



Planning Inspectorate

APPEAL REF: 6007402

Patshull Road, Albrighton, Shropshire WV7 3BH

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.

Inquiry Case Management Conference Summary Note

CMC held at 10:00 on Friday 5 June 2026 (Microsoft Teams)

Introductions

1. The case management conference was led by the Inquiry Inspector, Mr Andrew McGlone BSc, MCD, MRTPI.
2. Christopher Katkowski CBE KC of Counsel will represent the appellant.
3. Hugh Richards of Counsel will represent Shropshire Council (Council).
4. Chatura Saravanan of Counsel will represent Albrighton Development Action Group (ADAG)
5. The purpose of the conference was to discuss the ongoing management of the case, not the merits of the parties' positions.

Inquiry format

6. The Inquiry will take place in person and will open at 10.00am on Tuesday 15 September, resuming at 09:30 on subsequent sitting days. The Inquiry will not sit later than 17:00, and it will not sit on Friday afternoons.
7. The Inquiry is scheduled to sit for up to 16 days, so the parties should keep their diaries free for the original 16 days to avoid any lengthy adjournment. But I am optimistic that not all those days will be required. I shall seek your comments on the number of sitting days after the further work identified later in this note is carried out and before Proofs of Evidence (PoE) are submitted.
8. The Inquiry will be held at The Guildhall, Frankwell Quay, Shrewsbury SY3 8HQ. Retiring rooms have been set aside for the parties and I.
9. Sessions will last for about 1.5 hours with 15 minute breaks between, longer over lunch. There will be two sessions in the morning and two in the afternoon.
10. Due to venue availability, the Inquiry will sit online on 22 September and potentially on 7 October, though I shall review that once there is a firm idea on the extent of the dispute and the number of sitting days likely to be needed.

11. The Council should ensure that there is a venue booking for the other sitting days and take any steps to find an alternative venue if any sitting days cannot be accommodated at the Guildhall.
12. Local people and organisations are encouraged to take part in the Inquiry process, as local knowledge and opinion can often be a valuable addition to the evidence given by the main parties. However, it is not necessary to repeat the points already submitted in writing during the planning application and the appeal. Also, if there are several people who wish to speak at the Inquiry and they have the same views, it is a good idea for spokespeople to speak on behalf of the others to avoid repetition.
13. ADAG has requested an evening session online so that interested parties can make their submissions. I am willing to accommodate, but because the Inquiry venue cannot be used to facilitate this, holding an online session is subject to the other party's agreement, provision of a room for me to use along with a large monitor or provision of a large monitor, and a timeframe for the session. Further, before any arrangements are made to hold an evening online session, I would ask that ADAG confirm whether interested parties would solely wish to make submissions online or whether anyone would prefer to make submissions in person. It would be helpful if there was just one session to avoid potentially needing to recall witnesses. I shall review people's responses and decide how to proceed.
14. It is likely that some roundtable sessions will be heard online due to venue availability, and I may also hold discussions on the suggested planning conditions and the planning obligations online also. I will, in any event, hear closings online. The Council should make arrangements to host any online session.
15. I have noted the availability of Mr Ryan on 17 and 18 September. Please can the Council confirm whether he would be able to attend online on those days.
16. If there are any time constraints for any witnesses that might need to be catered for, please advise the case officer at the earliest opportunity.

Main issues

17. The appeal relates to an outline planning application with all matters reserved save for certain access details. It was agreed that further access details would need to be sought at the reserved matters stage should outline planning permission be granted. Planning conditions will be drafted to reflect that should I be minded to allow the appeal and grant planning permission.
18. As a result of discussions at the CMC, the main issues for the appeal are:
 - 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.
19. The Appellant confirmed that there are two strands to its Green Belt case. The first is that the proposal accords with Grey Belt policy, whilst the second is that, if the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, that there are other considerations that amount to very special circumstances and that they clearly outweigh the Green Belt harm.
 20. The Council confirmed that it does not consider the proposal to accord with Grey Belt policy because of purpose a), but then also because of purpose c) when all the purposes are taken together. Confirmation should be provided in accordance with the timetable at the end of this note about whether a case is being pursued on purpose d).
 21. The Council should also confirm in accordance with the timetable at the end of this note on whether it is pursuing a case under main issue 5 or whether the Council's case is confined to main issue 3 and the location of the proposed development in relation to the settlement and development plan policy.
 22. ADAG explained briefly that the potential unacceptable impacts on the surrounding area will revolve around local services and facilities and the capacity and availability of them in respect of main issue 3.
 23. ADAG confirmed that it disputes the proposal's compliance with Framework paragraph 115 a) and b) but will confirm its position in respect of parts c) and d) in accordance with the timetable at the end of this note.
 24. The Council agreed to confirm its position of where the proposal's effect would be on the spectrum of less than substantial harm for the heritage assets in a Heritage Statement of Common Ground (SoCG).
 25. It is agreed that the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, but the extent of the supply is in dispute between the Appellant and the Council. ADAG confirmed that it will adopt whichever the Council's figure is.
 26. The Council intends to call 5 witnesses in respect of green belt, landscape, planning policy, housing land supply and planning matters.
 27. The appellant intends to call up to 8 witnesses covering transport, urban design, landscape, heritage, education and healthcare, housing supply and planning matters.
 28. ADAG intends to call 2 witnesses covering transport and planning matters.
 29. Each party is asked to provide a list of their witnesses to the case officer in accordance with the timetable at the end of this note. But every witness may not need to give oral evidence to the Inquiry.
 30. The Appellant should check that the ecological surveys submitted with the planning application will remain reliable by the time the Inquiry opens and take any steps if considered necessary.

Dealing with the evidence

31. At this stage, there was consensus that main issues 1, 3 and 9 require formal presentation of evidence with cross examination and any re-examination and/or my own questions. I have noted the party's views about main issues 2 and 4 also being subject to formal presentation, and I shall review this as the timetable progresses

and inform the parties. This will depend on the extent of the dispute and the nature of the issues. Main issues 5 and 8 are likely to be roundtable discussions. However, aspects of main issue 8 may require formal presentation of evidence. This depends on the extent of agreement and disagreement and the nature of the dispute.

32. At this stage, I am unclear about main issue 6, but it could potentially be dealt with through formal planning evidence. I don't at this stage anticipate main issue 7 will require formal presentation or a roundtable session, but if the written evidence does need to be tested then a roundtable session is likely to be suitable.
33. I will determine how best to hear the evidence on each main issue once the further work is submitted in accordance with the timetable at the end of this note.
34. I intend to deal with the s106 agreement and the suggested planning conditions by round table discussions.
35. The appellant's evidence should address the other matters raised by interested parties. The s106 agreements need to reflect the details of where, when and on what the monies sought would be spent and be drafted in a manner that I agree with all, some or none of the parties seeking the various contributions.

Further work

36. It is in everybody's interests to try and narrow issues or, at the very least, provide clarity on your positions so that Inquiry time is used effectively. Equally, please think about the merit of your position. It is not helpful to pursue a point that does not have the substance to back it up, and it is also not helpful if you do not engage with the other party's point of view.
37. A SoCG between the Appellant and ADAG should focus on the matters in dispute between the two parties and be as detailed as possible and set out matters in agreement and those in disagreement and the reasons why you disagree. Within this document it would be helpful to include an up-to-date plan showing the location of facilities and services in the area, including the location of bus stops, public rights of way, any footways, any cycleways, any lighting of public footpaths or roads, where crossing points are, the surface of the route and its width. Equally, please outline what the parties consider to be a suitable benchmark to assess journey distances to facilities and services plus any other criteria that you consider to be relevant. Please include any other detail that you both consider to be relevant to main issue 5.
38. It was agreed that a Heritage SoCG between the Appellant and the Council would be beneficial. This should describe the respective heritage assets, their significance and setting. Given that the dispute is about the proposal's effect not the significance and setting of the assets, I would like you to set out your reasons, whether they are agreed or not, about the proposal's effect and the degree of harm that would be caused. Each party's planning proofs should address the public benefits test. The Heritage SoCG will hopefully negate the need for proofs of evidence on this matter and enable me to consider the issue based on written submissions or as a roundtable session if I have any questions.
39. It was agreed that a Landscape SoCG between the Appellant and the Council would be helpful. Within this, please agree on the methodology and viewpoints, ensure images cover different times of the year, and include a table which outlines what judgements each professional hold and why, and why you disagree.

40. To expand on the SoCG submitted by the Appellant and the Council, it was agreed that a SoCG Addendum will be prepared. This will cover matters such as purposes a), c) and d) if necessary, ecology, the extent of the housing land supply, the need and supply of affordable housing, any matters relating to BMV. Within the SoCG Addendum I would like you to agree on each other's housing supply figures even if you disagree on the reasons behind them. Please also set out the reasons why you disagree on any sites in a table. Be realistic about whether a site is deliverable or not. I would also like you to include a table setting out your positions on whether a policy is out of date or not. If there are any other matters that the Appellant and Council consider to be relevant to include in the SoCG Addendum, please do so.
41. If there is a dispute between the Appellant and the Council on education and healthcare, I would like a topic-specific SoCG on these matters. But if there is no dispute or it is not a fundamental dispute, then please cover these matters in the SoCG Addendum. That document will be a detailed document, so please use it to home in on what matters are in dispute and the merits of your positions. It is in everyone's interests to ensure that Inquiry time is used effectively. This work may or may not negate the need for technical proofs from the Appellant.
42. An agreed list of suggested planning conditions should be discussed between the parties and submitted in word. Please ensure that they satisfy the six tests and are grouped into different stages of development. Avoid any duplication. Please ensure each condition has all the necessary clauses, and it is clear what schemes to be submitted must include and what must be implemented and when. I will provide any comments that I have before the Inquiry opens on the anatomy of the suggested planning conditions.
43. The Council will need to submit CIL compliance statement setting out detailed justification for each obligation sought, setting out how it complies with the CIL Regulations, including any policy support and, in relation to any financial contribution, how it has been calculated, whether there is a document that explains how it has been calculated, and precisely on what it would be spent. This includes any other fees, such as monitoring fees. Please go into detail and cross-check the statements with the draft s106 agreement to ensure that every '£' sign has accompanying justification.
44. However, in advance of submitting the CIL Compliance Statement do liaise with the Appellant and ADAG on what the planning obligations will be, what sums are involved, how they have been calculated and what and where the monies would be spent on.
45. If the Appellant or ADAG disputes any of the obligations sought, then I will require a brief proof of evidence setting out your position on that issue.
46. The final draft legal agreement should be submitted in advance of the Inquiry, but your positions should be clear before the submission of PoE's as if the contributions sought cannot be resolved through the submission of an appropriate planning obligation, PoE's will be required from the parties. Please ensure that the definitions reflect the evidence detailed in the CIL Compliance Statement in terms of the amount of money and where and what it would be spent on. Please ensure the obligation secures what is intended.
47. I will allow a short time after the Inquiry for the submission of the signed version of any agreement if this is not possible by the time we close. Please advise me when

the Inquiry opens about the timeline for the agreements to be signed and sealed. Take steps to minimise any delay.

Proofs of Evidence

48. Please adhere to them to content and format noted that were attached to the pre-CMC note. Avoid repetition or duplication with other documents and do not rehearse policy text. Please make sure the Proofs are focused and you say what your views are and why and what policy compliance or conflict may arise. Do also give me a clear view on s.38(6) and Framework paragraph 11.

Core Documents

49. A Core Document list will need to be discussed and agreed in advance of preparing your PoE's so they can be properly referenced in them. The list should be comprehensive, and everyone is to work to the same system.
50. The agreed Core Documents list and documents should be sent electronically to the Planning Inspectorate at the same time as the PoE. Please ensure everyone is working to the same system. However, a core documents list containing documents not being used just creates unnecessary work for all.
51. **Please ensure Core Documents:**
- a. comprise **only** those to which you will be referring to in your evidence, otherwise, do not include it. **Keep the number to the absolute minimum as in my experience not many are actually referred to.**
 - b. group documents on a topic basis and use a simple referencing system.
 - c. do not duplicate the document within your PoE.
 - d. contain the front page and policies from the development plan that are of relevance to the appeal.
 - e. references to the Framework and PPG should be made within a particular point and identified by a Reference ID.
 - f. any appeal decisions and/or legal authorities to be relied upon are to be prefaced with a note explaining the relevance of the document to your case, the propositions on which you are seeking to rely, with the relevant paragraphs highlighted. Volumes of appeal decisions do not necessarily improve a point. Many are often not directly comparable.
 - g. do not include superseded documents or plans unless there is good reason.
52. The Council will helpfully create a website for all the Inquiry so that PoE, SoCGs, Core Documents, draft planning obligations, a schedule of suggested conditions, and any Inquiry Documents are available in a single place digitally. Details of the website and contact details for the person(s) who will keep this page updated during the Inquiry should be provided.
53. It is expected that all necessary documents will have been submitted in advance of the Inquiry. Any additional documents can only be accepted to the Inquiry (and the Inquiry library) with the Inspector's permission.

Inquiry Running Order / Programme

54. On the first day, I will start the Inquiry with my opening comments. There will then be opening statements from the Appellant, followed by the Council and ADAG.

These should be no longer than 10 minutes each.

55. At this stage, it is unclear whether the Inquiry will then hear from interested parties or whether evidence will start to be heard. Day 1 will be shorter than normal if an evening online session is to be heard.
56. The programme will be confirmed nearer to the time, but a possible running order could be: openness and purposes of the Green Belt, character and appearance, access to facilities and services, BMV and heritage assets, before the Inquiry then considers evidence the planning evidence, including Green Belt matters and the planning balance. The Council will go first followed by ADAG were applicable, before finishing with the Appellant on each topic. Suggested planning conditions and/or the planning obligation will be discussed at a suitable point in the programme, though if formal evidence is necessary for any planning obligations this will be heard before the planning evidence.
57. After hearing the evidence, closing submissions will be heard. The ADAG will go first, followed by the Council then the Appellant. I will need a copy of your openings and closings in Word format, which will need to be sent to the PINS case officer before you present them.

Timetable for submissions

12 June	- Each party provides a list of witnesses - Council confirms its case on purpose d), accessibility to facilities and services (main issue 5), education and healthcare. - ADAG confirms its case in terms of Framework paragraph 115. - ADAG to provide response about interested parties attending in-person or online. - Appellant and Council to confirm willingness to hold online session for interested parties and venue/equipment provision.
10 July	- SoCG – Appellant and ADAG - SoCG Addendum – Appellant and Council - Heritage SoCG – Appellant and Council - Landscape SoCG – Appellant and Council - Planning Obligations SoCG – Appellant, Council and ADAG as applicable depending on if there is a dispute and who between. - CIL Compliance Statement for each planning obligation
5pm 3 August	Note confirming if any changes to case following new Framework publication (submission date would change if new Framework not published before summer recess. Inspector to advise of new date)
18 August	- All PoE (including appendices and any summary PoEs) – see attached notes on their content and format - Core documents list and electronic copies
25 August	Draft list of suggested planning conditions in word
By 1 September	- Council's notification of Inquiry – letters and press notice - Appellant display of site notice
Noon 3 September	Any necessary rebuttals
5pm 3 September	Time estimates – be realistic. Include enough time for re-examination
5pm 4 September	- Final draft of planning obligation - Inquiry website details and all Inquiry Documents ready on website - Plan of site visit itinerary

Other matters

58. Electronic copies of all Core Documents and other documents to be provided to the case officer.
59. **I will advise the parties if any paper copies of document need to be provided after the submission of PoE. If any hard copies are required, they should be brought to the Inquiry.**
60. I am not encouraging the submission of supplementary or rebuttal proofs. I would hope these will not be necessary given the evidence thus far and the further work set out to be carried out before PoE are submitted.
61. I will carry out a site visit during the Inquiry. A time and date for this will be arranged once the draft programme is prepared.
62. Any Costs Applications if not already submitted should be made in writing before the close of the Inquiry. It would help programming if you could give notice of whether you intend to make an application for costs as early as possible and to inform the other party.

Andrew McGlone

INSPECTOR

5 June 2026

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, with crossing referencing back to the source inquiry 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 with **1 printed copy of each proof, summary and appendix** sent to the case officer at The Planning Inspectorate within 3 working days thereafter.