



Staffordshire County Council
Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Development Management Procedure Order 2015

To: Staffordshire Moorlands
 Staffordshire Moorlands District Council
 Moorlands House
 Stockwell Street
 Leek
 ST13 6HQ

Applicant:
 Masdar Arlington Energy 4 Kingdom Street, London W2
 6BD

Application Type: FULL

Officer:

Our Reference: SMD20250354

District Reference: SMD/2025/0354

Date Received: 13-Aug-2025

Date Responded: 02-Sep-2025

Particulars of Development:

Erection of a 300 MW Battery Energy Storage System (BESS)

Location of Development:

Land off Leek Road, Cellarhead, Staffordshire, ST9 0DQ

Recommendation Summary: Conditional

Site Visit Conducted on: 20-Aug-2025

1. Before the proposed development is commenced, details of the proposed access improvements to the field access comprising as a minimum: widening to accommodate swept paths; bound surfacing with construction detail to accommodated HCV traffic. The access shall thereafter be constructed in accordance with the approved details under Works Agreement and retained and maintained for the duration of the construction period.
2. The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until the visibility splays shown on plan 794-PLN-NPI-0181-DR-002 have been provided. The visibility splays shall thereafter be kept free of all obstructions to visibility over a height of 600 mm above the adjacent carriageway level.
3. No development shall take place, until a revised Construction Traffic Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The Statement shall provide for:
 - i) a site compound with associated temporary buildings;
 - ii) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
 - iii) loading and unloading of plant and materials;
 - iv) storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
 - v) wheel wash facilities including means of dealing with water runoff;
 - vi) mechanical road sweeper for existing carriageway;

REASONS

ALL to comply with NPPF paragraph 115 and 116; to comply with SMDC Local Plan Policy DC1; in the interests of highway safety.

IMPORTANT INFORMATIVE TO BE INCLUDED ON DECISION NOTICE

The access crossing to the site from the highway shall be improved in accordance with details to be submitted. The conditions requiring off-site highway works shall require a Highway Works Agreement with Staffordshire County Council. The applicant is requested to contact Staffordshire County Council in

order to secure the Agreement. The link below is to the Highway Works Information Pack including an application form. Please complete and send to the address indicated on the application form or email . The applicant is advised to begin this process well in advance of any works taking place in order to meet any potential timescales.

<https://www.staffordshire.gov.uk/Highways/highwayscontrol/HighwaysWorkAgreements.aspx>

As abnormal indivisible loads are expected consultation with and approval of SCC will be required. Please contact

NOTES TO PLANNING OFFICER

Application is for a BESS.

Pre application consultation was carried out but application was submitted very soon after the response and none of the recommendations have been included in the application.

Transport Statement and Construction Traffic Management Plan both refer to the existing field access 'which can be upgraded' but no details of these upgrades are included. Condition is recommended as pre commencement as upgrade will be required, developer acknowledges that upgrading will be required, pre app response stated details should be provided at application and extent of works should be clear before works commence as this will be the main access for the development. Condition can be discharged on confirmation of application for Works Agreement.

Adequate visibility plays can be provided at this access. Condition recommended to maintain these. Visibility at the Shirleys yard access is within a 30mph area and exceeds minimum standards.

Transport Statement and Construction Traffic Management Plan have been submitted which consider transport aspects of the construction period. While there is little detail, they do state a 32 month construction period and an average of 6 vehicles per day. The site is directly adjacent to a long established, large, transport yard. An average of 6 HCVs per day on a principal A road could not be considered to be severe.

These comments were made at pre app:
Access option 1 – Upgraded field access:

ATC's are the preferred method of surveys.

Visibility plays of 2.4m x 177.5m to the south and 2.4m x 151m to the north east are appropriate and achievable within highway land and should be provided.

Swept path drawings are included showing 16.5m articulated vehicle. Proposed kerb line is shown which provides a large bellmouth. It is not specified what the shading represents, but shading does not match up to the kerb line. I take it that when constructed, surfacing will match the kerblines? Although not specified, the access will need to be bound surfaced to an appropriate standard to accommodate multiple HCV movements for the construction period such that it won't break up under turning movements and no loose material is brought onto the carriageway. Widening of the access past the existing field gates should also be specified. The precise improvements are not specified. These should be detailed in the planning application.

Is it intended to maintain the access as improved once construction is complete? Or reduce the size of the access appropriate to smaller vehicles?

Construction of a bellmouth will require works agreement with SCC. Please see Highways Agreements - Staffordshire County Council for details.

Access Option 2 – Via Shirleys Transport yard

This is an existing access which has been in use as access to a transport yard for many years. It is in a 30mph area and visibility is in excess of minimum requirements. Speed camera is located approx. 50m from the access.

Internal movements in Shirleys yard will be a matter for agreement between the developer and management of Shirleys transport. However, it is a longstanding transport yard and any pedestrians should be familiar with and expecting HCV movements.

As swept paths show a widening of this access is required, this should form part of the works agreement.

Use of this access for AILs is likely to be more appropriate. Access to Shirleys yard is off A520, a principal route. While it is an A road, parts run through built up areas from A50. Careful consideration of the access route from the motorway network should be considered by the haulage contractor. This should be agreed with SCC when contacting

I note in para 1.30 all access for AILs will be via A520 south, but that swept path also shows access from A520 north. Cellarhead crossroads may be challenging for an AIL. If A520 north is to be used as access, swept path at Cellarhead crossroads should be carried out.

Delivery route will be A520 or A52. Both are A roads and principal roads.

Trips in the operational phase would be negligible.

Construction Traffic Management Plan has been included in the application. A construction layout area is shown on the drawing – is this the compound area? This should include site compound with associated temporary buildings; parking for construction workers and visitors; loading/unloading/storage area; plant storage.

Para 6.3 refers to up to 60 staff on site but that number of cars could be 30. Paras 6.11 and 6.12 go on to refer to a parking area of 5 vehicles. This is contradictory and requires clarification. A parking area of at least 30 vehicles would seem appropriate with provision for overflow parking.

Wheelwash should be provided and its location shown. Road sweeper should be available, either regularly or on call, if/as required. Condition above refers to revised CTMP to clarify these points.

Current records show that there was 1 personal injury collision (PIC) on Leek Road within 215m either side of the proposal in the previous five years. Although all PICs are regrettable, the overall volume of collisions does not suggest there are any existing safety problems that would be exacerbated by the proposed development.

There are a number of applications of this type in this area. This proposal is remote from the majority of these and accessed directly off an A road.

Assistant Director, Highways and the Built County
On behalf of the County Council as
Highway Authority