

SMDC Planning Reference –	SMD/2024/0019		
Site Name –	Newfields Farm Battery Energy Storage Site (BESS)		
Summary of proposals -	Electricity Storage Facility		
Consultation Note Subject –	Landscape and Visual Matters		
Planning Case Officer –			
Landscape Comments Prepared By –	Ryder Landscape Consultants		
Date of site visit —	14/3/24	Date of response	7/5/24
Landscape Policy Compliance –	Part Compliance – Part Conflict		

Dear Sir

Newfields Farm BESS, off Rownall Road, Cheddleton – Landscape and Visual Consultation

Thank you for appointing us to review the landscape and visual aspects of the submitted planning application and I pass a series of comments under the following headings;

1. Methodology
2. Site and surrounding's landscape character
3. Proposals for the site
4. Landscape effects
5. Visual effects from surrounding areas
6. Cumulative effects
7. Potential design considerations
8. Landscape Policy Compliance
9. Suggested Planning Conditions

1. Methodology

Staffordshire Moorlands District Council (SMDC) appointed Ryder Landscape Consultants to consider the submitted scheme and supporting documents in February 2024. an experienced Chartered Landscape Architect attended site on 14 March 2024, walked nearby public footpaths and highway corridors and took site photography.

The site visit was unaccompanied but I had the following plans and report to inform me about the proposals;

- Scheme Layout
- Fig 1 – Location Plan from the Pegasus LVIA
- Fig 7 – Landscape Strategy from the Pegasus LVCIA

2. Site and surrounding's landscape character

The site is comprised of a single pasture fields put to improved grass set to the north side of Newfields Farm which itself is set close to the south west corner of Cellarhead Electricity Sub-station that is owned and operated by the National Grid. Access is proposed through the current farm yard and it is uncertain whether any rationalisation of farm buildings are required to allow construction access.

Access to the site would be taken from Rownall Road via the existing track that services Newfield Farm.

The Staffordshire Moorlands commissioned Wardell Armstrong 2008 Landscape Character and Settlement Assessment confirms the site is located in a landscape character type called Ancient Plateau Farmlands.

The field is rectangular in shape with its north east corner ‘nibbed off’ with a rougher piece of grass land between it and the sub-station. It has a medium scale and measures approximately 2.2 Ha in size. The field’s boundaries are a mix of timber post and rail fencing, some agricultural mesh and outgrown hedges. There is also the screening woodland to the west side of the large Cellarhead Sub Station that forms the east side of the field.

There are two public footpaths associated with the Site. Cheddleton FP60 Follows the route of the access as it runs through Newfield Farm’s yard before continuing on west. Cheddleton FP48 also passes by the farm but in a northerly direction to skirt the eastern boundary of the Site field. At the time of the Site visit both paths were partially waterlogged given the wet winter conditions.

The Wardell Armstrong 2008 Landscape Character and Settlement Assessment study shows no landscape constraints on the Site or its contextual area. The Site lies outside of the Churnet Valley Boundary that was assessed in the Churnet Valley Landscape Character Assessment.

In landscape character terms the field is reasonably well contained by the mixture of sub-station woodland (east and north), the sub-station itself (north) and Newfields Farm to the south. There are no structures on Site but the residential property, outbuildings and barns that make up Newfields Farm is set approximately 40m to the south of the proposed facility.

I would not class the Site as a ‘valued landscape’ as per NPPF Para 180 a) given the close presence of the sub-station and lack of factors that lift it above an ordinary, or everyday rural location. Nor do I class the contextual landscape in which it is located as ‘valued landscape’ either.

The wider landscape context is a mixture of semi-upland pastoral landscape to the south and west and conforms to the broader landscape character description of the Ancient Plateau Farmland. To the east and north the landscape character is associated with the electrical infrastructure character of the sub-station. Across the wider area is a network of high voltage overhead power lines adding pylons to the local landscape scene.

The general lie of the land is undulating in the surrounding landscape with the Site displaying a relatively gentle slope from the higher south side where the farm sits towards the north west corner and its interface with the sub-station.

Dispersed farm properties can be seen off to the west of the Site (Greenfields) and a distant line of residential development at Armshead Road can be made out to the south of the Site in winter conditions. These houses are approximately 2.3km away and there would be no obvious inter-visibility to them in summer months. Even with the Cellarhead Sub-station set to two of its side the Site and surrounding area appear as a rural landscape under productive management.

3. [Proposals for the Site](#)

The main components of the scheme appear to be:

- Access taken through existing farm yard;
- An earth embankment up to 5m in height set to the west side of the Site with woodland and scrub planting set over it to act both as an acoustic bund and a raised area of planting;
- Central compound for the battery storage equipment containing 14 paired battery containers and transformers;
- DNO sub-station to the north end of the Site;
- A noise attenuation barrier set to the south and east side of the central compound presumably for the benefit of the residents at Newfields Farm;

- Security fencing set all the way around the central compound to form a secure area for safe operation of the proposed equipment, I refer to this as the 'battery yard';
- The unused portion of field is set to meadow seeding but has access tracks running through it so vehicles, especially larger plant do not have to reverse within the facility but do so in the open space of the field;
- A new hedgerow is proposed to run to the west side of the FP48 Footpath to the east side of the Site.

The 4m high acoustic barrier would present a solid, uniform barrier towards Newfields Farm.

The proposed planting is all native stock with a mix of tree and scrub species proposed to form the new woodland, hedgerows, and an Emorsgate native grass seed mix is proposed. There would be a net gain in woodland, hedgerow and scrub planting on the successful establishment of the planting proposals. The species types and planting densities are considered appropriate but if consented further detail of their protection from browsing by deer, rabbits, hares and smaller mammals is required along with details of establishment aftercare and management throughout the operational phase of the development.

4. Landscape effects

The proposals will effectively turn the single pasture field site into an industrial development more akin to the neighbouring Cellarhead Sub-station rather than the agrarian landscape to the south and west. For this field itself this change can only be classified as a **Major, Adverse and Permanent** effect that is an inevitability of development. The proposals are not considered in keeping with the wider pastoral landscape character of the Ancient Plateau Farmland even though there is the Cellarhead facility immediately adjacent to the east and north sides of the Site.

In considering the landscape context to the Site field it is its relationship with the west and south that are the most important as these abut pastoral landscape. The treatment shown on the Fig 7 - Landscape strategy plan is to form a planted earth bund to the west side of the battery yard. The bund is indicated as being approximately 20m wide, asymmetrical in form with the shallower embankment side facing outwards, its indicated height is 5m. The bund is pulled back from the existing western hedge so construction of it should not compromise the root protection area of the hedge or the mature trees it contains.

The bund also partially screens the south side of the proposals up to a point near the main access into the secured battery yard meaning that half the battery yard's southern boundary with its security fence backed by the acoustic barrier is set open.

The planting over the bund comprises a woodland mix on its higher parts (approx. 15m wide) and a scrub mix to the toe of the embankment that is approx. 5m wide. The plant species proposed in the planting schedule on the landscape strategy are all native species and are considered appropriate to this location and for this purpose. They will also offer up bio-diversity benefit that your Ecology consultee will be able to provide more informed guidance on their suitability.

The ability to create a strong planting buffer to the west is acknowledged and ultimately the woodland planting belt will likely screen views to the overall development in an estimated 6 to 8 years. The proposed planting belt to the south is considered not as full and there will be close-range publicly accessible views to it from Cheddleton FP60 looking along the proposed access route.

The next scale of landscape that can be affected by such proposals is the receiving landscape that the development is located within, this is usually referred to as the Site's local landscape context. The initial

change to the character of the local landscape context is set below with my judgement of long-term residual effects also given with the presumption of successful establishment of the landscape proposals;

- North which is the Cellarhead Sub-station – **Minor Adverse** at Year 1 reducing to **Negligible Adverse** at Year 15.
- East which is a wedge of screen woodland and Cellarhead Sub-station - **Minor Adverse** at Year 1, remaining at **Minor Adverse** at Year 15 as there is no screening woodland to this side of the proposals.
- South where Newfield Farm and pasture fields lay – **Moderate Adverse** at Year 1 with the rawness of the new earth works and fenced battery yard, reducing to **Minor Adverse** at Year 15 with the benefit of partial screen planting to part assimilate it within the scene; and
- West where pasture fields lie and then Greenfield farm buildings– **Major / Moderate Adverse** at Year 1 with scale of visible earth works and sense of change reducing to **Minor Adverse** with the formation of a woodland planting belt removing the sense of the bund but not replacing sight to the open field.

Effects on the landscape character of the contextual area can be amalgamated as **Moderate, Adverse** at Year 1 reducing with the establishment of the boundary planting to **Minor, Adverse and Permanent** by Year 15.

The third and final scale of landscape consideration is the proposed development's effect on the wider landscape. The wider landscape character type is the Ancient Plateau Farmland whose character description at both County and SMDC level describes elements such as the Cellarhead Electricity sub-station as 'incongruous features'. The addition of further power infrastructure will add more incongruous features to the wider Ancient Plateau Farmland. An aerial photograph figure is attached to this note that illustrates the position of the recently approved BESS schemes to the east of Cellarhead Sub-station (Applications SMD/2022/0444 & SMD/2022/0548) shown as points 1 & 2 on the aerial photograph respectively and others that are in the process of possibly gaining consent.

With all the BESS projects seeking consent there is a genuine risk of a sense of proliferation of power projects in the area and that this tips the balance from semi-upland pasture farmland with a limited number of power installations to broad scale power infrastructure with an assortment of intervening fields and screen planting left between various battery parks.

However, the individual Sites have to be judged on their own merits, as well as in the wider landscape and this particular Site is relatively discrete in the broader landscape as it is screened by Cellarhead Sub-station and its existing screen planting to the north and east and has Newfields Farm to the south. It is also fringed with a semi-open hedgerows to the west and south with the more mature trees in these boundaries contributing more interest than the hedges. It is not in a prominent position in landform terms and generally appears tucked out of general sight and appreciation in the wider landscape. Overall the long-term residual landscape effect of this single field being put to a BESS for the wider landscape is **Minor, Adverse and Permanent** for the duration of operation of the equipment.

The woodland planting along the western and southern sides of the field is acknowledged as a landscape benefit and its long term management as a diverse broadleaf woodland would need to be secured through a Landscape Management and Maintenance Plan (LMMP). The presence of the earth bund over which it is planted is not typical of the landscape character type and will appear artificial until the planting has successfully established and hidden its physical form from sight. It is presumed that the earth bund would be formed from excavations generated from the battery yard to avoid exporting

material from Site. It would then be available for reclamation of the facility at the end of its operational licence so it can be returned back to a pasture field. The felling the established woodland to access the soil would be necessary to achieve this re-use of stripped soils from the bund.

If material is to be imported to help build the acoustic bund then it should be inert, contamination free and comply with all Environment Agency standards for transfer of materials.

The wildflower meadow seeding is considered of greater ecological benefit than a landscape one as such features within the landscape are best appreciated at close range with the proposals generally seeking to screen such visibility through hedge and woodland planting. Again the long-term management of wildflower meadows to stop their succession to woodland) without the benefit of hay cuts or grazing animals) should be a point of specific consideration in any LMMP. Also the suitability and fertility of the soil needs to be proven to be appropriate for the seed mix and if it is not then suitable ground preparation such as topsoil / subsoil inversion should be undertaken.

5. Visual effects from surrounding rural areas

The main Site is effectively open and visible from public footpaths Cheddleton FP48 that runs along the east side of the field and Cheddleton FP60 that runs just outside of the southern side of the field. There are also a lesser view from Cheddleton FP58 to the south west but this is a more filtered view from approximately 200m away at its closest point.

The residential receptors at Newfield Farm are also a visual receptor and even though they may be accepting of the proposals it does not mean that the residential amenity of future residents should be disregarded.

Taking these visual effects in order of listing;

Cheddleton FP48 – runs for 130m along the east side of the open Site before entering into a nibbed corner of the field containing taller ruderal vegetation before running for 120m through established scrub and trees to the north of the Site. The proposals seek to screen off views from the eastern part of this footpath route by running it within a hedged boundary by setting a hedge approximately 4m away from the field's wood enclosed fence line. The hedge on establishment in 8 to 12 years would then screen out views to the acoustic barrier and sub-station equipment to the east side of the battery yard. I do not consider this an effective solution to treating users of FP48 for they will have close range views at approximately 40m away to the main development area until the hedge reaches maturity above eye-level. The growth rate of the hedge will be impaired by the proximity of the mature woodland set to the east of the field. Finally once established the route will not be an attractive one to walk with narrow enclosed views, fundamentally dark and uninteresting compared to its current offering. An alternative arrangement is suggested in the design modifications section below. The footpath users around the field are considered to have **Medium/Low** visual sensitivity given their existing appreciation of Cellarhead, combined with a **Large** magnitude of effect would lead to a **Moderate, Adverse** significance of effect at Year 1. With the hedge screening to the east and more woodland planting to the north at Year 15 this would diminish magnitude to **Medium/Small** leading to a **Minor, Adverse and Permanent** effect.

Cheddleton FP60 – runs for 150m along the south side of the Site with its eastern third set within the outbuildings and next to the farm building itself. Users of the path will be able to see the southern side of the proposals along the route to the battery yard's main access. The proposed bunding and planting will screen the western third of the yard from path users, the middle third of the path will have open sight to the acoustic barrier and security fencing and the eastern third would be screened by Newfield Farm buildings. The bund is anticipated to screen off sight into the battery yard immediately (assuming

a solid acoustic gate is provided) and the farm buildings will do so immediately, leaving the middle portion of this path to have close range (approx. 40m) open views even with the mitigation planting established. This will allow path users to mark the position of the central battery yard and perceive the Site as power infrastructure and different to the wider pastoral landscape character. The footpath users on FP60 to the south of the field are considered to have **Medium** visual sensitivity given they have some, but not close-up, appreciation of Cellarhead, combined with a **Large** magnitude of effect would lead to a **Major/Moderate, Adverse** significance of effect at Year 1. With the planted bund screening to the north and wildflower meadow at Year 15 this would diminish magnitude to a **Medium** level leading to a **Moderate, Adverse and Permanent** visual effect.

Cheddleton FP58 – is set to the south west of the proposals at approximately 200m and users on it have mid-range views back to Site's southern and western boundaries. Views from approximately 400m of the path have partly screened sight to the Site field. This existing screening comes from the hedgerow trees and to a lesser extent the hedgerows themselves that are set between the viewer and the Site. At Year 1 the earth bund and possibly the tops of the eastern containers and sub-station in the battery park would be evident. The earth bund when its planting establishes and starts to put on height will appear as scrubby woodland in an estimated 8 to 10 years. The distance and slight elevation that this path has over the Site field means the bund planting will take longer to become an effective screen than closer views from FP60. Path users on FP58 have a **Medium/High** sensitivity without the close influence of Cellarhead Sub-station, the magnitude of effects at Year 1 will be **Medium** resulting in an initial **Moderate, Adverse** significance of visual effect. It should be recognised that the bund will initially appear as an uncharacteristic feature within the undulating terrain. With the bund planting fully established at Year 15 sight to the proposals will generally have been removed with the exception of the small entrance gap to the southern boundary of the battery yard. With the **Medium/High** sensitivity, combined with a **Small/None** magnitude of effect the resulting significance of visual effect is **Minor, Adverse and Permanent**.

In considering house part of Armshead Farm as a residential visual receptor it is set approximately 50m to the south east of the battery yard. At this distance a 4m high acoustic barrier is required to keep their residential amenity. The same acoustic barrier, fronted by the security fence would be the primary focus of the residence's view to the north and west. The landscape strategy shows it fronted by wildflower meadow so there is no substantial vegetative screen between the house and the battery yard.

Typically, sensitivity of residential receptors is automatically judged to be **High** given the value they place on the view from their abode. However in this situation I would reduce it to **Medium** given the fact that they are not as susceptible to power infrastructure equipment with Cellarhead Sub-station as a visual influence. The magnitude of effect would be **Large** resulting in a **Major/Moderate** significance of effect. With wider mitigation and loss of 'rawness' the magnitude of effect reduces to **Medium** resulting in a **Moderate, Adverse and Permanent** visual effect. The current residents are suspected to be accepting of this effect if they benefit from the proposals but future residents of the property will experience them also until the removal of the facility.

In summary the initial effects of forming the acoustic bund and erecting the acoustic barrier will be highly notable until the mitigation planting establishes and even with this planting there will still be adverse visual effects with the former longer views from FP's 48 & 60 truncated by the solid barriers. In looking back from the paths to the south and west these proposals will likely be read as an extension to Cellarhead Sub-station whose taller elements are visible behind this Site. From the wider landscape the planted acoustic bund will introduce a further block of woodland planting into the scene and assist in disrupting views to the lower equipment at Cellarhead. However it would not block out sight to the pylons that emanate from it. For **Medium/High** sensitive path users to the south and west the

magnitude of change would be **Small/None** leading to a **Minor, Positive and Permanent** effect as long as the planted bund remains. This effect is for paths in the wider area rather than the ones already discussed above.

6. Cumulative effects – Please see Fig 1 to locate various proposals

There are two sets of cumulative effects to consider. The first with the existing Cellarhead Sub-station, the second with the potential BESS development across fields to the south west and south east of these proposals.

This proposal will appear as an extension to Cellarhead Sub-station by virtue of the similar equipment it holds (DNO Sub-station, security fencing, warning signs and CCTV) but there is an actual publicly accessible route and gap between the two, namely FP48. However it is not considered that Cellarhead will appear any larger in the wider landscape given the scale difference between these proposals and the existing facility.

There will be intervisibility from paths to the south and west of this Site of this and other BESS sites should similar proposals be brought forward. There is also the matter of the sequential experience of walking the routes passing one BESS facility after another and this changing the scenic qualities of the area. There are too many permutations to take into account in this consultation note but the wider capacity of the area to accommodate multiple energy applications should be factored into your decision-taking process.

7. Potential design amendments

The following summary of potential design amendments are given as a way of improving the landscape and visual aspect of the proposals. Their adoption should be sought if you are minded to consent the proposals.

- The rounding of the top of the acoustic bund and varying its slope gradients to mitigate its artificial land form appearance;
- Considering breaking up the top line and varying the colour of noise barrier to make it appear less uniform until the mitigation planting establishes;
- Ensuring that inert material forms the basis of the acoustic bund;
- Further detail on how the meadow diversity would be achieved on ground previously improved by nutrient application;
- Specifying recessive colours for the acoustic barriers and security fencing to minimise their notability in mid and long range views;
- Patches of parkland trees in the meadow grass to the east of the battery yard to add additional screening whilst still retaining the meadow habitat; or
- Seeking diversion of the FP48 to track along FP60 to the south and then up the west of the Site to give a better user experience visually with the equipment set behind the bund and a more pleasant view to the west.

8. Landscape Policy Compliance

The SMDC landscape planning policies that need to be considered are;

SS11 – Churnet Valley Strategy – Site is considered outside of Churnet Valley Area

DC3 – Landscape and Settlement Setting

This is the main landscape focussed policy of the Local Plan that seeks to protect and where possible enhance local landscape. The five parts to its policy box are set below and considered in turn;

1. Resisting development which would lead to prominent intrusion into the countryside or have a significant adverse impact on the character or the setting of a settlement or important views into and out of the settlement as identified in the Landscape and Settlement Character evidence.

There would be intrusion arising from the new facility and it is considered prominent for a minimum period of 6 to 8 years and a reduced level until the mitigation planting screens the artificial form of the acoustic bund and barrier.

Conflict with Part 1 of the policy has been found.

2. Supporting development which respects and enhances local landscape character and which reinforces and enhances the setting of the settlement as identified in the Landscape and Settlement Character evidence.

The existing field does not form the setting to any settlement so that part of the policy is not applicable. The proposals cannot be classed as leading to a net improvement in local landscape character so cannot be considered as complying.

Conflict with Part 2 of the policy.

3. Supporting developments which conserve or enhance the biodiversity qualities of any natural or man-made features within the landscape, such as trees, woodlands, hedgerows, walls, watercourses or ponds.

The proposed field margin wildflower seeding, hedgerow planting and woodland belt creation over the acoustic bund and to the north would all comply with this part of the policy. Its long-term establishment and ecological contribution will need to be delivered through an appropriate landscape management and maintenance plan (LMMP).

Compliance with Part 3.

4. Supporting opportunities to positively manage the landscape and use sustainable building techniques and materials which are sympathetic to the landscape.

The sustainable building techniques could be applied to the demountability of the scheme and ease of removal should the proposals become defunct or superfluous to the power grid. The materials and building form, particularly of a typical acoustic fence, are clearly not sympathetic to the landscape when compared to traditional materials used in the area.

Conflict with Part 4 even though this part of the policy does not appear to be strongly applicable to the proposals.

5. Ensuring that development does not adversely affect the wider setting of the Peak District National Park.

This part of the policy is not applicable to these proposals as the site is sufficiently remote from the PDNP.

Not applicable.

NE2 – Tree, Woodland and Hedgerows

This three-part policy is aimed to 'protect existing trees, woodlands and hedgerows, in particular, ancient woodland, veteran trees and ancient or species-rich hedgerows from loss or deterioration.'

The first part that seeks the integration of trees, woodlands and hedgerows on site unless their removal clearly outweighs their loss is complied with by the retention of boundary hedgerow and trees. The offset of the western acoustic bund away from the root protection area of the Site's western hedgerow is noted and this 'gap' also needs to be protected should construction come to pass as it is easy to inadvertently kill trees through soil compaction caused by site vehicle routes. This is controllable through Arboricultural Impact Assessment work and defining site exclusion zones.

Part 1 - Compliance.

The second part seeks new tree planting associated with development that this scheme demonstrates to the south and west of the Site. The proposed species, size at planting and planting densities appear appropriate.

Part 2 – Compliance but the scheme would benefit from some open ground tree planting to the east and possibly to disguise the main site entrance to the south.

The third and final part of the policy addresses the retention of ancient woodland, veteran trees and ancient or species rich hedgerows. The hedgerow trees to the west field boundary appear as the oldest stock around the Site and these are retained.

Confirmation of root protection areas and avoidance of excavations, trenching, ditch digging that could affect the trees' roots is recommended if not already submitted.

Part 3 – Compliance.

9. Suggested planning conditions

There is clear landscape and visual harm to be put in the planning balance but should you be minded to grant planning consent and notwithstanding the already submitted landscape proposals the following planning conditions are suggested;

- A. That a detailed hard and soft landscape mitigation scheme is submitted for consideration.
Reason – to ensure that the proposals maintain the boundary character and respect the neighbouring landscape.
- B. The soft landscape proposals should be implemented in the first growing season after construction has commenced and replacement of dead, diseased or dying stock should be undertaken in accordance with a Landscape Maintenance and Management Plan for a minimum period of 20 years. *Reason – to ensure the quality of the landscape mitigation measures.*
- C. That no tree felling is undertaken on , or excavation within root protection areas, without the express written agreement of SMDC's Arboricultural Officer and after consideration of tree sensitive construction processes – *Reason to protect the remaining mature tree stock that contributes to the local landscape.*
- D. That a Landscape Maintenance and Management Plan (LMMP) is prepared for implementation by the site owners for the full operational life of the facility and that an arrangement for continuation of the LMMP by future owners is entered into should the Site be sold – *Reason – to reflect the importance of the soft landscape mitigation proposals for the local landscape character.*
- E. Low light level scheme – *Reason – to reduce the intrusive nature of lighting in the hours of darkness.*
- F. That details of the acoustic barrier including elevation treatment is submitted for agreement with SMDC– *Reason to protect local landscape character until mitigation planting has established.*

- G. That a schedule of works activities in the form of a site restoration plan is produced to explain the removal of equipment and full restoration of the battery yard back to a pasture field is submitted for agreement with SMDC prior to the Site becoming operational. In addition at the end of the operational life of the facility that it is not deemed to be brownfield land – *Reason to protect local landscape character and rural amenity on the cessation of use as a power storage park.*

I recognise that the suggested conditions could possibly be combined with others that have been suggested and may require re-wording to be enforceable but wished to explain the reasoning behind them.

I trust you find these comments useful as you consider the determination of this application and I have forwarded photography from my site visit by separate cover for your report. Should you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me.

Director – Ryder Landscape Consultants

7 May 2024

Energy Projects Near Cellarhead Electricity Sub-station

Plan I - Positions of Other Power Infrastructure Projects Near Cellarhead Sub-station



Key to Power Projects

- 1 - SMD/2022/0444** – Site to north east of Cellarhead substation. Planning permission approved (22/12/22) – facility for 196 battery containers, 98 inverter units, 49 transformer units, application site area 9.42ha (2.58ha of developed area)

2 - SMD/2022/0548 – Site to east of Cellarhead substation. Planning permission approved (27/06/23) facility for 112 battery containers, and 56 transformers, application site area 5.4ha

3 - SMD/2022/0574 – Site at Armshead Farm (this Appeal). Planning permission refused – facility for 64 battery containers, 32 transformer units, application site area 1.3ha.

4 - SMD/2024/0019 – Land at Newfields Farm, Rowall Road. Application submitted and pending consideration. 14 battery storage racks, 14 skid solutions (inverters and transformers). Application site extends to 2.48ha (approx. 0.5ha to be developed).

5 - SMD/2023/0055 - Erection of a Flexible Energy Facility, associated works, landscaping and habitat creation – facility for 248 battery containers, 62 transformers and 124 invertors on a total site of 22.4 ha. The area of the facility where all proposed plant and machinery will be located extends to 4.45 ha. Application submitted pending consideration and this is EIA development

6 - SMD/2023/0523 - Land At Rowall Farm. Installation of a solar farm comprising ground mounted solar PV panels with a generating capacity of up to 49.99MW. Site 58ha in area. Application submitted pending consideration

7 - SMD/2023/0639 - Land at Greenfields Farm, Thorney Edge road. EIA Screening opinion for battery storage (no numbers specified) on 8.9ha site. Potentially EIA development

Note
For more accurate representation of development red line boundaries please see individual applications on SMDC Planning Application web pages. For Footpath routing please Staffordshire County Council Definitive Map or online Public Web Map service.