

Planning application SMD/2022/0076 – Construction of a temporary Battery Energy Storage System on land off Bemersley Road, Ball Green, Stoke on Trent

Fire Precautions

Despite the dangers already proved of fire hazard linked to Lithium batteries there is no specific fire code for BESS

They state that the risk of fire is relatively low, but that risk is obviously present

Fire alarm tests are planned to take place on a 6 weekly basis, recommended frequency is weekly. This is inadequate and unacceptable.

All fire precautions are site specific and do not cover local residential areas. What precautions are in place for the emission of toxic fumes etc that may be released in case of fire.

Toxic waste could contaminate the River Trent which would affect areas down river from the site

The Company seems to be very complacent over risks that can and do exist. There is no room for complacency in a proposal such as this.

Construction Traffic Management Plan

They state construction will only take place Monday – Friday between 8.00am and 6.00pm and on Saturdays from 8:00am until 2.00pm. They quote 774 two-way journeys:

- Via very narrow and winding lanes – in parts it can be difficult for 2 cars to pass one another
- Past a primary school which is situated on the road – congestion and a large number children negotiating narrow pavements on their way to and from school
- Through small village with shops, pharmacy and doctors directly on the road, with an ageing population accessing them. A children's nursery has also opened on this road.
- and they will pass directly by a children's playground

If this is not bad enough, they add that “dependent on weather conditions or unless otherwise specified in writing by the local planning authority” these hours may change. This is unacceptable, dangerous and the timings are open to misuse.

- They fail to demonstrate or have any awareness of the route they are proposing
- The A53 is a main arterial route in the city with nowhere to pull over without significant disruption and congestion
- The turning into Norton Lane from the A53 is narrow and would create difficulties for the size of vehicle to be used
- Travel along Norton lane, a narrow winding lane, where it is very difficult in places for oncoming cars to pass without slowing down considerably and pulling into the verge. This road has restrictions over the size of vehicles permitted to use it.
- Proceed via the village of Norton, where the pavements are extremely narrow in parts with double yellow lines and then proceed via the village of Ball Green.

The route **DOES NOT** allow for articulated vehicles to simply pull up. The only widening of the road on the entire route is directly adjacent to a children's play area in Ball Green! Is this where they propose to pull up?

Their documents state that Norton Lane and Bemersley Road will be used by laden vehicles of 28.2 tonnes and unladen vehicles of 11.2 tonnes and yet the weight limit for both, which is clearly signed is for 7.5 tonnes. Have Stoke on Trent City Council and its local Elected Members been consulted over this?

They also state Bemersley Road has a maximum speed limit of 40 miles per hour, with no street lighting. On the entire route from entering Norton Lane from the A53 to the proposed site there is signage stating that the legal limit is 30 miles per hour, and it is also fully lit with street lights set at less than 200 yards which, according to the official Traffic Signs and General Directions 2016 signifies a 30mph limit.

Bemersley/ Knypersley Road is the ONLY access road to the village of Ball Green so there is no alternative route for either the residential or site traffic.

They state they will reduce the risk of mud on to the highway not how they will eliminate mud, which of course would cause dangerous driving conditions. This needs to be satisfactorily mitigated, with the use of road sweepers at the applicant's own cost.

Visual and noise Impact on the Green Belt - proposal of an Acoustic Fence

According to the consultants report on noise pollution it has been proved that even with the proposed increase in the height of the fence there will be an adverse night impact on residents living closest to it. This is totally unacceptable.

As acoustic fence is of solid construction, therefore to propose a solid "wall" like structure in the middle of the open green belt is unacceptable.. The new proposal is to raise it above the previous height the visual impact of the BESS would be bad enough but to have a solid barrier in the middle of open green belt which can be viewed from miles around is ludicrous. This is a visually intrusive impact on our Green Belt.

The maintenance of such a fence over a 40-year period is not mentioned nor is any replacement during this life cycle. The more that is installed also has more of an impact when it comes to decommissioning and disposal.

Very Special Circumstances

It is considered that the irreversible damage to the local community in terms of visual, audible and general intrusion to the Green Belt are not outweighed by the minor contribution the BESS will provide to the wider community. It will not have any local economic benefit as Anesco intend to monitor the site remotely with no local maintenance on site.

The installation of an ugly development of this nature and size will be detrimental to the character of the area for years to come. The development cannot be considered as a temporary structure and it is too far into the future to determine what will happen in 2063, when some of us will no longer be here. Their own response to decommissioning is so ridiculously light with just 231 words describing its removal, against thousands of words trying to excuse its build, that it is clear they too have no concept of what decommissioning will really mean.

Finally, the very special circumstances as required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 147 for the development in the Green Belt ARE NOT MET by this application. There are no special circumstances to excuse the violation of Green Belt. The special circumstances outlined by the NPPF cannot be used when there is already an application to construct a BESS on a Brown field site just 850 meters away!

I therefore once again object to this application.

