The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Reference: 6013490

Land West of Tattenhall Road, Tattenhall

Case Management Conference at 14:00 Monday 5 October 2026

Inspector's Pre-Case Management Conference Note

1. A separate document provides the agenda. There will be no discussion on the merits of the case, and I will not hear evidence during the conference. The purpose of the conference is to provide ongoing case management.

Likely main issues

2. The main issues are presently considered to be the effect of the proposal on on-site ecology and whether appropriate provision would be made for affordable housing and local infrastructure.

How the likely main issue will be dealt with

3. The likely main issue should be dealt with by cross-examination. However, this is a matter for discussion at the conference.

4. You are requested to give the above careful consideration in advance of the conference. Any request for evidence to be heard other than as currently envisaged will need to be fully justified.

5. It appears that the Council has not yet taken a report to committee and Tattenhall and District Parish Council has been granted Rule 6 status recently. Therefore, it is not clear whether any additional main issues will come forward.

6. In light of the above, it may be necessary to hold a further case management conference in early November. It would be helpful if the Parties could confirm that availability for the 2 and 3 November 2026.

Timetabling and submission of documents

7. The event will open at 1000 on **24 November 2026**. At present, 6 sitting days have been identified on 24 – 26 November and 1 – 3 December 2026. A reserve day of 4 or 8 December 2026 will be confirmed at the case management conference. We will discuss sitting dates at the conference. While it is possible that not all sitting days will be required, the main parties should keep all the dates available for the inquiry.

8. The deadline for proofs of evidence is currently **27 October 2026**, four weeks prior to the inquiry. The Rule 6 party statement of case is also scheduled for submission at a similar time. I will address general timetabling of document submission during the conference. The attached Annex 1 sets out the preferred format and content of documents.

Event arrangements

9. I will wish to discuss where the inquiry is likely to take place. There will also be discussion as to what arrangements will be put in place if a virtual event is required.

10. It will also be necessary to talk about the involvement of interested parties and the number of local people who are likely to wish to speak. It is important that interested persons can participate if they wish to do so.

11. I will seek the views of the parties as to how and when the site visit will take place and whether an itinerary would be useful.

Core documents

12. In order that appeal documents are available to all participants, it will be necessary for one of the main parties to administer and publish core documents on a website. This will include documents submitted during the inquiry. I expect the core documents to be clearly organised to enable all participants, including interested parties, to find documents quickly and easily. Annex 2 to this note sets out a minimum requirement for a core documents library website.

Conditions and planning obligations

13. I will briefly cover my expectations for conditions and planning obligations.

Costs

14. If applications for costs are to be made, the Planning Practice Guidance makes it clear that they should be made in writing to me before the inquiry. You should give the other party or parties timely notice to enable them to compose a response. In order to support an effective and timely planning system in which all parties are required to behave reasonably, I have the power to initiate an award of costs in line with the Planning Practice Guidance.

AJ Sutton BA(Hons) PGDip MRTPI

INSPECTOR

28 September 2026

Annex 1: Content and Format of Proofs and Appendices

Content

Proofs of evidence **should**:

- focus on identified main issues, particularly 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 the professional expertise and experience of the witness, and/or local knowledge;
- be prepared with a clear structure that addresses the main issues within the witness's field of knowledge and avoids repetition; and
- focus on what is necessary to make the case and avoid including unnecessary material or duplicating another witness's evidence.

Proofs **should not**:

- duplicate information already included in other inquiry material, such as site description, planning history, officer report, and the relevant planning policy; and
- recite the text of policies: 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 proposal's merits need be referred to.

Format of the proofs and appendices

- Proofs should be no longer than 3,000 words if possible. Where proofs are longer than 1,500 words, summaries are to be submitted.
- Front covers to proofs and appendices are to be clearly titled, with the name of the witness on the cover.
- Pages and paragraphs must be numbered with clear and consistent numbering formatted to ensure paragraphs can be found quickly.
- Appendices are to be paginated and provided in a separate PDF from the proof.

Annex 2: Core Documents Library Format

- The core documents library should **NOT** be hosted on the Council's planning application search function. This is because such functions time out during inquiries and it is not quick and straightforward for participants to find documents. As such, it wastes inquiry time for all parties.

- If the Council does not have sufficient resource capacity to host the core documents library website, the Council should engage with the appellant prior to the Case Management Conference to see if it is possible for the appellant to take on this responsibility. It is in no-one's interests for a core documents library to be provided late, to be incomplete, or to be of a poor quality.

- The core documents library should be divided into sensible headings and folders (which will vary in number and type dependent on the particulars of the case). Sensible headings/folders include:

  CD1.0 Application documents
  CD2.0 Appeal documents
  CD3.0 Committee Reports and Minutes (if applicable)
  CD4.0 National Planning Policy and Guidance
  CD5.0 Local Planning Policy and Guidance
  CD6.0 Background documents (e.g. Strategic Flood Risk Assessment)
  CD7.0 Relevant planning appeals and legal judgments
  CD8.0 Appellant's statement of case, proofs of evidence and rebuttals
  CD9.0 Council's statement of case, proofs of evidence and rebuttals
  CD10.0 Rule 6 Party's statement of case, proofs of evidence and rebuttals
  CD11.0 Documents submitted during the Inquiry.

- Numbering of documents within each core document library section should follow the format of CD1.1, CD1.2, CD1.3 etc, as per the relevant section.

- Hyperlinks should be provided for each core document which should generally be in PDF document format.

- Each core document should be numbered and named appropriately on the tab when the PDF document is open. This allows the participants to find open tabs swiftly.

- Where core documents are scanned documents, only relevant numbered pages should be provided.

- The numbering of the PDF document pages should match the numbering on the pages, wherever possible.

- The parties should work together to ensure that there is no mismatch in numbering in proofs of evidence and rebuttals.

- **No additional core documents should be added to the library following the deadline for provision of the library unless previously agreed with the Inspector and in consultation with the other parties**.