

REDACTED	There have been a number of fires at similar sites lately. The pollution caused by such fires is immense. The potential damage to the health of residents, even those living some distance away, is incalculable. The Fire Service's policy, in agreement with the operators of such sites, is to try to contain the fire and let it burn out. They cannot be extinguished. A recipe for disaster.	10-03-2025 12:23:29	N/A
REDACTED	Proximity to local homes: noise and traffic nuisance during construction phase. No benefit to local residents. Post construction: Battery Energy Storage facilities can generate noise pollution, at a level in excess of 70dB which would continue 24/7 and cause undue nuisance and noise pollution to local residents, as well as potentially reducing property values in the immediate area.	17-03-2025 14:17:45	N/A
REDACTED	Too close to houses, additional noise isn't needed.	22-03-2025 12:46:40	N/A
REDACTED	<p>Dear Planning Officer,</p> <p>I strongly object to the proposed Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) facility at the above location due to the significant risks and negative impacts it will have on the local community.</p> <p>1. No Direct Benefit to Local Residents</p> <p>The applicant claims that the BESS facility will contribute to energy efficiency and net-zero goals. However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stored electricity will not directly benefit local homes or businesses—it will be used for energy trading at a national level. • There is no guarantee this will reduce local energy bills or improve local energy security. • The local community will bear the risks and negative impacts, including fire hazards, pollution, noise, traffic, and loss of quality of life, with no compensation or benefit. <p>This proposal places the burden entirely on local residents while benefiting only energy companies and developers.</p>	29-03-2025 10:25:36	N/A
	<p>2. Fire Risks & Public Safety Issues</p> <p>Battery Energy Storage Systems pose a serious fire risk due to thermal runaway, which can lead to explosions and the release of toxic gases.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BESS fires are extremely difficult to extinguish and can burn for days, requiring specialized fire response strategies. • Proximity to residential areas increases the danger, as toxic smoke could spread to homes and schools. • Emergency vehicle access is severely constrained, meaning fire crews may struggle to respond in time to prevent a disaster. <p>The applicant has not demonstrated how they would ensure fire safety without putting local residents at risk.</p> <p>3. Highway Safety Concerns – The Applicant's Own Admission</p> <p>The applicant acknowledges in their own documents that access to the site is highly constrained and unsuitable for large vehicles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The road leading to the site is frequently blocked by traffic to the nearby tip, making emergency access even more difficult. • The site lacks sufficient turning space, meaning large vehicles could be forced to reverse onto the highway, creating a severe safety hazard for road users and pedestrians. • The presence of an adjacent bus stop prevents any meaningful improvements to site access. <p>Despite admitting these issues, they are still pushing forward with a project that requires large-scale infrastructure transport, maintenance, and emergency access—a reckless and dangerous decision.</p> <p>4. History of Flooding & Infrastructure Failures Nearby</p> <p>The site is next to an area with a history of severe flooding and structural collapses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Mill Vale Estate suffered four major floods in 2012, culminating in a culvert collapse on September 25th that left homes teetering on the edge of a sinkhole which had to be demolished. • Although repairs were made, there is no guarantee this will not happen again, especially given Northumberland Estates' reluctance to take long-term responsibility for the incident that impacted so many local residents. <p>Given that BESS facilities rely on electrical systems, placing one in a flood-prone area creates serious electrical hazards and fire risks.</p> <p>5. Noise Pollution Plaguing Local Residents</p> <p>Battery Energy Storage Systems generate constant low-frequency noise due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cooling fans and air conditioning systems required to prevent overheating. • Inverters and transformers converting stored energy for grid use. • Occasional high-pitched electrical noise associated with charging and discharging cycles. 		

	<p>This noise will plague nearby residents day and night, affecting sleep, quality of life, and mental well-being.</p> <p>Unlike traditional businesses that shut down overnight, a battery storage facility operates 24/7, meaning residents will never get relief from the noise.</p> <p>6. Property Value Reduction & Negative Impact on Local Housing Market</p> <p>The introduction of an industrial BESS facility near a residential area will have severe consequences for property values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perceived fire and explosion risks will deter potential buyers, making homes harder to sell. • Noise pollution and visual blight will make the area less desirable. • Increased traffic congestion and road safety concerns will further drive down demand for local properties. <p>Homeowners who have invested in the area could see their property values plummet, effectively punishing them financially for a development they did not ask for.</p> <p>No compensation or mitigation has been proposed for affected residents. Why should they be forced to suffer financial loss for a project that provides them with no benefits?</p> <p>7. Intrusive Lighting & Surveillance Impacting Residents</p> <p>The proposal includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lighting positioned around the access road and battery storage site. • Motion-sensitive LED lights, which will suddenly activate at night. • CCTV cameras attached to street lighting columns, creating privacy concerns. <p>These features will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disrupt residents' sleep due to sudden light activations. • Make residents feel constantly monitored, as CCTV could intrude on private properties. • Decrease the area's residential appeal, contributing to property devaluation. <p>8. Loss of Employment Land & Misrepresentation of Its Value</p> <p>The applicant acknowledges that this development represents a loss of designated employment land but argues that the site is of low quality and minimal importance due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supposed limited uses due to site constraints. • An oversupply of employment land elsewhere in the city. <p>This argument is flawed for several reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Poorly Located Battery Storage Facility Does Not Justify the Loss of Employment Land – Just because the land has limitations does not mean it should automatically be handed over to an industrial energy project that infringes on local residents' safety and well-being. • The Applicant Contradicts Themselves on the Site's Constraints – They admit that the site is unsafe for large vehicles, yet they are proposing a facility that relies on HGV access for construction and maintenance. • Employment Sites Are Still Valuable to Local Communities – This land could still be used for businesses that do not introduce fire risks, pollution, and traffic hazards. <p>9. Lack of Transparency & Collusion with Northumberland Estates</p> <p>This proposal appears to have been pushed forward quietly, seemingly in collusion with Northumberland Estates' so-called solar farm, without proper consultation with local residents.</p> <p>If these projects were truly beneficial to the local community, why have they been kept from public scrutiny until now?</p> <p>This proposal is not worth the risk to local residents' safety, well-being, and financial security. I urge the planning committee to reject this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Hide More</p>		
REDACTED	<p>This is the first stage of a most horrendously thought out, inconsiderate and upsetting plan for a solar farm in Blucher as proposed by Northumberland Estates - essentially the Duke of Northumberland, that will ruin designated supposedly protected land - this as decided by the councils own plans, this is prime Green Belt high quality farmland that we cannot afford to loose. How are we going to feed ourselves if prime land is taken over by polluting Solar farms, its a short term solution but will cause a long term damage and harm to the environment.</p> <p>While this particular BESS - one of several planned to support the function of this solar farm, may appear modest on paper, it is clearly an important part of a much larger energy infrastructure network that will have far-reaching impacts on the surrounding areas. The local infrastructure does not support the number of heavy specialist vehicles that will be using the site to exchange and re-patriate batteries around the country: its a fire and chemical risk, its very near to houses and small businesses.</p> <p>Its also like putting the cart before the horse - why apply for the BESS before approval has been gained for the solar farm - or is it already a done deal ???</p> <p>Its is inconceivable to the local inhabitants - that this is being seriously considered by the council, ruining prime greenbelt land with a 34 hectare solar farm, in close proximity to wildlife corridors, nature reserves, incredibly</p>	11-04-2025 10:45:07	N/A

near housing (50mtrs away) with the the CCTV"s on tall towers, security fencing, etc. 40 years of a solar farm and afterwards un- usable farming land due to the chemicals used to keep then panels clean.

This whole areas is of historical merit - being the site of the Newburn Ford battles between Scotland and England, there are several protected buildings, the old hospital, the old vicarage, the church, wildlife corridors, lots of reasons to try and protect the area - so its sacrilege to try and build this BESS in "preparation for an unwanted solar farm - and it is completely unwanted - not one person here is in favour of it.

Not many years ago the Duke publicly berated those who were making money going down the renewable energy route - and here he is doing exactly that - and he does"nt have to look at it or live wiht it, or have the noise of it affect his life - certainly it wouldn"t be happening on his doorstep in Alnwick. And this shows a complete disregard for our environment in NE15.

I"m not against renewable energy and we all need to look to the future of how we do this - but buying in hundreds of solar panels - made in China under a dubious human rights regime, who as a county are one of the world biggest polluters and who has no plan to reduce this - indeed they are building more coal powered electric generating plants every day - it does not make sense to buy these from abroad, and ship them here, and all of that carbon footprint created will take years to cancel out with this proposal.

On an administrative note - should there not have bene notices posted through the residents & business owners doors to advise of this plan for rh BESS and also the solar farm - we know that the Duke has bene working on this for a number of years - but seems to have been hiding the plans until we- as concerend residents have very little time to object. and why have our own council members & local MP"s not helped us ?? surely they shpuod be representing theirh people - not the Duke as it would seem

[Hide More](#)

****REDACTED****

This is far too close to housing and the added danger of them catching fire

11-04-2025
12:00:34

N/A

****REDACTED****

The area is too close to houses. The bottom of Mill Vale Estate is literally above this area. Danger of batteries catching fire and fire reaching those bottom houses or the woodland area above.

12-04-2025
09:28:40

N/A

****REDACTED****

This will vastly impact the local community in a negative, bring down local house prices and add to the already busy traffic around the area whilst being set up. this effect the local wildlife with the constant buzzing of the battery and inverters.

12-04-2025
09:53:16

N/A

****REDACTED****

This is far too near to residential properties also the land contains extensive old pit works and seams. Coal is highly flammable and there have been several instances in the press lately showing battery storage facilities ablaze, not a healthy combination.

12-04-2025
15:12:30

N/A

****REDACTED****

I object as I feel it will have an impact on the surrounding homes due to the noise and light pollution.

12-04-2025
15:24:07

N/A

****REDACTED****

This site is not suitable for the development of this type as it has been subject to major flooding in the recent past. There is no mention of why a battery storage facility is required at this location unless it relates to a potential application for the solar panel installation at Walbottle / Blucher for which a planning application has yet to be made. It would concern me that such applications as this are made in advance of other applications that may create a precedent for other unsuitable developments that are of massive concern to residents.

12-04-2025
20:45:15

N/A

****REDACTED****

The area is silent at night. This will create noise pollution disturbing local residents and there will be a fire risk, risking pollution and safety. The land is not safe to be used and the lorries will damage the roads in the surrounding areas in an already neglected area, leading to potholes that are unlikely to be fixed quickly.

12-04-2025
22:25:31

N/A

****REDACTED****

I object to this BESS being placed here it's in a highly dangerous place given the volume of traffic and the problems that's already created there with traffic there is the school runs twice a day, buses, general traffic combine it with the massive queue to Walbottle tip and cars having to go on the wrong side of the road to get past and also the now proposed solar farm industrial site on hospital lane creating "11 movements" per day it's a crazy amount of traffic into the villages. it's on top of old coal mines that in itself is a massive fire safety risk and given that it's already been flooded in that area we all know electricity and water do not mix, there's noise created on a nighttime for local residents 24/7 365 days a year the village is deadly silent on a night and this will echo up to the houses in and around the area. There is absolutely no benefit to the local community whatsoever for this being here we just have to live with the eyesore and danger of it while baring the cost on our housing market as no one will want to buy in the village. Businesses are being lost to this as the units have already been told they must find other premises, these are local people and local businesses now gone. There is schools in the immediate area what heath risks does this pose to our children? I request that this is rejected for the safety of the local residents.

[Hide More](#)

13-04-2025
12:00:33

N/A

****REDACTED****

This site is totally unacceptable and extremely dangerous due to its close proximity to the public at large. The elevated site and close proximity of the river Tyne make it susceptible to pollution in the event of an accident given the copious amounts of water needed to extinguish such a fire. Businesses housing and a busy three way road junction are at risk in the event of an accident. Increased noise pollution which will be 24/7 instead of within working hours of the businesses occupying the current site. In my opinion this site has been selected due to financial considerations and not as a best practice risk analysis.

13-04-2025
15:55:12

N/A

REDACTED	.	13-04-2025 16:48:39	N/A
REDACTED	<p>I object to this application, for the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Traffic. This site has limited access for large vehicles and the area is already congested with traffic queueing to access the tip. 2. Noise. This site will produce a noise nuisance for residents living close by, this will be amplified by the topography of the landscape and as it will be operational 24/7, this will be unbearable for workers in nearby industrial units and workshops as well as residents. 3. Fire. There have been several well known occurrences of lithium battery fires in facilities such as there; they are extremely difficult to extinguish. This is a danger to residents and other businesses in the area, and will be a cause of great anxiety. 4. Flood. The area in question suffered severe flooding in 2012 and there is no guarantee that this couldn't happen again, however the combination of flood and electricity poses a particular danger. 5. Mineworkings. The Coal Authority has stated that this land is unsuitable for this development due to historic Show More	14-04-2025 16:04:04	N/A
REDACTED	<p>I do not want to live next to this !! They are constantly setting on fire. Battery storage is mistakenly as being green energy. This is a myth. The energy stored has already been generated from a mixture of coal,nuclear,solar and simply sold at high price when required. Its economic It simply does not comply with Strategy39. Battery tec is high Carbonin manufacture (you would have to be an a mad man to accept thenet 0 myth being shoved down peoples knecks) The method of storing energy in batteries is inherently wistful and at least 13% is lost in the charging and dis charging process. The facility will omit electromagnetic radiation (Is there insurace policys in place for health claims made against this company in the future)?? There are 2 primary parts of the local planning legislation that this Facility contravenes. 1 This facility is not low carbon and not renewable energy under strategy 39 Renewable & low carbon projects. The proposed site is too close to the community and green belt. contravening strategy 7 Development in the countryside. The storage container will have a negative impact on the landscape.</p>	14-04-2025 16:32:24	N/A
REDACTED	<p>I strongly object to the BESS. There have been a number fires across the UK from similar units. This could be a danger to life, residential and business. The electrical fires could lead to air pollution and water pollution with a site so close to water. The batteries require a large amount of carbon for production and therefore the manufacture is not ecological. The residents are not receiving any benefits from the BESS. Any profit will be used for global trade.</p>	14-04-2025 19:03:29	N/A
REDACTED	<p>I strongly object to the BESS. There have been a number fires across the UK from similar units. This could be a danger to life, residential and business. The electrical fires could lead to air pollution and water pollution with a site so close to water. The batteries require a large amount of carbon for production and therefore the manufacture is not ecological. The residents are not receiving any benefits from the BESS. Any profit will be used for global trade.</p>	14-04-2025 19:03:32	N/A
REDACTED	<p>Major safety concerns with Battery storage and risks of fire, explosions etc</p> <p>Far too close to residential dwellings and should be built nowhere near any occupied buildings.</p>	14-04-2025 19:52:55	N/A
REDACTED	<p>This is a dangerous proposed site so close to local housing and wildlife . There is a high potential for fire at these battery sites. I strongly object to this due to the lack safety and the noise and environmental pollution this would cause to local people</p>	15-04-2025 18:53:52	N/A
REDACTED	<p>I wish to object to this proposal on grounds of noise/disturbance, security and safety.</p> <p>The site is in close proximity to residential areas including Mill Vale, Walbottle and West Denton Park. The ambient overnight noise in these areas is very low and I fear that this plant, with air conditioning and fans operating 24/7, will prove to be disturbing and detrimental to the mental health of local residents. In addition, motion-activated security lighting in an area with a great deal of natural surroundings could be disturbing for locals – human and animal.</p>	16-04-2025 10:48:56	N/A
	<p>There are also safety issues which concern me. The risk of fire and subsequent explosions appears to be more than minimal according to recent reports of incidents in similar sites. BESS fires are, I understand, difficult to extinguish and left to burn out (though contained). This will result in pollution in the air, rising from the valley to residential areas such as West Denton Park and Walbottle as well as the Nature Reserve and local footpaths. The applicants have themselves stated that access to the site is difficult for large vehicles and that manoeuvrability is restricted. This suggests that, in the event of an incident, the emergency services would be compromised. Additionally, as I myself experienced recently, traffic queueing for the nearby Waste Recycling Centre often blocks one side of the road – further hindering access for emergency service vehicles.</p> <p>There have been issues with flooding in this area (including in 2012, the collapse of residential buildings). Has this issue been fully addressed? I see that the Coal Authority has concerns regarding the underground situation. I also see that the applicants have appointed a firm to refute the issues but can the Coal Authority be so completely wrong? Is the council prepared to risk the disaster that Electricity + Water could equal?</p> Hide More		
REDACTED	<p>I want to register my objections to the battery storage site.</p> <p>The proposal is very near to homes in the nearby area including where I live in West Denton Park. It is a quiet residential area particularly at night. I understand that the installation will affect both the noise levels and light. We enjoy the natural environment where we live and the proposals will interrupt these surroundings with potential detrimental effects to health and disturbing the wildlife.</p> <p>There have been reports of fires and explosions in other sites. These incidents have been difficult to extinguish and are left to burn out. The direct line from where I live to the proposed site is less than 200 metres. This is too close to be exposed to such hazards.</p>	17-04-2025 15:54:17	N/A

REDACTED	<p>Erection of Battery Energy Storage facility 2024/0447/01/DET Planning Officer David Grimshaw</p> <p>Dear Mr. Grimshaw,</p> <p>I write to object in the strongest possible terms to the above application by Fig Power.</p> <p>The chosen site is wholly inappropriate and presents a great danger to the residential properties within an extremely close proximity. There right to their quiet enjoyment of their homes will be greatly affected by the 24/7 noise generated from this proposal. The danger of fire and criminality will greatly impact upon their day to day lives.</p> <p>The Coal Authority have registered their concerns surrounding historic unrecorded mine working at shallow depths, gas emissions, two mine shafts in the immediate vicinity and building within influencing distance of a mine entry raises significantly safety and engineering risks.</p> <p>There are very significant archaeology remains of Spencer Steelworks on the site and Piled Fencing will greatly impact the archaeological remains.</p> <p>There has been insufficient landscaping information to show how the protection and retention of the perimeter vegetation will be addressed. The development does not meet the requirements of Policies DM20-DM27&28 and the proposal should therefore be refused.</p> <p>There is serious concern relating to the Culvert because of inadequate maintenance that caused catastrophic harm and serious financial loss to property owners of Mill Vale and Spencer Court in 2012 when the culvert collapsed and remedial action taken caused land slide. This electric development will be at the bottom of the hill and should any problem with the culvert arise it will flood the entire area.</p> <p>There is no evidence since 2012 the culvert has been maintained so it is a very real threat.</p> <p>Highways the location of the proposal is at the bottom of a steep hill adjoining a roundabout with very narrow carriageways this will be extremely dangerous to other road users when HGVs are trying to navigate access to the site. There is only one entry-exit point which in itself is unacceptable should the emergency services need access and this will pose a significant danger to the surrounding residential properties.</p> <p>Planning Control Officer reports that the construction will not generate sufficient additional jobs so there is no benefit to the community with regards to employment. Nor is there any financial gain for the local community just an industrial noise polluting blot on the landscape.</p> <p>I believe this is a very poorly thought out proposal and one that Newcastle City Council Planning Department must refuse.</p> <p>Yours faithfully,</p>	18-04-2025 16:54:51	N/A
	<p>Hide More</p>		
REDACTED	<p>These sites have been proven to pose a high fire risk. Approving them would endanger the health and safety of local residents, which the council has a duty to protect. Granting approval in this context would therefore constitute a neglect of that duty</p>	18-04-2025 20:20:54	N/A
REDACTED	<p>This site dangerous due to its closeness to a residential area and nature reserve. There is a risk of pollution to nearby residents in the event of an accident or a fire. There have been a number fires across the UK from similar units. This could be a danger to life and pollution, having an impact on nearby residents' health and well-being. There will be noise pollution 24 hours per day. The waste disposal centre already causes a lot of traffic at many times, making it impossible to drive down the road, and this will add to the current traffic problems and cause a safety risk. This is not an industrial area and the current roads and infrastructure will not be able to cope with this. No thought has been given to local residents when making this application.</p>	19-04-2025 11:10:45	N/A
REDACTED	<p>I object to this being built, this is too close to us residents in the area and will disturb the nature and wildlife in the area, also it is a worry to think of a fire at one of these storage units as they are dangerous and cannot be contained , there is no benefit at all to local residents, only increased traffic in our local walking routes creating more noise,</p>	19-04-2025 11:22:09	N/A
REDACTED	<p>It's dangerously close to residential property due to increased fire risk.. traffic queuing for the tip makes this road dangerous at times increasing traffic on this road is unacceptably dangerous.</p> <p>The constant noise is detrimental to local residents health.</p> <p>Constant noise will be detrimental to local wildlife. There are deer just across the road from this proposed site.</p> <p>The number of which has increased significantly because of all the building developments across north walbottle and callerton.</p>	19-04-2025 11:57:51	N/A
REDACTED	<p>I object to this going ahead due to the siting of BESS its too near housing and the heavy plant and traffic using the small roads ie Hospital Lane would be dangerous for drivers and pedestrians.</p>	19-04-2025 16:05:12	N/A
REDACTED	<p>Health and safety concern Destruction of greenspace</p>	20-04-2025 07:58:24	N/A
REDACTED	<p>These are dangerously, prone to fires, noisy and too close to residential properties.</p>	20-04-2025 20:38:38	N/A
REDACTED	<p>Objection due to a number of issues. Firstly-impact on the wildlife within the area, secondly, to proximity to the local housing and what will cause a negative effect on housing prices in the area. There is also an impact on the wider community who use this area for walking which will be taken away and have a impact on people's mental health status as do not have a safe haven close to them to walk. The current news of the battery storage units setting alight are also making this feel dangerous especially for the families with young children who live close in proximity of where they will be built. The overlook of the landscape from the other side of the Tyne with be an eyesore and will effect the housing market from possible glare and views of the area. Sadly due to the areas poor behaviour there is a high chance of graffiti, destruction and burglary. This will be something that happens</p>	21-04-2025 14:31:30	N/A

	regardless of the security measures that have been imposed. There should of been an EIA (environmental impact assessment conducted		
REDACTED	<p>Reasons for objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Effect on wildlife within and surrounding area. -The effect on housing prices within the area -Bad behaviour within the area leading to graffiti, destruction and burglary regardless of the measures put in place on security that has been listed. -Detrimental effect on people's mental health status due to the nature corridor being destroyed. -Battery storage unit in the news setting alight and having a dangerous effect on the families in the area. -The glare and look from the ryton side and effect on housing prices on that side. -The traffic within the area during construction. 	21-04-2025 22:45:37	N/A
REDACTED	<p>Risk of fire hazard to residential properties immediately to the rear of this site.</p> <p>The volume of traffic for this build over 9-12 months coming through Throckley and down through Newburn will cause significant disruption to all road users due to larger vehicles such as artic lorry's and flat beds in addition to the solar farm traffic for 9-12 months. This is in addition to the existing household recycling centre and Sanshills sites industrial trucks each day as well as the existing daily queues by users of the tip.</p> <p>These roads are main bus routes for the Outer West of Newcastle and are used heavily for schools as well as commuting.</p> <p>This site will provide no benefit to Newburn or the surrounding area; no local employment, no economic benefits, no environmental improvements in fact will cause environmental detriment in terms of constant noise, traffic pollution as well as the risk to residential safety.</p> <p>This site is on unstable ground as part of the large culvert that drains down the bank to the River Tyne.</p> <p>This is the same culvert that collapsed and resulted in a significant loss of residential homes in the development to the rear (Mill Vale).</p>	22-04-2025 13:36:56	N/A
	<p>The village locations of Newburn and Walbottle will sit immediately in the centre of a large industrial area between this battery site, the recycling centre, Sandhills and a solar farm. This will destroy the area for residents and devalue homes.</p> <p>Who is going to support the residents? Who will be our voice to object to the clear destruction of our villages?</p> <p>Hide More</p>		
REDACTED	I object to the building and installation of the battery plant because of the real threat to wild life and their habitat , because once gone it will not return.	22-04-2025 15:10:36	N/A
REDACTED	<p>object to this application, for the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Traffic. This site has limited access for large vehicles and the area is already congested with traffic queueing to access the tip. 2. Noise. This site will produce a noise nuisance for residents living close by, this will be amplified by the topography of the landscape and as it will be operational 24/7, this will be unbearable for workers in nearby industrial units and workshops as well as residents. 3. Fire. There have been several well known occurrences of lithium battery fires in facilities such as there; they are extremely difficult to extinguish. This is a danger to residents and other businesses in the area, and will be a cause of great anxiety. 4. Flood. The area in question suffered severe flooding in 2012 and there is no guarantee that this couldn't happen again, however the combination of flood and electricity poses a particular danger. 5. Mineworkings. The Coal Authority has stated that this land is unsuitable for this development due to historic mineworkings. 6. Lack of benefit. This scheme brings no benefit to the local area. The electricity stored here will not supply local homes or bring down bills. On the contrary, local residents will find the value of their property is much reduced and with no compensation whatsoever. For the residents of Mill Vale this is particularly unfair as they suffered greatly due to the culvert collapse and flooding of 2012. There will be no gain for biodiversity or the quality of the local landscape. Existing local businesses will be evicted, taking away jobs from the area. 7. Detrimental negative impact to wildlife which has increased in numbers because of their habitat being taken to build houses. 8. Negative mental health impact on people who live and work in the area. <p>.</p> <p>Hide More</p>	22-04-2025 16:10:18	N/A
REDACTED	I strongly object to the bess facility because of noise, light pollution and also there have been several fires in facilities such as this. If they were to set on fire they are hard to extinguish and are sometimes left to burn out this should not be situated so close to residential dwellings.	22-04-2025 21:20:08	N/A
REDACTED	<p>I object to this plan on the basis of the storage facilities being unsafe.</p> <p>A simple Google search can reveal all of the problems occurring with battery storage facilities such as this. They can cause pollution from fires.</p> <p>They are in a residential area that could potentially cause noise and air pollution as seen in other battery storage facilities.</p> <p>The infrastructure is not set up to accommodate such a facility including the extra traffic. The roads are already in a terrible state in that area.</p>	23-04-2025 09:47:05	N/A