

Planning, Heritage and Design and Access Statement for Proposed Amendments to Approved and Operational Energy Storage Facility.

Woodend Farm, Woodend, Egremont, CA22 2TA.

On behalf of Cleator Battery Storage Ltd.

Date: December 2025 | Pegasus Ref: P22-0882



Document Management.

Version	Date	Author	Checked/ Approved by:	Reason for revision
1	04/12/2025	AGH/NW	CC	First Issue
2	11/12/2025	AGH/NW	CC	Peer Review
3	23/12/2025	AGH/NW	CC	Client Issue



Contents

Document Management..... i

1. Introduction.....1

2. Site Description and Planning History2

3. Proposed Development..... 4

4. Planning Policy 5

5. Assessment of Development Proposals 9

6. Conclusions16

1. Introduction

- 1.1. This statement has been prepared by Pegasus Group on behalf of Cleator Battery Storage Ltd, in support of a full planning application for proposed amendments to approved and operational energy storage facility at Woodend Farm, Woodend, Egremont, CA22 2TA. This full application is being made following planning permission (4/16/2263/OF1), which was granted approval on 27 October 2016. A subsequent NMA application under ref: 4/16/2263/OF1 to amend the existing layout was granted approval on 16th February 2017.
- 1.2. Further to this, in December 2022, an application for proposed amendments to the approved and operational storage facility was approved under permission ref: 4/22/2335/OF1. However, this permission was not implemented and has now lapsed. Therefore the 2016 permission remains the extant permission.
- 1.3. The applicant wishes to amend the existing, operational energy storage facility, therefore, the applicant has prepared and submitted this application which cover the proposed amendments.
- 1.4. The purpose of the statement is to assess the proposals against the relevant planning considerations, in respect of current local planning policy and national planning policy in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and regard to any other material considerations.
- 1.5. This planning application will consist of the following:
 - Planning Application Form and Certificates;
 - Covering Letter;
 - Site Location Plan drwg no. SOP_100_LOCATION PLAN_Cleator_Ennerdale-House-Woodend-Egremont-Cumberland-CA22-2TA rev. A;
 - Site Layout Plan drwg no. SOP_103_CLEATOR_SITE LAYOUT rev. C;
 - Site Elevations drwg no. 17-0104-1_site_layout – Elevations rev. A;
 - BESS Container Elevations drwg. no. AUG_110_1_CLEATOR_BESS_STATION_ELEVATION DRAWINGS_1 IN 50 rev. A;
 - MV Station Elevations drwg no. AUG_110_2_CLEATOR_MV STATION_ELEVATION DRAWINGS_1 IN 50 rev. A;
 - Palisade Fencing Elevation drwg no. SOP_032_Palisade Fence Elevation drawing rev. A;
 - Detailed Planting Plan drwg. no. P22-0882_EN_002;
 - Planning, Heritage, Design and Access Statement (Pegasus Group);
 - 251113 – Cleator BESS Augmentation – Noise Impact Assessment (Parker Jones Acoustics);
 - Ecological Impact Assessment (Taxus Ecology);
 - Biodiversity Net Gain Report Cleator BESS December 2025 R1 (Taxus Ecology);
 - Biodiversity Net Gain Metric (Taxus Ecology); and
 - Landscape and Visual Note (Pegasus Group).
- 1.6. This Planning, Heritage and Design & Access Statement assesses the development proposal in relation to all relevant planning policy and demonstrates that the application is in accordance with the adopted Development Plan for Copeland Borough Council. This statement draws conclusions on the suitability of the proposals in the context of the development plan and takes into account all relevant material considerations of the development proposals given the site's location and constraints.

2. Site Description and Planning History

- 2.1. The site is an existing approved and operational energy storage facility.
- 2.2. There is existing landscaping within the site which was previously implemented as part of the original 2016 permission, including native woodland planting on the bund, as well as wildflower grassland on the adjacent slopes.

Landscape and Visual Amenity

- 2.3. The previous 2022 permission on this site for an extension to and amendments to the existing energy storage facility found that the principle of development was acceptable given the established use and its alignment with local and national energy policies. In terms of landscape, the officer acknowledged potential visual impacts due to the semi-rural setting and proximity to residential properties, but concluded that once landscaping was implemented and matured, the development would not result in significant adverse effects and could deliver beneficial long-term landscape outcomes. On this basis, the proposal was considered acceptable and compliant with relevant local and national policy, with temporary construction impacts outweighed by effective mitigation and the wider public benefits of sustainable energy storage.
- 2.4. A Landscape and Visual Note to help assess the potential impact of the proposed amendments on local, wider views and landscape character accompanies the application alongside an updated landscaping planning plan.
- 2.5. Landscaping within the site is now mature, it is expected that views will be better screened and less substantial to what they were when the previous 2016 permission was consented.
- 2.6. No fundamental landscape or visual difference has been identified between the effects of the battery storage facility extension proposals from the previous 2022 permission and those of the current battery storage facility extension proposals from 2025.

Noise

- 2.7. An updated Noise Impact Assessment has been prepared by Parker Jones Acoustics and is submitted as part of the application.
- 2.8. In summary, the report concludes that the proposed amendments to the scheme will not increase noise emissions compared to the levels previously accepted under the 2022 permission. Using worst-case modelling with all new plant operating simultaneously at full output, predicted noise levels at the nearest receptors remain at 39 dB and 33 dB for NSR1 and NSR2, and reduce from 33 dB to 25 dB at NSR3.
- 2.9. These results confirm that the revised layout and equipment specification—including integrated rooftop silencers on battery containers, Noise Relief Covers on MV stations, and inward-facing orientation of the noisiest façades—will not worsen noise impact and may offer improvements. As the 2022 scheme was deemed acceptable against WHO guideline values, and the current proposal achieves equal or better performance, the assessment concludes that the development remains compliant and no additional mitigation is required.

Heritage

- 2.10. In the officers report of the previously consented 2022 scheme, the Conservation Officer was of the opinion that as the site is already within the plot of the existing battery storage facility, it will entail less-than-substantial harm towards the negligible end of the scale, to the setting of the nearby listed building.
- 2.11. The officer also stated whilst there will be greater less-than-substantial harm temporarily during the construction works and the establishment of the vegetation, once this has taken place and matured it may be more successful for screening the development than is currently the case.
- 2.12. A Heritage Statement is included at chapter 5 of this Planning Statement.

Ecology

- 2.13. A Habitat Regulations Assessment was undertaken for the original consented 2016 application and there is expected to be no further ecological harm or disruption.
- 2.14. Updated planning policy requires proposals to deliver 10% on site biodiversity net gain. A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and BNG Report and Metric have therefore prepared are submitted as part of the application.

Planning History

- 2.15. The planning history for the site is as follows:
- **4/22/2335/OF1**– Extension to Battery Storage Facility (Application approved 15 December 2022).
 - **4/ 16/2263/OF1** – Application for non-material amendment to planning permission 4/16/2263/OF1; extension of electricity substation to facilitate grid connected battery storage facility and associated landscaping. (Application approved 16 February 2017).
 - **4/16/2263/OF1** – Extension of electricity substation to facilitate grid connected battery storage facility and associated landscaping. (Application approved 27 October 2016).

3. Proposed Development

- 3.1. The purpose for the proposed amendments to the site are to incorporate design optimisations and improve operational efficiency, allowing the battery storage duration on the site to increase from 30 minutes to 2 hours, and to increase the import and export capacity by 5MW.
- 3.2. The proposed development consists of minor amendments to an approved and operational energy storage facility. The Proposed new equipment is as follows:
- 3 no. new MV Stations;
 - 6 no. new BESS Stations;
 - 2 no. new lighting/CCTV columns;
 - Existing lighting/CCTV column to be removed;
 - Parts of existing fence to be removed;
 - Proposed acoustic/palisade fencing; and
 - Proposed bund.
- 3.3. Further details can be found on the Proposed Site Layout drwg. no. SOP_103_CLEATOR_SITE LAYOUT rev. C which is submitted as part of the application alongside a full drawings package which includes elevations for the proposed infrastructure.
- 3.4. Energy storage facilities are a key component of a low carbon and decentralized energy system as part of a supply management system. Battery storage provides a capability to store electrical energy for use when peak energy needs are required. This helps to balance out the supply and demand differentials in the national grid as a whole and in the local network as a result of local energy production and consumption.
- 3.5. Moreover, a battery storage system is not only a benefit to low carbon energy and decentralized production, but it is also a benefit to all non-fuel-based energy systems because it can store surplus energy generated without the use of fuel (such as wind or solar power sources) and release it on demand, obviating the need to use fuel (either fossil, nuclear or biomass).
- 3.6. NPPF Glossary defines decentralised energy as: *Local renewable and local low carbon energy sources*. This proposal fits easily within this definition.
- 3.7. The proposed amendments should be considered appropriate due to the existing battery site and the immediately adjacent substation. It would be viewed as effectively amending and improving an existing energy infrastructure installation. The approval of the scheme should be supported within the context of updated national policy and the increased push for renewable energy with storage facilities playing a crucial part. As such the proposal is considered to accord with the policies of the Copeland Local Plan (2021–2039) and the relevant sections of the NPPF (2024).

4. Planning Policy

Legislative Background

- 4.1. This chapter summarises the planning policies and guidance relevant to the application development proposed. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plans, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 4.2. The development plan for Copeland Borough Council consists of the Copeland Local Plan 2021–2039.
- 4.3. The policies relevant to this proposal are as follows:

Copeland Local Plan 2021–2039

- Policy DS4– Design and Development Standards;
- Policy DS5: Hard and Soft Landscaping;
- Policy CC1– Large Scale Energy Developments (excluding nuclear and wind energy developments);
- Strategic Policy N1: Conserving and Enhancing Biodiversity and Geodiversity;
- Strategic Policy N3: Biodiversity Net Gain;
- Strategic Policy N6: Landscape Protection;
- Strategic Policy BE1: Heritage Assets; and
- Policy BE2: Designated Heritage Assets.

National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024)

- 4.4. The NPPF sets out a broad framework for plan making and decision taking at the local level. It must be taken into account in the presentation of local and neighbourhood plans and is a key material consideration in planning decisions.
- 4.5. The following paragraphs are of relevance:
 - **Paragraph 2** states that planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the Local Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
 - **Paragraph 8** of the Framework identifies how the planning system has three overarching objectives for achieving sustainable development which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways so that opportunities can be taken to secure net gains across each of the different objectives. The three overarching objectives are listed as:

a) an economic objective – to help build a strong, responsive, and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation, and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure.

b) a social objective – to support strong, vibrant, and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering a well-designed and safe built environment, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities' health, social and cultural well-being.

c) an environmental objective – to protect and enhance our natural, built, and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy.

- **Paragraph 9** advises how the overarching objectives should be delivered through the preparation and implementation of plans and the application of policies in the Framework.
- **Paragraph 10** states *"So that sustainable development is pursued in a positive way, at the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development"*
- **Paragraph 85** confirms the Government's commitment to supporting sustainable economic growth and states (inter alia) *"Planning policies and decisions should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt. Significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development. The approach taken should allow each area to build on its strengths, counter any weaknesses, and address the challenges of the future."*
- **Paragraph 88**, supporting a prosperous rural economy, is also pertinent as the Development Plan identifies the Site as being located in the open countryside, it states how planning decisions should enable the sustainable growth of all types of businesses in the rural areas; and the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses.
- **Paragraph 135** sets out that planning decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing appropriate innovation or change.
- **Paragraph 165** of the NPPF sets out the planning policy perspective with regard to increasing the use and supply of renewable and low-carbon energy. Through the paragraphs, the Government requires the decision-maker to:

- a) provide a positive strategy for energy from these sources, that maximises the potential for a suitable development, and their future re-powering and life extension, while ensuring that adverse impacts are addressed appropriately (including cumulative landscape and visual impacts);
 - b) consider identifying suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy sources, and supporting infrastructure, where this would help secure their development.
 - c) identify opportunities for development to draw its energy supply from decentralised, renewable, or low carbon energy supply systems and for co-locating potential heat customers and suppliers.
- **Paragraph 166** In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should expect new development to:
 - a) comply with any development plan policies on local requirements for decentralised energy supply unless it can be demonstrated by the applicant, having regard to the type of development involved and its design, that this is not feasible or viable;
 - b) take account of landform, layout, building orientation, massing and landscaping to minimise energy consumption.
- **Paragraph 167** Local planning authorities should also give significant weight to the need to support energy efficiency and low carbon heating improvements to existing buildings, both domestic and non-domestic (including through installation of heat pumps and solar panels where these do not already benefit from permitted development rights). Where the proposals would affect conservation areas, listed buildings or other relevant designated heritage assets, local planning authorities should also apply the policies set out in chapter 16 of this Framework.
- **Paragraph 168** When determining planning applications for all forms of renewable and low carbon energy developments and their associated infrastructure, local planning authorities should:
 - a) not require applicants to demonstrate the overall need for renewable or low carbon energy, and give significant weight to the benefits associated with renewable and low carbon energy generation and the proposal's contribution to a net zero future;
 - b) recognise that small-scale and community-led projects provide a valuable contribution to cutting greenhouse gas emissions;
 - c) in the case of applications for the repowering and life-extension of existing renewable sites, give significant weight to the benefits of utilising an established site.
- **Paragraph 215** Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use

- **Paragraph 216** The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
- **Paragraph 221** Local planning authorities should assess whether the benefits of a proposal for enabling development, which would otherwise conflict with planning policies but which would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset, outweigh the disbenefits of departing from those policies.

4.6. Overall, the Framework confirms that the primary objective of development management is to foster the delivery of sustainable development, not to hinder or prevent it. Local Authorities should approach development management decisions positively – looking for solutions rather than problems so that applications can be approved wherever it is practical to do so.

NPPF Consultation Draft (December 2025)

- 4.7. On 16 December 2025, a draft consultation version of the NPPF was published. It updates national planning policy across several chapters, including plan-making, decision-making, sustainable development, climate change, housing, economy, clean energy and water, and land use.
- 4.8. Chapter 10 now places significant emphasis on repowering and life-extension of existing facilities, confirming that applicants are not required to demonstrate overall need and that substantial weight should be given to the benefits of such proposals in achieving net zero.
- 4.9. These changes provide a clear national policy basis for the proposed amendments at Woodend Farm, aligning with the Framework's objectives to maximise renewable energy potential and improve operational efficiency within established sites.

5. Assessment of Development Proposals

- 5.1. The following section of this report assesses the development proposals against the policies of the Development Plan and policies and guidance set out at national level.
- 5.2. It is considered that the key issues in the determination of the planning application are heritage, design, ecology and biodiversity, and visual landscape. The principle of development for energy storage on the site has been established by the original and implemented permission for the development of an electricity storage facility ref. 4/16/2263/OF1. This proposal represents a continuation, in a varied format of that acceptable development.
- 5.3. In addition, there are substantial public benefits arising from the scheme such as clean, renewable energy that weigh heavily in favour of the scheme. Local Plan Policy CC1 supports new renewable energy generation proposals which best maximise renewable resources and minimise environmental and amenity impacts. Although this application is not a new renewable energy generation proposal, it is for updates to an approved and operational battery energy storage facility.
- 5.4. Policy CC1 relates to renewable energy development in the Borough and states that: *"The Council will support proposals for large scale renewable and carbon neutral energy schemes and other large scale energy developments, including (but not limited to) solar farms, geothermal, low-carbon and decarbonisation, hydrogen to energy plants, and battery stores. Careful consideration should be given to siting, scale and design of the development and associated infrastructure to avoid individual and/or cumulative impacts on the following":*
- *Landscape character, including historic landscape character*
 - *Residential amenity*
 - *Visual amenity*
 - *Biodiversity*
 - *Geodiversity*
 - *Flood risk*
 - *Townscape*
 - *Coastal change*
 - *Heritage assets and their setting, including the St Bees and Whitehaven Heritage Coast*
 - *Highway safety*
 - *Aviation and defence navigation systems/communication.*
 - *The amenity of sensitive neighbouring uses (including by virtue of noise, dust, odour, air quality, traffic, glare or visual impact)*

- *The Outstanding Universal Value of the English Lake District and the Frontiers of the Roman Empire (Hadrian's Wall) World Heritage Sites*
- *Water resources and water quality (including catchment land for public water supply purposes)*

5.5. *Where proposals would result in significant adverse effects on the above, proposals will only be accepted where this harm is outweighed by the wider environmental, economic, social and community benefits and in the case of the historic environment balanced against public benefit. Where harm is unavoidable, the planning application must include details of mitigation measures proposed in order to overcome or reduce such harm. Proposals will only be considered suitable where it can be demonstrated that the planning impacts identified by local communities during consultation have been taken into account.*

5.6. The proposal meets the criteria of Local Plan Policy CC1 as demonstrated further within this chapter.

Heritage Statement

5.7. The Site contains no designated heritage assets, and is not located within a Conservation Area. Within a 500m study area from the Site, there is a single designated heritage asset, comprising the Grade II Listed Croft End House, Area Walls, Gate Piers, and Railings (NHLE 1086703), which is located c.70m to the south of the Site.

5.8. This Heritage Statement provides information with regards to the significance of the historic environment to fulfil the requirement given in paragraph 207 of the Government's *National Planning Policy Framework* (the NPPF), which requires:

"...an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting."¹

5.9. In order to inform an assessment of the acceptability of the scheme in relation to impacts on the historic environment, following paragraphs 212 to 216 of the NPPF, any harm to the historic environment resulting from the proposed development is also described, including impacts on significance through changes to setting.

5.10. Legislation relating to the built historic environment is primarily set out within the *Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990*, which provides statutory protection for Listed Buildings and their settings and Conservation Areas.²

5.11. In addition to the statutory obligations set out within the aforementioned Act, Section 38(6) of the *Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004* requires that all planning applications are determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.³

¹ Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (MHCLG), *National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)* (London, December 2024), para. 207.

² UK Public General Acts, Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

³ UK Public General Acts, Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, Section 38(6).

- 5.12. Within the Copeland Local Plan 2021–2039 (adopted November 2024), Strategic Policy BE1: Heritage Assets and Policy BE2: Designated Heritage Assets are of relevance to the application.
- 5.13. For the previously approved scheme (Application Ref. No. 4/22/2335/OF1), the Officer's Report noted that the Conservation Officer concluded the following on the application:
- "No objection, is of the opinion that the proposal will entail less-than-substantial harm, to the negligible end of the scale, to the setting of the nearby listed building."***
- 5.14. As part of the previously approved scheme, the County Archaeologist confirmed that the previous proposal did not raise any archaeological issues. Given that there are minor changes from the previously approved scheme, it is assumed that the works would also not raise any archaeological issues, and therefore an assessment of the archaeological potential of the Site has not been undertaken.
- 5.15. Development proposals may adversely impact heritage assets where they remove a feature that contributes to the significance of a heritage asset or where they interfere with an element of a heritage asset's setting that contributes to its significance, such as interrupting a key relationship or a designed view.
- 5.16. The assessment determines that the only designated heritage asset that has the potential to be sensitive to the development proposals through change to setting is the Grade II Listed Croft End House.
- 5.17. Croft End House was added to the National List as a Grade II Listed Building on 9th August 1984. The List Entry describes the building as follows:
- "House; early/mid C19. Incised stucco, over rubble with corner pilasters; eaves band. Graduated slate roof with stone copings and cast-iron gutter. Corniced stone mid and end chimneys. Symmetrical 2-storey, 3-bay front. Central part-glazed door in Greek Doric porch; tripartite sash to either side on each floor and single sash above door, all with glazing bars in stone surrounds. Low area walls c.3 ft high of coursed rubble with quoins; chamfered coping. Square, rusticated gate piers on plinth blocks; ogee finials to corniced caps. Low wrought-iron railings have square, spear-head standards."***
- 5.18. Croft End House is located to the immediate south of the Site at the junction of Dalzell Street and the A5086. The building was first mapped on the 1843 Tithe Map of the Parish of Egremont, where apportionment records show no historical association between the Listed Building and the Site, which comprises agricultural land.
- 5.19. The Listed Building occupies a prominent position at the junction of Dalzell Street and the A5086. It is visible in dynamic views along the road by the regular vehicular and pedestrian traffic running through the areas.
- 5.20. To the north of the house, there is the electricity substation within the Site. The existing energy storage facility includes a substantial earth bank (bundling), which acts as a screen between the heritage asset and the existing storage facility, and further substation. The bunding also includes tree planting, which provide continuity with the mature woodland setting that exists in the immediate grounds of the Listed Building.

- 5.21. The Grade II Listing of the building highlights that it is a heritage asset of the less than the highest significance as defined by the NPPF. The heritage significance of the Listed Building is principally embodied in the **historic** and **architectural interests** of its physical fabric, representing a late-Georgian building designed in a vernacular style.
- 5.22. The setting of Croft End House also contributes to the significance of the asset, although the significance derived from the setting is less than that derived from its historic fabric. The principal elements of the physical surrounds and experience of the asset (its 'setting') which are considered to contribute to its heritage significance are summarised below:
- The rear grounds and gardens which comprise small groupings of mature trees. These are noted on historic cartographic sources, with a functional relationship to the house, and are where the building is best experienced from.
 - Dalzell Street and the A5086. The building can be accessed from these roads, and holds a prominent position on the junction, where its vernacular architectural style can be appreciated.
- 5.23. There are elements within the surrounding area that also detract from the significance of the heritage asset, including the electricity substation to the north within the Site. The existing bunding and trees screen visibility of the modern infrastructure from the Listed Building, with some visibility in co-views between the Site and house on Dalzell Street.
- 5.24. The updated amendments to the already approved and operational storage facility comprise the minor changes, including the installation of additional equipment, as well as the installation of an acoustic / palisade fence and lighting / CCTV columns. These proposed works are all located within the existing screened facility area, and will therefore have no visual impact on the significance of the Listed Building, further to the existing baseline conditions of the operational facility.
- 5.25. Therefore, the proposals will cause **no harm** to the significance of the Grade II Listed Croft End House, through change to its wider setting. The proposals thus accord with the duties contained in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the policies of the Local Plan, and Section 16 of the NPPF.

Design and Access

Amount

- 5.26. The site comprises roughly 0.68ha and is shown on the enclosed Infrastructure Layout ref: SOP_103_CLEATOR_SITE LAYOUT_REV_C.

Layout

- 5.27. A bund is proposed around parts of the site. The maximum height is to match existing bunds. Excess spoil is to be redistributed within application boundary or removed from site. Further information can be found on the enclosed Infrastructure Layout ref: ref: SOP_103_CLEATOR_SITE LAYOUT_REV_B.

Scale

- 5.28. The scale of the proposal is to be in keeping with the surrounding landscape and the site's location.

Everything proposed is no larger and negligible in size and scale prepared to the 2022 permitted equipment, for example the 2022 BESS container was 17m long x 3.3m wide and 2.4m high whereas the 2025 containers are proposed to be 6m long x 2.4m wide and 3.1m high.

- 5.29. In short, previous approvals have established a precedent for changes of a similar scale and nature. The modifications now proposed are comparable in extent to those previously permitted. In light of this consistency, it would be reasonable to grant approval for the current proposal.

Landscaping

- 5.30. All soil is to be site topsoil or imported to meet BS topsoil requirements for 'general purpose' use. A woodland buffer mix is proposed, and wildflower seed areas are to be provided.

- 5.31. Further information can be found withing the Landscape and Visual note submitted as part of the application.

Access

- 5.32. Access to the site remains as existing (Dalzell Street to the south).

Appearance

- 5.33. New acoustic/palisade fencing is proposed. Further details can be found within the submitted Palisade Fencing Elevation drwg no. SOP_032_Palisade Fence Elevation drawing rev. A

Ecology

- 5.34. Local Plan Policy N1 relates to biodiversity and geodiversity and states:

Potential harmful impacts of any development upon biodiversity and geodiversity must be identified and considered at the earliest stage Proposals must demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Council, that the following mitigation hierarchy must have been undertaken:

- *Avoidance – Biodiversity and geodiversity must be considered when drafting up proposals and any potential harmful effects on biodiversity and geodiversity must be identified along with appropriate measures that will be taken to avoid these effects*
- *Mitigation – Where harmful effects cannot be avoided; they must be appropriately mitigated in order to overcome or reduce negative impacts.*
- *Compensation – Where mitigation is not possible or viable or in cases where residual harm would remain following mitigation, harmful effects should be compensated for.*

Where this is in the form of compensatory habitat an area of equivalent or greater biodiversity value should be provided. Compensation is a last resort and will only be accepted in exceptional circumstances.

5.35. Policy N3 relates specifically to biodiversity net gain:

All development, with the exception of that listed in the Environment Act 2021 and any documents which may supersede it must provide at least 10% biodiversity net gain over and above existing site levels, following the application of the mitigation hierarchy set out in Policy N1 above. This is in addition to any compensatory habitat provided under Policy N1.

5.36. A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) alongside a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Report and Metric have been prepared and are submitted alongside the application.

5.37. The PEA concludes that the development will take a very small footprint of land from the surrounding bunds, has very few potential impacts and is considered very low risk.

5.38. The BNG report states that the proposed development will create 0.0946ha of artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface, from the loss of other neutral grassland and concludes the development will lead to a 0.76 habitat loss. Off-site mitigations are proposed and a habitat bank will be utilised to source land to offset the unit loss which results from the proposal and will be secured through a legal agreement.

5.39. This proposal is therefore in accordance with policies N1 and N3.

Landscape and Visual Assessment

5.40. Policy N6 relates to protecting and enhancing the Borough's landscapes and assesses proposals according to whether the proposed structures and associated landscaping relates well in terms of visual impact, scale, character, amenity value and local distinctiveness and the cumulative impact of developments will be taken into account as part of this assessment.

5.41. A Landscape and Visual Note has been prepared and is submitted as part of the application. The note concludes that as previously assessed for the 2022 proposals, once the now proposed battery storage facility extension has been completed, the landscape and visual effects would be similar to that which already exist; therefore, no additional effects are predicted over and above that set out for the existing storage facility. In the longer-term, with the proposed mitigation planting having established, there would be the potential for beneficial landscape and visual effects. No fundamental landscape or visual difference has been identified between the effects of the battery storage facility extension proposals from 2022 (as previously assessed in the 2022 version of this report) and those of the current battery storage facility extension proposals from 2025.

5.42. As such, it is considered that the proposal accords with policy N6.

Noise

5.43. Local Policy CC1 supports proposals for renewable energy development in the Borough as long as there are no unacceptable impacts of noise that is likely to affect residents and other adjoining land users.

- 5.44. A Noise Impact Assessment has been undertaken by Parker Jones Acoustics and is submitted as part of the application and as stated earlier the report concludes that the revised layout and equipment will not worsen noise impact and may offer improvements.
- 5.45. Therefore, the proposal considers to be in accordance with policy CC1.

6. Conclusions

- 6.1. This application seeks full planning permission for proposed amendments to approved and operational energy storage facility at Woodend Farm, Woodend, Egremont, CA22 2TA.
- 6.2. Alongside the submitted drawings and accompanying reports, this statement has assessed the proposals against the relevant policies of the adopted Development Plan and National Planning Policy Framework.
- 6.3. Overall, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable in terms of heritage, design, ecology, visual landscape, and noise.
- 6.4. This proposal clearly leads to public benefits which weigh in favour of the planning balance and outweighs any harms that may exist.
- 6.5. On the basis of the above, and those other matters considered in this statement, it is considered that the proposed development accords with the Development Plan and there are no material considerations to indicate otherwise. The Local Planning Authority is therefore respectfully requested to approve the application without delay.

Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)
Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

Leeds

5th Floor (East), Capitol, Russell Street,
Leeds. LS1 5SP
T 0113 2878200
E Leeds@pegasusgroup.co.uk
Offices throughout the UK

Expertly Done.

DESIGN | ECONOMICS | ENVIRONMENT | HERITAGE | LAND & PROPERTY | PLANNING | TRANSPORT & INFRASTRUCTURE

Pegasus Group is a trading name of Pegasus Planning Group Limited (07277000) registered in England and Wales.

Registered office: 33 Sheep Street, Cirencester, GL7 1RQ

We are ISO certified 9001, 14001, 45001



[Pegasus_Group](#)



[pegasusgroup](#)



[Pegasus_Group](#)

PEGASUSGROUP.CO.UK