



SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

Pre-Inquiry Meeting held on 17th September 2007 at Tynedale Functions and Conferencing, Tyne Green, Hexham, Northumberland, NE46 3SG

by David M H Rose BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform and the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate
4/09 Kite Wing
Temple Quay
House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN
☎ 0117 372 6372
e-mail: enquiries@planning-inspectorate.gsi.gov.uk

Date

Application Reference : APP/R2928/A/07/2039188 – Site at Green Rigg Fell

An Appeal, under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, by Wind Prospect Developments Ltd against the failure of the Tynedale District Council to determine within the statutory time period an application for the erection and operation of 18 wind turbines with associated tracks, underground cables, switchgear building and anemometer mast on land at Green Rigg Fell, Birtley Parish, Tynedale;

Application Reference : GDBC/001/00247C – Site at Ray Estate

Application by Amec Project Investments Limited, under Section 36 of the Electricity Act 1989, to construct and operate a wind turbine generating station on land at the Ray Estate, Northumberland;

Application Reference : GDBC/001/00278C – Site at Steadings

Application by Steadings Wind Farm Limited, under Section 36 of the Electricity Act 1989, to construct and operate a wind turbine generating station on land near Kirkwhelpington, Northumberland.

A summary of matters discussed and actions agreed are set out below

1. Introduction

1. The meeting was opened at 2.00pm by Mr David Rose, the Planning Inspector, who welcomed those present and introduced himself as the Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform and the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government to hold a joint Public Local Inquiry into the above proposals. The Public Inquiry will begin on Tuesday 15th January 2007 at 10.00am.
2. Roger Claxton was introduced as the Inquiry Programme Officer (*see also paragraph 43 below*) and general housekeeping matters were explained, including the fire alarm and emergency exit arrangements and the switching off of mobile phones. Signing of the Attendance Sheets was requested and any members of the Press present were asked to contact the Programme Officer.

3. Mr W Norris QC, on behalf of Amec Project Investments Ltd (The Ray proposal), drew attention to the very late indication of the Ministry of Defence's objection to each of the proposals individually and cumulatively. Advocates for the other two proposals, finding themselves in the same position, echoed these concerns and endorsed the need for urgent meetings to take place to resolve the issue or to narrow and define and agree matters of fact. The Inspector confirmed that exploratory discussions should take place as a matter of urgency and that the Inquiry Programme Officer should be kept fully informed.

2. Purpose of the Pre-Inquiry Meeting

4. The Inspector explained that the Pre-Inquiry Meeting was concerned solely with procedural matters and was not the forum for any discussion on the merits or otherwise of the proposals. It was to set out the arrangements to be put in place to ensure an effective, efficient, well-structured and well-organised Inquiry. The Inspector emphasised that those unable to attend the Pre-Inquiry Meeting were not precluded from attending or speaking at the Inquiry itself.

3. Appearances

5. The applicants, other main parties, other groups and some individual objectors identified as wishing to appear at the Inquiry are listed at Annex A. An indication of the number of witnesses the applicants and main parties were likely to call at the Inquiry was given by each party. These would, however, be reviewed when evidence was submitted by the specified dates (*see paragraph 25 below*). The Inspector explained that major participants would have certain rights in terms of being able to cross-examine those presenting an opposing case, but would also have certain responsibilities in terms of producing proofs of evidence. Any other parties or individual objectors who wish to appear or be represented at the Inquiry should register with the Programme Officer.
6. The Inspector stressed that he expected the main parties, in particular, at the Inquiry to address all the matters identified by the relevant Secretaries of State in their published Statement of Matters as being likely to be relevant to their consideration. The Inspector briefly summarised the matters, as follows:
 - Development Plan and Government energy policies;
 - The justification for the sites, and what other sites were considered and why they were discounted;
 - Visual impact;
 - Noise;
 - Impact on aviation interests;
 - Impact on the historic environment;
 - Planning conditions;
 - Any other relevant matters.

The Inspector added that, in response to a letter dated 20 June 2007 from Tynedale Council, the "Impact on the historic environment" would be taken to expressly include the impact on any listed building and its setting; and that the reference to "Planning conditions" would be extended to include planning obligations and other agreements.

7. The Inspector also explained that he would be taking full account of written representations received and any additional written material from those not wishing to

speak at the Inquiry. *(The applicants are reminded of the need to comment on submitted written representations, as appropriate.)* The Inspector also encouraged individuals wishing to speak to consider whether they could join with others to present a joint case, as he did not wish to hear repetitious statements.

4. Procedure and Programme

8. The Inspector confirmed that the Inquiry was due to be formally opened at 10.00am on Tuesday 15 January 2008. The Inquiry would not normally sit on Mondays and sitting times would generally be 10:00 – 13:00 and 14:00 – 17:00. Some variation could be possible to permit an earlier finish on Fridays. The Inquiry would be arranged in blocks of 3 consecutive sitting weeks followed by an adjournment of one week – some variation might be necessary to achieve a sensible programme or to reflect the availability of accommodation.
9. It was confirmed that a provisional booking had been made with the Britannia Newcastle Airport Hotel. There was general agreement with this choice of venue.

4.1 Inquiry Procedure Rules

10. The Inspector explained that, in terms of procedure, The Town and Country Planning (Inquiries Procedure) (England) Rules 2000 applied to inquiries held under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 – in this case, the appeal in respect of the Green Rigg Fell windfarm proposals – and that The Electricity Generating Stations and Overhead Lines (Inquiries Procedure) (England and Wales) Rules 2007 applied to inquiries held under the Electricity Act 1989 – in this case the two applications in respect of the proposed Ray Estate and Steadings windfarm proposals.
11. As this was a joint inquiry, the Inspector was of the view that, to avoid confusion and uncertainty (not least on the differences in the rules in imposing different time periods for submitting documents) only one set of rules should be applied to the joint inquiry. It was agreed that the Inspector's preferred solution for The Electricity Generating Stations and Overhead Lines (Inquiries Procedure) (England and Wales) Rules 2007 (*Statutory Instrument 2007 No. 841*) to govern the inquiry should be adopted.

4.2 The Inquiry

12. On the first morning of the Inquiry, the Inspector said that he would invite short opening statements, of no more than 20 minutes duration, from each of the three windfarm promoters; Tynedale District Council and other major participants in order to set the scene for the respective cases and to inform members of the public of the principal arguments being advanced.

4.3 Organisation of the Inquiry

13. The Inspector outlined three options for organising the Inquiry:
 - 1) Each applicant's case, and objections thereto, to be heard in turn
 - 2) A Topic-based programme
 - 3) A combination of 1) and 2)
14. Following detailed discussions, it was generally agreed that the discrete Topic-based option should be adopted.

4.4 Order of Appearances

15. The question of which order the applicants should appear was discussed. It was agreed that the applicants' witnesses appearing within each Topic would normally present their cases in the following order:

- 1) Steadings (Steadings Wind Farm Ltd)
- 2) Ray Estate (Amec Project Investments Limited)
- 3) Green Rigg Fell (Wind Prospect Developments Ltd)

The Inspector confirmed that each of the applicants' evidence on a Topic would precede that of other participants.

16. The representative for English Heritage indicated uncertainty in its role at the Inquiry in that it had not received all of the necessary information on two of the three schemes. The Inspector asked that this be pursued as a matter of urgency and for the position of the organisation to be clarified as soon as possible. If it intended to take a major role, consideration would be given to making English Heritage a Rule 6(6) party.

17. Similarly Northumberland National Park Authority had not sought Rule 6(6) status but anticipated that it would be represented by an advocate and an expert witness in relation to landscape and visual assessment. On this basis the Inspector would recommend confirmation of Rule 6(6) status.

18. Others seeking to play a major part in the Inquiry, including the Northumberland and Newcastle Society and Mr J William Short, should also be afforded formal status and be required to submit a statement of case and all related documents by the due dates. The representative for CREDIT confirmed that the organisation did not intend to play a major part in the Inquiry but would wish to respond to some of the evidence presented.

4.5 Presentation of evidence

19. With regard to the presentation of evidence, the Inspector confirmed that the usual practice of reading summary proofs of evidence would apply but that would not preclude cross-examination on the contents of the proof as a whole and its supporting documents. (*Note: Summary proofs of evidence are required where the full proof of evidence extends to more than 1500 words.*) The Inspector asked the parties to ensure that summary proofs of evidence accurately condensed the gist of the proof so that they could be read in their own right as a meaningful document.

20. The Inspector strongly endorsed Amec's suggestion that each applicant and possibly other major parties get together to establish certain protocols for the preparation of evidence, for example in relation to landscape assessment methodologies,

21. The Inspector made it clear that he encouraged the parties to co-operate as much as possible in simplifying the material to be presented to the Inquiry, especially to avoid repetition, and also to avoid cross-examination on matters capable of exploration and clarification, with possibly some agreement being reached before the Inquiry began. In this respect, the Inspector suggested that there could be merit in the three applicants supplementing the Statements of Common Ground to be produced between them and the local planning authority (*see also Annex B*), with topic based position statements setting out what is agreed between the applicants and what is not agreed.

4.6 Inquiry Duration

22. The Inspector said that the Planning Inspectorate had estimated that the Inquiry would require 32 sitting days. This was done prior to receipt of outline statements, but

despite these now being available and with some participants' preliminary time estimates of case presentation, it was too early to provide a more rigorous estimate. Following discussion, it was generally accepted that at least 32 sitting days would be required.

23. The Inspector explained that, under the 2007 Inquiry Rules, he was required to submit a draft timetable for the consideration and approval of the Secretary of State. At this stage only a range could be suggested, pending statements of case and possibly the submission of proofs and the drawing up of the Inquiry timetable. He would therefore be seeking the co-operation of the parties, through the Programme Officer, in drawing up considered time estimates which they were able to adhere to. He pointed out that the 2007 Inquiry Rules provided a sanction for curtailing evidence or cross-examination where it would prejudice the timetable. (*See also paragraph 29 below.*)

4.7 *Timetable for the Submission of Evidence*

24. The Inspector explained that, as there were three separate applications being considered at the joint Inquiry and that some parties would need to consider the evidence relating to all three cases, he wanted to agree a process and timetable to ensure that all of the evidence that the Inquiry would need to consider was available in good time for the Inquiry.

25. Following discussions, the following timetable for the submission of documents was established by the Inspector :

Statements of Case:	15 th October 2007
Statements of Common Ground:	5 th November 2007
Proofs of Evidence and Written Statements:	3 rd December 2007
Rebuttal proofs/supplementary proofs:	20 th December 2007

(Note: All documents to be sent to the Programme Office by the above dates in both hard copy (four copies) and electronic form (Word or Adobe PDF))

26. Discussion took place about the production of documents covering the Aviation topic. It was agreed that this element might have to be delayed pending negotiations between the principal parties. In this regard the submission of Aviation Statements of Common Ground and Aviation Proofs of Evidence would be subject to further consideration and direction by the Inspector, dependent on urgent meetings taking place between the relevant parties. The Inspector said that the Programme Officer should be kept fully informed of developments on Aviation issues so that he could advise the Inspector.
27. A similar discussion took place about the submission of Proofs of Evidence on landscaping issues. The Inspector said that they should be submitted by 3rd December 2007, although he would consider requests for later submission. Such a request must be passed to the Programme Officer and any slippage on the 3rd December submission date could only take place with the Inspector's agreement, otherwise the 3rd December date must be adhered to. Should the Inspector agree to a delay in submission, he also made it clear that only a maximum of one week delay would be granted, for submission no later than 10th December 2007.
28. The Inspector noted that Amec had raised the issue of the possibility of competing applicant's cases being contrary to the case advanced by one or both of the other applicants, especially on cumulative impacts. They suggested that there should be an

opportunity to comment accordingly. It was agreed that applicants could respond to the Statements of Case of other applicants by 29th October 2007.

29. The Inspector stressed the need for these submission dates to be adhered to, especially as the Christmas and New Year period would effectively lose a week for all in preparing for the Inquiry. It would also enable proper consideration of time estimates with a view to issuing an Inquiry timetable by no later than 17th December (as required by the 2007 Inquiry Rules).

4.8 *Second Pre-Inquiry Meeting*

30. There were no requests for a second Pre-Inquiry Meeting (PIM) to be held, but the Inspector said that should it be necessary for him to call a second PIM (for example, to discuss progress/problems with Aviation issues), it would be held on 10th December 2007, subject to venue availability.

4.9 *Documents*

31. The Inspector said that a separate note would be issued about the submission of proofs and documents based on the guidance of Circular 5/2000 (*see Annex C*), but briefly summarised, as follows:
- Proofs of evidence, over 1500 words, must be accompanied by separate summaries (summaries should not be an afterthought for handing in on the day).
 - Proofs and appendices should be bound separately.
 - Each main party should adopt a document numbering system with a unique identification prefix. Further guidance would be given in the separate note. The parties will be responsible for up-dating and submitting a complete list at the end of the Inquiry.
 - A core document library would be established.
 - Opening statements and closing submissions should be available in writing and in electronic format. An adjournment will be included in the programme before the presentation of closing submissions to assist with their preparation.
32. The Inspector added that he intended to use, reserving the right to edit as necessary, closing submissions as a framework for his report as this was likely to save considerable time. Closing submissions should therefore cover each of the points set out in the Secretaries of State's Statement of Matters and represent the basis on which the parties would wish their case to be presented to the Secretaries of State.
33. The Inspector confirmed that an Inquiry web-site was in the early stages of development and that this would in due course provide up to date details of the inquiry. It would be owned and maintained by the Inquiry Programme Officer. (*The Inquiry website address is www.persona.uk.com/tynedale*)
34. The Inspector confirmed that from the date of the Pre-Inquiry Meeting all material (proofs, documents, statements, letters etc.) pertinent to the Inquiry should be sent direct to the Inquiry Programme Officer. (Prior to the Meeting there had been two contact points, the Planning Inspectorate for the planning appeal and the Department for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform (previously Department of Trade and Industry)).

5. Site Visits

35. The Inspector explained that, before the Inquiry opened, he intended to undertake preliminary inspections of the sites and their wider surroundings which would assist him in establishing the context for landscape evidence in particular. Although the 2007 Inquiry Rules did not expressly permit him making accompanied inspections before the Inquiry he had nonetheless found that it was an extremely useful practice in the past especially where the sites are not generally accessible to the public.
36. The Inspector said that the Programme Officer would in due course seek the views of the parties on a programme of preliminary site visits and whether these should be accompanied or unaccompanied. He also confirmed that he would carry out formal accompanied inspections at the end of the Inquiry in the usual way.

6. Any Other Business

6.1 *Environmental Statements*

37. With regard to the Environmental Statements (ES) which had been submitted with the three windfarm applications and which had been the subject of publicity and consultation, the Inspector understood that these had been supplemented by additional information in the form of Supplementary Environmental Information. Each of the three parties was to confirm what constituted their own Environmental Information and whether anything else was in the course of preparation.
38. The Inspector added that in relation to the three Environmental Statements, as supplemented, those for Ray and Steadings windfarm proposals included assessments of the cumulative impacts of the proposed three wind farms: - on landscape and visual impacts; construction traffic assessment and aviation. The Inspector asked for confirmation whether such studies had been prepared, or whether they were in the course of preparation, for Green Rigg. It was also important that each of the promoters should indicate whether any alternative sites had been studied.
39. The Inspector also asked, in relation to the Green Rigg proposal, for a more detailed description of how the turbines would be connected to the National Grid, including the methods proposed and any consequent effects entailed in traversing sensitive areas such as Hadrian's Wall World Heritage Site
40. Mr Newcombe, on behalf of Steadings Wind Farm Ltd, indicated that it was intended to revise the application proposal by omitting one of the proposed turbines and repositioning two others. This would be reflected in Supplementary Environmental Information which was in the process of being advertised and distributed for consultation.

6.2 *Cumulative Effects*

41. In relation to the identification of relevant wind farm sites (existing and proposed) for the base line for cumulative analysis it was agreed that the three applicants and the local planning authority should identify and reach agreement on relevant sites.

6.3 *The position of Tynedale District Council*

42. It was explained that the Council would argue that no consent should be granted for any wind farm. However, it would be ranking each of the three proposals, following consultation, to indicate the relative merits of the sites.

6.4 Programme Officer and Contact Points

43. Mr Roger Claxton of Persona Associates had been appointed to assist the Inquiry as Programme Officer. The contact address is Persona Associates, West Point, Springfield Road, Horsham, West Sussex RH12 2PD; telephone 01403 217799; email rogerclaxton@personaassociates.co.uk. Mr Claxton is the contact for the Inspector prior to and during the Inquiry. The Inquiry web site for access to documents submitted is at www.persona.uk.com/tynedale. Any questions with regard to the running of the Inquiry or its timetable should be addressed to Mr Claxton in the first instance. During the Inquiry Mr Claxton will be based at the venue and will hold the Inquiry Library as well as being responsible for the timetable and submission/circulation of documents for the participants.
44. If anyone has any comments or queries upon the matters referred to above, please contact the Programme Officer in the first instance.

David M H Rose

Planning Inspector

Annex A – APPEARANCES

ANNEX A

FOR THE APPLICANTS :

Mr Vincent Fraser	Queen’s Counsel, instructed by Hammonds Solicitors on behalf of Wind Prospect Developments Ltd (Green Rigg Fell)
Mr William Norris	Queen’s Counsel, instructed by Shepwedd and Wedderburn, Solicitors on behalf of Amec Project Investments Ltd (Ray Estate)
Mr Andrew Newcombe	Of Counsel, instructed by Bond Pearce, Solicitors on behalf of Steadings Wind Farm Ltd (Steadings)

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY :

Mr Anthony Crean	Queen’s Counsel, instructed by Tynedale District Council
------------------	--

FOR THE COUNTY COUNCIL and NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY :

Mr Matthew Copeland	Of Counsel, instructed by Northumberland County Council
Ms Lucy Butler	<i>representing</i> Northumberland National Park Authority

FOR OTHER STATUTORY AGENCIES AND COMMERCIAL UNDERTAKINGS :

Mr Julian Chafer	<i>representing</i> Defence Estates, Ministry of Defence
Mr A Hunter	<i>representing</i> English Heritage
Mr Phil Jones	<i>representing</i> North East Assembly (<i>Representations to be made in writing</i>)
Mr Peter Nesbit	Eversheds, Solicitors representing Newcastle International Airport Ltd.

FOR OTHER LOCAL AUTHORITIES :

Mr Peter Ramsden	<i>representing</i> Bavington Parish Council
Mr D Burn	<i>representing</i> Birtley Parish Council
Mr Roger Bolam	<i>representing</i> Elsdon Parish Council
Mr Richard Thornton	<i>representing</i> Kirkwhelpington Parish Council

OTHER INTERESTED PERSONS AND GROUPS :

Revd John Wylam	<i>representing</i> Throckington Parochial Church Council
Mr Martin Archbold	<i>representing</i> Campaign for Responsible Energy Development in Tynedale (CREDIT)
Mr Peter Bennet (<i>continued next page</i>)	<i>representing</i> Friends of the Wanneys

Mr David Gardner-Medwin
Mr Anthony Coon
Mr David Clipsham
Mr J William Short

representing The Natural History Society of Northumbria
representing Northumberland and Newcastle Society
representing self
representing self

ANNEX B

Extract from Department for Communities and Local Government Circular 05/00

A Guide to the Statement of Common Ground

1. This guide is referred to in paragraph 40 of Annex 3 to Circular 05/00.
2. The statement of common ground is a written statement prepared jointly by the local planning authority and the applicant (or appellant). The purpose of the statement of common ground is to set out the agreed factual information about the proposal. The inclusion of agreed material in the statement of common ground should result in shorter proofs of evidence and shorter inquiries.
3. The statement of common ground should complement the proofs of evidence and both should be received by the Secretary of State no later than 4 weeks before the inquiry. The main parties will therefore need to meet before that date to try to narrow the areas of dispute and agree on what should go in the statement. It is the responsibility of the applicant (or appellant) to send the statement to the Secretary of State.
4. The statement of common ground should be kept factual and should not include opinion and comment.
5. In all cases agreement can be reached on some matters: the precise nature of the proposal before the inquiry, the description of the site, its planning history and the relevant policies can all be agreed.
6. Evidence on technical matters and topics that rely on basic statistical data can often be fruitful areas for pre-inquiry agreement. Traffic evidence, for example, can be simplified and the issues refined, by pre-inquiry agreement on matters such as traffic flows, design standards, and the basis for forecasting the level of traffic the proposal would generate. Other examples of topics where a degree of factual agreement might be possible are the pattern and frequency of public transport routes, applicable air quality standards, acceptable noise impact thresholds, nature conservation survey data, and housing land availability. What might be agreed in any particular appeal will depend on the matters at issue and will be unique to that case.
7. The statement of common ground, by clearly identifying the matters which are not in real dispute, may save time and cost at the inquiry. It may also be useful for the statement to identify areas where agreement is not possible.
8. Time can also be saved at the inquiry by seeking to agree beforehand the conditions that any permission granted should contain and any planning obligations being considered. The Rules reinforce the established presumption against taking into account material submitted after the inquiry is closed. It is therefore sensible to reach agreement on any necessary section 106 planning obligations before the inquiry.
9. Failure to reach agreement on the statement of common ground could, if resulting from a non-co-operative attitude rather than a genuine disagreement on the facts, lead to an application for costs. If it can be shown that a lack of co-operation has extended the inquiry, for example, and caused additional expense, an award of costs could be made.
10. The Rules require the local planning authority to allow anyone who requests it an opportunity to inspect the statement of common ground.

Extract from Department for Communities and Local Government Circular 05/00
A Guide to Presenting Written Evidence at Public Inquiries

1. This guide is referred to in paragraph 34 of Annex 3 to Circular 05/00.

Proofs of Evidence and Summaries

2. The term "proof of evidence" is used in the Inquiry Procedure Rules. It refers to the document containing the written evidence about which a person appearing at a public inquiry will speak.

3. Proofs should be concise and ideally contain facts and expert opinions deriving from witnesses' own professional or local knowledge as applied to individual cases. It would also be helpful if they were to address the question of conditions to the extent appropriate to a witness's evidence.

4. Proofs should not include matters which are not in dispute. The statement of common ground prepared jointly by the applicant (or appellant) and the local planning authority should contain basic matters such as site description, planning history and the relevant planning policy. In addition, the statement of common ground should include the results of any pre-inquiry agreement the main parties have reached on what conditions might be needed.

5. Where it is important to set out facts in detail, the proof should focus on what is really necessary to make the case and avoid including unnecessary material. Where the proof makes a point which relies on a document, the page and paragraph number in that document should always be identified and cross-referenced.

6. Reasons for refusal must specify all relevant development plan policies. These policies should therefore be quoted in the proof only to the extent needed to understand the argument being put forward and only those that are fundamental to an appraisal of the proposal's merits.

7. If case law is to be cited in the proof, it would be helpful if the full law report reference is included together with a copy of the report are included as a document and cross-reference.

8. Where a party calls more than one witness, the evidence of each should address distinct topics. It is important that witnesses do not overlap in their evidence. Even fairly small differences in emphasis can confuse the case being presented.

9. Proofs should, as far as possible, be bound so that they can be opened flat. They should be bound separately from any supporting documents. To allow notes to be made they should be printed on only one side of each page. Proofs should have their pages and paragraphs numbered. Sufficient copies should be prepared for all the main participating parties and distributed in accordance with the Rules. Additional copies should be made available for inspection at the local planning authority's offices prior to the inquiry and for inspection and circulation at the inquiry. The number required will depend on the likely level of public interest.

10. Summaries should be provided when a proof exceeds 1500 words. As a guide, summaries should not exceed 10% of the length of the proof. It is normally only the summaries that are read out at the inquiry. These should accurately condense the gist of the proof, concentrating on the case in relation to the main points at issue. The content of the summary should not go beyond the scope of the text it purports to summarise otherwise unproductive disputes can arise.

Documents

11. All documents accompanying proofs of evidence should be carefully prepared, presented and, where appropriate, edited so as to exclude irrelevant matter. Their purpose is to set out in an ordered and readily-identifiable form the factual material and technical data upon which the evidence is based. They should be separate from the proofs of evidence and have identifiable reference numbers prefixed by letters denoting the name of the party producing them. The relevance of all documents submitted should be explained in evidence or submissions.

12. Lists of core documents, such as policy statements and development plan extracts, should be compiled and indexed by local planning authorities and submitted as statements of case. Co-operation between parties should ensure that as far as possible a list of core documents is agreed and that extracts contain all material to be referred to. All main parties should start to number their own documents before the inquiry, and keep an up-to-date list to be completed and submitted before the close of the inquiry.

13. As far as possible documents should be of A4 size. Extracts from published material must indicate the precise context with full titles, chapter headings and dates. A photocopy of the document's title page is sufficient to indicate its origin and publication date.

14. Plans, maps and diagrams should be similarly identified and be of A4 size or folded to A4 size. Plans and maps may be photographically reduced and incorporated in an A3 size plan brochure provided it is flexible enough to be folded to A4 size. Otherwise, photographs should be mounted on a series of A4 cards. Each photographic view should be individually numbered and the viewpoints from which they were taken shown on a separate Ordnance Survey extract. The time and date at which a photograph was taken should be given. It is also helpful to give the focal length of the lens used. Models displayed at inquiries should be photographed, preferably in colour, and copy prints submitted as documents.

15. In preparing for longer inquiries local planning authorities should compile lists of core documents and submit them with statements of case. These documents will include policy statements and development plan extracts, and other key policy documents and background material. The test for including a document is whether it is probable that it will need to be referred to before the inquiry closes. As the pre-inquiry process continues the parties should consult to agree on any additions to the core document list prior to the submission of these documents to the Secretary of State. If a document is a core document there is no need to produce separate extracts to accompany individual proofs. The proof only needs to refer to it by its core document reference number.