the observation that during an incident it must be assumed by SFRA that the water will be contaminated without recourse to on site testing and this, I suggest, would be extremely

unlikely to occur.

I am afraid the above usage of “may be” and “could be” do not inspire me with confidence regarding the proposed drainage system and for this reason I consider that this aspect should have been fully addressed prior to committee stage.

My comment in response to paragraph 7.143 - For the above reasons I am unable to pass comment on the “details” and I would make the observation that the Planning Committee itself should be provided with a full copy of the information discussed in the document without which I do not see how they can come to their own conclusions.

At this stage I do not consider the above comments to be late representations- they are simply a view that full disclosure of the documents must be made available to enable a reasoned response by Bagnall PC and others to be formulated. As previously stated the design and capacity of the drainage system itself is very important and I consequently take the view that this should have been formally submitted prior to committee stage. In such circumstances, and also been mindful of the short time available, I would suggest that it would be inappropriate for the Planning Committee to consider the proposal at their meeting on the 18th September.

Best regards

Andrew Batson

Vice Chair Bagnall Parish Council

Sent from my iPhone