

From: [Andrew Batson](#)
To: [Planning \(SMDC\)](#)
Cc: [bagnallpc](#); [Declan Cleary](#); [Ben Haywood](#)
Subject: SMD 2024/0055
Date: 10 December 2024 07:17:58

Bagnall Parish Council OBJECTS to the proposed development SMD/2024/0055.

Whilst Bagnall PC is not a statutory consultee the proposed development is reasonably close to our Parish boundary and as such we wish to make representations.

We consider that this area of North Staffordshire, which is Green Belt, is at a significant risk of been turned into an industrialised location. There are already three battery storage sites which have been agreed in this locality and we consequently consider that the Authority must take in to account the cumulative effect of the developments.

Having read many documents over the last twelve months, for other sites as well as this proposal, we do note that they all essentially follow a pattern. We feel that in many cases the expert starts with a required result and then works back. If we take for instance the document lodged by the applicant and placed on the planning portal, 24th October 2024, marked Technical Advice Part 1 prepared by Glyn Jones we note the following. He writes in paragraph 2 “.. *the need for the proposed scheme in this location..*” so by making this statement he has identified the purpose of the consultation. The letter then goes on to refer to a National Grid document called the “Connect Now Research Assistant” which provides information on the capacity of each substation in its network and a link to the website is kindly provided. Looking at this link we note that all the substations in the wider area are shown to be at capacity **with no links available prior to 2036.** (Our emphasis). The site adjacent to the current proposal, Cellarhead Substation, is indeed marked on the National Grid document as “*no connection prior to 2036*”. The validity of this document must be brought in to question as immediately after referring to it Mr Jones advises that “*there is already a connection offer in place for the 400MW battery storage facility proposed at Cellarhead, which is why the current application is viable and deliverable notwithstanding that the Cellarhead GSP itself is listed as having no capacity for a connection until at least 2036. Evidence of the connection offer can be provided on request.*” Having relied on the National Grid document to support his opinion that other sites are not available we fail to understand how he can then simply dismiss other sites when Cellarhead is considered. We are consequently unable to place any significant weight on the advice contained in the document as it would appear that the experts view is clearly, in our opinion, less than impartial.

A second aspect from the letter is the advice that the Battery Storage Site..” *has an essential requirement to be located as close as possible to the connecting substation*” . Indeed if we look at other approved BESS in the UK we note that two of the largest are located adjacent to a power station (Drax) and the second is a development at the onshore terminal of the transmission line for offshore wind generation located at Hornsea, Yorkshire. We do consider that the most suitable location for a BESS is close to the point of generation, as shown in the above two examples, which will then minimise transmission losses which are also referred to in Mr Jones letter. We make the observation that there is no generation of electricity in the Cellarhead locality and the BESS site, if approved, would be energised by electricity produced elsewhere and transmitted to North Staffordshire via the 440 KV overhead cable network. As a consequence we consider that the siting at this location is not necessary or supported.

Notwithstanding the above representation if the Committee is minded to still approve the

application then we consider that a condition, on the grounds of safety, must be placed on the developer to consult with Staffordshire Fire and Rescue Service and agree a robust fire safety plan prior to any development taking place.

A final point- we do not consider that the removal of both ancient footpaths and the traditional nesting sites for endangered bird species by the proposed siting of the development are acceptable and we would ask the committee for all the above reasons to decline the current application.

Andrew Batson
Vice Chair Bagnall Parish Council