

APP/J0350/W/25/3366043
Manor Farm, Poyle Road, Slough, SL3 0BL

**Case Management Conference (CMC) to be held at 14.00 on
Tuesday 22 July 2025 as a MS Teams meeting**

CMC SUMMARY NOTE

1. The CMC was led by the Planning Inspector, Miss R Barrett. She had liaised with the Inquiry Inspector Mr David Rose prior to the meeting.
2. Having canvassed main parties' views on the format to be adopted for this event the Inspector now confirms that the Inquiry is to be held as a physical event, opening at 10.00 on Tuesday 14 October 2025, resuming at 09.30am on subsequent days, as necessary. It was confirmed that the parties would ensure a fall back virtual alternative if required.
3. The Inquiry is scheduled to sit for up to 8 days. However, on the basis of the evidence submitted at present, the Inquiry Inspector has requested two reserve days. Please can all parties reserve **6 and 7 November 2025**, in the event that should be required.

4. Appearances for the main parties were confirmed as follows:

Appellant

Mr Rupert Warren KC (represented at the CMC by Dr Ashley Bowes).
He will calling five witnesses in relation to need, power, alternative sites, landscape and planning matters.

LPA

Mr Richard Ground KC. He will be calling two witnesses to deal with the full range of matters in dispute.

Rule 6 party

None at present

5. Public interest at application stage does not warrant live streaming of this event. That at appeal is unknown at present. If public interest at appeal indicates live streaming to be necessary, the Inquiry Inspector will communicate this to the main parties at the earliest possible opportunity.
6. To ensure that Inquiry time is used to best effect, it would be helpful for interested parties to work together with a view to appointing one or two spokespersons to represent their views to the Inquiry. The LPA is encouraged to draw the attention of interested parties to this Note, including posting a copy on its web site.

Notifications

7. Inquiry notifications should normally be issued a minimum of 2 weeks in advance of opening. The LPA must send a copy of the notification letter to the

case officer, together with a list of all those notified, at the same time that it is sent out to the parties, but in any event no later than **30 September 2025**.

8. The appellant is also requested to erect site notices containing the same information at locations around the site. To avoid any confusion, the notices are to be posted on the same day that the letters of notification go out – the parties will need to liaise on that. Once posted, a plan is to be submitted confirming the locations of the notices, with photographs of each. The notices must not be removed before the Inquiry takes place.

Main Considerations

9. On the basis of evidence to date, and in the absence of an agreed Statement of Common Ground (SoCG), the main considerations were agreed to relate to:
 - Effect on the Strategic Gap between Slough and Greater London
 - Effect on the Colne Valley Regional Park
 - Effect on Heathrow third runway
 - Need (national and local) including availability of alternative sites
 - Deliverability
 - Planning benefits
 - Green Belt/grey belt
 - Very Special Circumstances /planning balance
 - Conditions and S106
10. The appellant and LPA confirmed that some areas of disagreement may fall away, which would be confirmed in the general SoCG and submission of planning conditions and a planning obligation.
11. Interested parties may raise additional concerns. Whether any of those matters are dealt with as main considerations in the Inspector's Decision will depend on the evidence as it emerges in due course.
12. The Inquiry will also look at any benefits to be weighed in the planning balance, including any implications of not proceeding with the scheme.

Confirmation of scheme at Inquiry

13. It was agreed by the main parties that the description of development will be agreed and included in a general statement SoCG along with a list of plans on which the LPA made its decision and those on which the appellant requests permission.

Dealing with the evidence

14. There is no agreed and signed SoCG. The importance of a good SoCG, or more to the point a statement of uncommon ground, will be critical in this case providing a focus for the Inquiry and helping us get through all that we need to in a reasonable time. Given its importance this should be submitted by **30 July 2025**. It is understood that amendments may be required if areas of disagreement are further narrowed, which can be accommodated either in an agreed revised version or addendum.
15. The parties agreed the necessity of a topic based SoCG on planning history of the appeal site. That should be submitted no later than **8 August 2025**.

16. The Inspector set out her thoughts, based on the evidence before her and discussions with the Inquiry Inspector, that all matters should be explored through formal presentation of evidence and cross examination. The LPA stated a preference for matters relating to Heathrow airport third runway to be dealt with through a round table discussion (RTD). The Inquiry Inspector will confirm his position on this matter once he has had sight of all the evidence to be tested.
17. All proofs should be submitted by **16 September 2025**. Any necessary rebuttal proofs should be submitted by **30 September 2025**.

Conditions

18. An *agreed* schedule of possible conditions, together with the reasons for them (including references to any policy support) will need to be submitted in Word format at the same time as the proofs (**16 September 2025**). The LPA is to take the lead on preparing that list, in discussion with the appellant.
19. Careful attention is to be paid to the wording, which should avoid 'tail-pieces.' The conditions will need to be properly justified having regard to the relevant tests, in particular the test of necessity. You are reminded that conditions that are required to be discharged before development commences should be avoided unless there is a clear justification. The reasons for any pre-commencement conditions will need to include that justification. The Inspector will also need agreement in writing from the appellant to those. Any difference in view on any of the suggested conditions, including their wording, should be highlighted in the schedule with a brief explanation given.

Planning Obligation

20. An early draft of the planning obligation is to be provided by **2 September 2025**, with a final agreed draft to be submitted by **30 September 2025**. That final draft must be accompanied by the relevant office copy entries and a CIL Compliance Statement prepared by the LPA. That statement is to set out a fully detailed justification for each obligation sought, detailing how it complies with the CIL Regulations, in particular the test of necessity in terms of how it would mitigate a particular harm arising out of the development proposed. It should include reference to any policy support and, in relation to any financial contribution, exactly how it has been calculated and on precisely what it would be spent. Although the pooling restriction on financial contributions has been rescinded, the statement will still need to set out whether any relevant schemes are the subject of other financial contributions in order for the Inquiry Inspector to be able to come to a view as to whether any contribution sought in relation to this appeal is justified.
21. The Inquiry Inspector will allow a short time after the Inquiry for submission of a signed version of the obligation, if necessary.

Core Documents/Inquiry Library/Hard Copies

22. You will need to discuss and agree a list of Core Documents in advance of preparing proofs so they can be properly referenced. It was agreed that the list will be co-ordinated by the appellant and submitted no later than **12 August 2025**. A preferred template for that list is included as annex A.

23. The Core Documents should comprise **only** those documents to which you will be referring in your evidence. Where any documents on which it is intended to rely are lengthy, only relevant extracts need to be supplied. Such extracts should, however, be prefaced with the front cover of the relevant document and include any accompanying relevant contextual text. A copy of the NPPF does not need to be included. Neither do documents that relate to matters which are not in dispute. Any appeal decisions and/or legal authorities on which you intend to rely will each need to be prefaced with a note explaining the relevance of the document to your case, together with the propositions on which you are seeking to rely, with the relevant paragraphs flagged up.
24. The main parties are to work together to set up and host an electronic Inquiry library. It was agreed that this would be hosted by the LPA. The library is to include all the Core Documents, plus the proofs and appendices, together with any rebuttals etc. These will need to be ordered and clearly referenced (using the same referencing system as the Core Documents) to enable quick access for all participants and third parties. Confirmation from the main parties that this has been done should be submitted by **12 August 2025**.
25. It is expected that all necessary documents will have been submitted in advance of the Inquiry. Any additional documents can only be handed up to the Inquiry **with the Inquiry Inspector's permission**. Only if accepted, they will need to be placed in the library web site from where they will need to be available to be shared and viewed by all parties.
26. The Inspector requires some documents in hard copy. That is likely to include proofs, rebuttals, relevant plans (at suitable and usable size) and any LVIA. The Inquiry Inspector will confirm his requirements. Any hard copies requested should be submitted no later than two days after exchange of proofs (**18 September 2025**).
27. The Appellant should also collate a set of the hard copy documents available at an appropriate place in the Inquiry room for the benefit of third parties. As long as technical support is available at the event, a laptop providing access to all core documents is an appropriate alternative.

Inquiry Running Order/Programme

28. Following on from the Inquiry Inspector's opening comments on the first day of the Inquiry, he will invite opening statements from each of you, which should be no longer than 10-15 minutes, appellant first, followed by the LPA.
29. The Inquiry will then hear from any interested parties who wish to speak, although there is scope for some flexibility if someone has difficulties that prevent them from attending and speaking on day one. Until we have an idea of the numbers who might wish to speak, we won't know how long that is likely to take. For planning purposes, the Inspector has allocated half a day for openings and interested parties.
30. The running order after that will be confirmed by the Inquiry Inspector once he has had sight of proofs. It is noted that the LPA would prefer the Inquiry Inspector to hear the main parties cases in full, rather than a topic based approach given it will call two witnesses to deal with all matters. Again, the Inquiry Inspector will confirm his preference once he has sight of the proofs.

31. The Inspector will lead the usual RTD on provisions of the planning obligation and then conditions.
32. Closing submissions, will be heard firstly from the LPA followed by appellant. The Inquiry Inspector will need copies of openings and closings shortly before you present them. Closing submissions should include all relevant references and cross-references where evidence is relied on, for the avoidance of doubt. Preferably, they should be no longer than around 40 minutes in length.
33. The advocates are to work collaboratively on their time estimates for each stage of their respective cases. They should produce a draft programme in light of their final timings. This should be submitted by **7 October 2025**. The Inquiry Inspector will consider it and publish a final version prior to the event. Other than in exceptional circumstances, you are expected to take no longer than the timings indicated, which will require the cooperation of both advocates and witnesses.
34. The Inquiry Inspector will need to undertake a site visit at some stage. It is expected that he will wish to undertake one unaccompanied prior to the event. You will need to work together on an agreed itinerary for that, which should include alternative sites. This should be provided no later than **30 September 2025**. The Inquiry Inspector will undertake a further visit on an accompanied basis after/during hearing evidence. The purpose of any site visit is simply for the Inquiry Inspector to see the site and its surroundings.

Costs

35. No application for costs is currently anticipated by any party at this stage, although positions were reserved. If any application is to be made, that should be done in writing before the Inquiry. You are also reminded that the Inspector has the power to initiate an award of costs in line with the Planning Practice Guidance if appropriate. Unreasonable behaviour may include not complying with the prescribed timetables.

Timetable for Submission of other Documents

36. Submission dates below have been slightly altered following the CMC to include additional items and following Inspector further consideration.

30 July 2025	Deadline for submission of: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• signed Main SoCG• confirmation of Inquiry venue
8 August 2025	Deadline for submission of: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• signed topic specific SoCG (planning history)
12 August 2025	Deadline for submission of: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• core documents list and confirmation of access arrangements
2 September 2025	Deadline for submission of: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• initial draft planning obligation
16 September 2025	Deadline for submission of: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• all proofs• suggested planning conditions
18 September 2025	Deadline for submission of: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• any hard copy proofs/documents requested
30 September 2025	Deadline for submission of: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• a copy of the Inquiry notification letter and list of those notified• site visit itinerary (including alternative sites and details of access where necessary)
30 September 2025	Deadline for submission of: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• final draft planning obligation and relevant office copy entries• CIL Compliance Statement (LPA)• any necessary rebuttal proofs
7 October 2025	Deadline for submission of: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• final timings and draft timetable
14 October 2025	Inquiry opens 10.00

R Barrett
INSPECTOR
22 July 2025

Annex A

TEMPLATE FOR CORE DOCUMENTS LIST (adapt headings to suit)

CD1 Application Documents and Plans

1.1
1.2 etc

CD2 Additional /Amended Reports and/or Plans submitted after validation

2.1
2.2

CD3 Committee Report and Decision Notice

3.1 Officer's Report and minute of committee meeting
3.2 Decision Notice

CD4 The Development Plan

4.1
4.2

CD5 Emerging Development Plan

5.1
5.2

CD6 Additional material submitted after determination of the application

6.1
6.2

CD7 Relevant Appeal Decisions/Judgements

7.1
7.2

CD8 Other

8.1
8.2

Annex B

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 prepared with a clear structure that identifies and addresses the main issues within the witness's field of knowledge and avoids repetition;
- be concise, precise, relevant and contain facts and expert opinion deriving from witnesses' own professional expertise and experience, and/or local knowledge;
- 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 as indicated elsewhere in this note;
- where data is referred to, include that data, and outline any relevant assessment methodology and the assumptions used to support the arguments (unless this material has been previously agreed and is included as part of a SoCG).

Proofs **should not**:

- duplicate information already included in other Inquiry material, such as site description, planning history and the relevant planning policy;
- recite 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;
- all documents should be submitted digitally. Hard copies should be provided as and when requested;

- front covers to proofs/ statements and appendices should be clearly titled, with the name and qualifications of the witness on the cover;
- pages and paragraphs should be numbered;
- all appendices should be compiled separately from proofs/ statements. Digital versions of appendices should be submitted as separate documents;
- appendices should be indexed and paginated.

All proofs/statements, appendices and other documents should be available for members of the public to view with a link from LPA's website (as agreed at the CMC).