



APPEAL REF: 6007402

Inquiry Case Management Call (CMC) Agenda

Appeal Site: Patshull Road, Albrighton, Shropshire WV7 3BH

Appellant: Boningdale Developments Limited

Local Planning Authority: Shropshire Council

LPA application ref: 24/02108/OUT

Description of development: Outline application to include access for a mixed-use development comprising up to 800 no dwellings, a care home of up to 80 units, a secondary school and local centre with associated access, infrastructure, landscaping and drainage.

CMC to be held on Friday 5 June at 10:00am (Microsoft Teams)

(Details for logging in to the CMC will be/are set out in a separate note)

AGENDA

1. Introduction by Inspector
2. Purpose of the CMC
3. The Inquiry
4. Provisional Main Issues
5. Advocates and witnesses
6. The Inquiry
7. Further work and format of evidence
8. Timescales for submissions
9. Any other business

-
1. The CMC will be led by the Inquiry Inspector, Mr Andrew McGlone BSc, MCD, MRTPI. Attached are instructions for joining the CMC, a conference etiquette to be observed, and the conference agenda.
 2. There will be no discussion during the CMC of the merits of the parties' cases, and no evidence will be heard. The purpose of the call is to discuss the ongoing management of the case and the presentation of evidence, so that the Inquiry is conducted in an efficient and effective manner.
 3. The Inquiry is scheduled to open at 10:00 on Tuesday 15 September 2026. The Inquiry will take place in person with up to sixteen sitting days across that week and the following weeks. That number should change with further work to clarify the extent of agreement / disagreement between the parties. Your views will be sought at the CMC. The Inquiry will not sit on Friday afternoon. Views from the parties will be invited at the CMC, but I am likely to hear closings online. Other sessions such as planning conditions, planning obligations and the s106 agreement, could potentially also be heard online. Precise sitting days will be confirmed after the CMC once I have heard your views.
 4. After the opening day, I propose to start each subsequent day at 09:30, though it would be helpful to know at the CMC whether there are any limitations that would not make this possible. The Inquiry will focus on areas of disagreement or where evidence needs to be tested. It is therefore important that the parties work together to narrow and/or clarify their cases. The CMC will explore this and how best to hear the evidence so the Inquiry is conducted as efficiently as possible.
 5. Based on the submissions to date, I provisionally consider the main issues in dispute to be:
 - 1) whether the proposed development would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the development plan and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework);
 - 2) if the proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt, its effect on the openness of the Green Belt;
 - 3) whether the proposal would accord with the spatial strategy in the development plan;
 - 4) the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area;
 - 5) whether future occupiers of the proposed development would have adequate access to a range of facilities and services;
 - 6) the effect of the proposal on best and most versatile (BMV) land;
 - 7) the effect of the proposal on the Boningdale Conservation Area (CA) and the Grade II listed buildings of Lea Hall and Barn;
 - 8) whether the proposal would make adequate provision for affordable housing, sports and playing pitch facilities, highway improvement works, sustainable transport, education, healthcare, open space, ecology, sustainable drainage systems and biodiversity net gain (BNG); and
 - 9) if the proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt, whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm is clearly outweighed by

other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development.

6. The main parties all agree that, for the purposes of this appeal, the Council cannot currently demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. I do not therefore anticipate this being a main issue. But I will be asking for work to be undertaken to agree on the extent of the supply against the housing requirement, and if there is any dispute, to explain what that is and why. I will also be asking for the same work to be carried out in respect of affordable housing. I will then determine whether I need to question matters at the Inquiry, but the aim of this work is to negate that, or to minimise it.
7. I note Albrighton Development Action Plan's (ADAP) position on housing land supply, and the citation that the extent of the supply is a relevant consideration. With this in mind, I will be asking ADAP whether it will be adopting the Council's position on the extent of the supply even if it is different to that in the most recent Five Year Housing Supply Statement (4.61 years) or whether it will be maintaining its position that there is a 4.61 year supply. If it is the latter or different to the Council's position, this could lead to questions for ADAP to answer at the Inquiry.
8. I am in receipt of a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) between the Appellant and the Council. Thank you for your timely submission and for clarifying several matters, but there is a need to go further so that Inquiry time is used effectively. I will outline further work at the CMC for all three parties. I shall set a timeframe for a SoCG to be submitted between the Appellant and ADAP.
9. The Appellant has indicated that 25 witnesses may be called to give evidence. I am unclear if that number relates solely to the Appellant or all the main parties involved in this appeal. I would like each party to confirm a list of witnesses that you intend to call (or potentially call) and what topics/main issues they will cover at the CMC. Whether 25 witnesses need to be called to give evidence depends on the matters in dispute, the extent of dispute between the main parties, and the ability of the parties to agree matters before the Inquiry.
10. I expect more detailed evidence may need to be heard. I will be seeking your views at the CMC on what might be the best way to hear the evidence. At this stage, I anticipate issues 1, 2, 3, 4 and 9 may need more detailed evidence, along with matters relating to planning policy and the overall planning balance, including any other considerations and benefits of the proposal. This will require formal presentation of evidence and cross examination. However, there may be merit in holding a roundtable session on the purposes of the Green Belt, and possibly main issue 2 depending on the party's positions, but I shall review this, and how best to hear all the evidence, as the timetable progresses.
11. Among other matters, main issue 3 will consider ADAP's points about Albrighton's role in the spatial strategy and the scale of growth. I would like ADAP to clarify what the potential unacceptable impacts on the surrounding area might be so that I can fully understand your case and to consider if any further work is necessary.
12. In respect of Main Issue 5, I will be asking ADAP to clarify its position about the four parts to paragraph 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework, and whether all or some are in dispute, and if some, which part(s). This main issue

could be suitable for a roundtable discussion, subject to the matters in dispute.

13. The extent of agreement and disagreement on main issues 6 and 7 will influence how this evidence is heard. The Council's position in respect of the suggested benefits of the education and healthcare aspects of the proposal will also influence how this evidence is heard (main issue 8). However, my view about how the evidence is heard is not fixed. I will seek your comments at the CMC. I hope that the issues between the parties can be sufficiently narrowed to enable each main issue to be dealt with efficiently. It is in no one's interests to agree matters at the Inquiry that could have been agreed earlier. The Appellant's evidence will also need to address any other matters raised by interested parties.
14. Should any or part of main issue 8 (or any other) not be resolved through the submission of an appropriate planning obligation or planning conditions, then the Appellant, Council and any other relevant party will need to submit brief proofs of evidence setting out their positions. The Council and any other relevant party should have input into the s106. A CIL Compliance Statement will need to be submitted justifying any monitoring or other fee sought.
15. I consider specific targeted work will be required by the parties. This will involve you entering into constructive dialogue to prepare and submit that work which should be as detailed as possible covering the areas of agreement/disagreement to narrow the issues in dispute. I will be asking the parties to discuss and agree a detailed list of suggested planning conditions that will be discussed at the Inquiry should I be minded to allow the appeal. This is standard procedure. I will discuss the further targeted work at the CMC.
16. I anticipate taking a topic-led format. I expect to hear the evidence of the Council and ADAP first (where applicable) then the Appellant's evidence. Suggested planning conditions and the planning obligations will be discussed at a suitable point in the programme.
17. It is not yet clear whether local residents or objectors will wish to speak, and if so, how many. However, I expect there will be a need to accommodate third parties, and the programme may need to be flexible. I will be asking the Council whether the venue will be able to accommodate everyone who may wish to attend, and that there are suitable rooms for each party and I to use when the Inquiry is not sitting.
18. I would welcome any efforts by the main parties before the CMC to help focus on the main issues in dispute, to avoid overlap or repetition, to generally minimise delay, and to contribute to the efficient use of the time available.
19. The parties are requested to give the above careful consideration in advance of the discussion at the CMC. The attached Annex sets out the conference call etiquette and the preferred format and content of proofs and other material.
Please ensure these points are observed.
20. The Council is asked to ensure that a copy of this pre-CMC note is made publicly available along with the other Inquiry documents.

Andrew McGlone

INSPECTOR

2 June 2026

Annex A

Information Regarding Conference Call Etiquette

- Each party should have a single spokesperson nominated to speak.
- The case officer will record the names of those present during the call for each party before the Inspector 'arrives'.
- Please make the case officer aware when joining if you intend to record the conference call.
- Background noise on a conference call can be an issue. You may want to consider putting yourself on mute and then un-muting yourself when you speak.
- Make sure that personal phones are kept away from any speaker phones in order to avoid potential issues.
- Know when, and when not to speak – when you're on a conference call, you can't see the body language of someone who is about to speak. No one likes being spoken over, so make sure you take note of your cues to speak and don't speak over (or louder) than the other participants on the call.
- The Inspector will lead the conference and will invite specific contributors to speak at particular times.
- The Inspector will 'arrive' last and leave first.

Content and Format of Proofs and Appendices

Content

Proofs of evidence **should**:

- focus on the main issues identified, in particular on areas of disagreement;
- be proportionate to the number and complexity of issues and matters that the witness is addressing;
- be concise, precise, relevant and contain facts and expert opinion deriving from witnesses' own professional expertise and experience, and/or local knowledge;
- be prepared with a clear structure that identifies and addresses the main issues within the witness's field of knowledge and avoids repetition;
- focus on what is really necessary to make the case and avoid including unnecessary material, or duplicating material in other documents or another witness's evidence;
- where case law is cited in the proof, include the full Court report/ transcript reference and cross refer to a copy of the report/ transcript which should be included as a core document.

Proofs **should not**:

- **Duplicate information already included in other Inquiry material.** So in respect of items such as the reasons for refusal, descriptions of the site and development and planning history, if they are described in a statement of comment ground, decision notice, committee report or application document, they should not be duplicated in a proof. Please cross reference back to the source material; and
- **Recite at length the text of policies referred to elsewhere:** the proofs need only identify the relevant policy numbers, with extracts being provided as core documents. Only policies which are needed to understand the argument being put forward and are fundamental to an appraisal of the proposals' merits need be referred to.

Format of the proofs and appendices:

- **Proofs to be no longer than 3000 words** if possible. Where proofs are longer than 1500 words, summaries are to be submitted.
- Proofs are to be spiral bound or bound in such a way as to be easily opened and read.
- Appendices are to be bound separately.
- Appendices are to be indexed using **projecting tabs**, labelled and **fully paginated**.
- Electronic copies of proofs, summaries and appendices to be submitted to case officer at The Planning Inspectorate on the specified date.