



APPEAL REF: APP/C4235/W/25/3373210

**Woodford Garden Village Extension,
Former Woodford Aerodrome,
Chester Road, Woodford, Stockport**

Outline application with all matters reserved for a new residential-led development comprising the demolition of the existing employment building and structures; the erection of residential dwellings, extra care accommodation, and a local community hub; the creation of new vehicle, cycle and pedestrian connections, open space, landscaping and other associated works

**INSPECTOR'S PRE-CONFERENCE NOTE FOR THE CASE MANAGEMENT
CONFERENCE TO BE HELD AT 10 AM ON WEDNESDAY 3 DECEMBER 2025
(VIA MS TEAMS)**

1. The case management conference for the Inquiry will be led by Mr Matthew Shrigley, a chartered town planner and Planning Inspector.
2. There will be no discussion during the conference as to the merits of your respective cases and Mr Shrigley will not hear any evidence. Rather the purpose is to set out a clear indication as to the ongoing management arrangements expected and the presentation of evidence, so that the forthcoming Inquiry is conducted in an efficient and effective manner.
3. The Inquiry itself is scheduled to open at **10.00am** on 3 February 2026 at a venue to be confirmed.
4. It is currently expected to sit for no more than 5 days.

Main issues

5. The appeal relates to non-determination. Based on the material currently submitted, the main issues of the case are likely to relate to:
 - Green Belt impacts including any harm to openness and whether there are any very special circumstances.
 - Whether there would be any harm to the operation of the highway network including regard to any mitigation; and
 - The adequacy of provisions made by the development toward: (i) local education delivery (ii) recreational open space, (iii) active travel and sustainable transportation having regard to the site location.
6. It is essential that all parties communicate effectively with one another to seek to narrow the issues for consideration at the Inquiry. This should be an on-going conversation. You are therefore requested to give consideration in

advance of the case management conference as to whether the identified matters encapsulate those most pertinent to the outcome of the appeal.

7. The Inquiry will focus on areas where there is disagreement. With that in mind, the conference will explore how best to hear the evidence in order to ensure that the Inquiry is conducted as efficiently as possible.

Dealing with the evidence

8. To avoid unnecessary repetition, my initial thoughts are that having regard to the issues set out above, that they would comprise topics best suited to the formal presentation of evidence and cross-examination. However, the respective advocates views will be considered.
9. Matters relating to the main issues, overarching planning policy, and any associated overall planning balance exercise, would be dealt with through the formal presentation of evidence in chief by the planning witness(s) for each of the main parties, which would be subject to cross-examination. The evidence of the appellant would also need to address any other matters raised by interested parties.
10. You are requested to give the above careful consideration in advance of the related discussion at the case management conference. Any request for evidence to be heard other than as currently envisaged will need to be fully justified.
11. All the above points are included on the case management conference agenda attached below in Annex A.
12. Annex B also accompanying this correspondence sets out the preferred format and content of proofs and other material, which should be observed.

M Shrigley

INSPECTOR

25 November 2025

Annex A

AGENDA

1. Introduction by Inspector
2. Purpose of the conference
3. Confirmation of advocates
4. Likely main issues
5. How the main issues will be dealt with
6. Conditions
7. Planning Obligation matters (if required)
8. Core Documents
9. Inquiry running order/programme/evening session
10. Timetable for submission of documents
12. Costs
13. Any other procedural matters not otherwise addressed

Annex B

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 necessary to make the case and avoid including unnecessary material, or duplicating material in other documents or another witness's evidence.
- 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 the statement of common ground).

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.
- Proofs are to be spiral bound or bound in such a way as to be easily opened and read.
- Front covers to proofs and appendices are to be clearly titled, with the name of the witness on the cover.
- Pages and paragraphs should be numbered.
- Appendices are to be bound separately.
- Appendices are to be indexed using projecting tabs, labelled and paginated.