Supporting Background Information relating to Motion 1 : -

Current Scale of these developments: -

The Renewable Energy Planning Database https://data.barbour-abi.com/smart-map/repd/desnz/?type=repd lists the following:

BESS	**National**	**EMids**
Applications submitted	434	36
Awaiting Construction	592	40
Operational	116	9
Revised	109	6
Under Construction	86	4
Total	**1,337**	**95**
Solar PV		
Applications submitted	505	55
Awaiting Construction	2379	218
Revised	250	24
Under Construction	160	23
Total	**3,294**	**320**
Wind Onshore		
Applications submitted	214	0
Awaiting Construction	259	1
Revised	218	7
Under Construction	33	0
Total	**724**	**8**

That means there are 1,337 BESS Sites, that are operational or potentially coming into operation that have had no official safety regulator overseeing their construction nationally and 95 in the East Midlands. If you also assume that the Solar PV and Onshore Wind sites that are in the planning/construction stage will also require BESS sites there is potential for a further 4,018 nationally and 328 in the East Midlands that could go through without the overview of an official safety regulator.

Paul Christensen, Director Lithiumionsafety Ltd Consultancy
https://www.linkedin.com/posts/paul-christensen-a2bb6b82_battery-energy-storage-systems-bess-activity-7242068051511152640-h78z/?utm_source=share&utm_medium=member_android

I am very much a supporter of safe, well managed BESS, and I believe they are essential if we are to decarbonise our electricity supply, hence I am pleased to see that a Research Briefing on BESS has been published by the UK Government.
P5: “In response to concerns about the safety, the [then] government said BESS were covered by “robust regulatory framework.” Based on my reading of the report, this framework is the following:
All energy storage system planning applications are assessed by local planning authorities. In my experience, planning officers know essentially nothing about the risks and hazards of lithium-ion batteries – so how can they make an informed judgement?
“There is no list of material considerations” to guide planning officers. P15
“There are no specific policies for the siting of BESS”. P15.
The government guidance on BESS published in August 2023 encouraged developers and local planning authorities to consult local FRS: but they are not statutory consultees. P16.
Schedule 2 of the Buildings Regulations 2010 states that “detached buildings (i.e. BESS) are exempt from the Building Regulations if people do not normally enter them or they only enter intermittently to inspect or maintain plants or machinery”. P28.
BESS are excluded from the COMAH Regulations 2015 as LiBs are considered “devices” rather than “dangerous substances”. Also, the HSE considered that “the current regulatory framework is sufficient and suitably robust”. P32.
The Environmental and Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 require some installations to require an environmental permit – for activities that may cause pollution. But the government does not class BESS as installations. It stated it was “in discussions with the Environment Agency”. I do not think anything has come from these discussions as yet. P33
A few additional comments.
P5: “BESS sites can also be designed with safety features such as fire suppression systems to ensure their safety”. This is patently not true given the number of failures in recent years including BESS that have conformed to UL 9540A (see EPRI database). The report repeatedly refers to suppression systems and ignores the generally-accepted view that BESS fires cannot be put out, but if they are, the hazard switches from fire to explosion. Hence the “controlled burn” strategy adopted by FRS and the guidance re same from e.g. Tesla.