

Request

Please could I apply for all correspondence in relation to the planning of industrial units adjacent to FINCH PARK (24/7 industrial Units on the field between Applewood Farm and Finch Park Housing Estate).

Please include all applicants who applied to buy the field. All details in relation to current developer and communication between the ad planning officers. When did the application to build begin. What recommendations were made by planning officers and developers. How long these plans have been in place and withheld.

Response

The information for any planning application(s) on this land is available to view on the Council's website by using the following link:

<https://planning.wigan.gov.uk/online-applications/>

Additional documentation is attached (next page) that wasn't available online.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 December 2023 12:11
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Public Footpaths - A/23/96226/MAJOR

Hi [REDACTED]

I appreciate that the information outlined below will be contained within the submitted pack of information but for the benefit of the Council's PROW Officer, would you please be able to produce a clear plan which addresses all of the points raised below?

Regards

[REDACTED]
Principal Planning Officer

Places Directorate: Economy and Skills
Wigan Council
Wigan Life Centre (South Site)
College Avenue
Wigan
WN1 1NJ

[REDACTED]

www.wigan.gov.uk
www.twitter.com/wigancouncil
www.facebook.com/WiganCouncilOnline

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above planning application, of which I understand that there is a desire to divert a number of public footpaths: Public footpaths Tyldesley No.'s: 145, 152, 154, 155 and 159.

I have looked at a number of plans, including the site layout proposal, but I can't find a specific plan that clearly refers to the public footpaths and what is proposed.

The layout proposal plan shows the existing alignment of public footpaths, in a broken blue/purple line, but it is unclear as to where the proposed diverted routes will be, as there is no key or clear identification. Also, there is some reference on the plan to public footpaths, but in the same colour scheme there is also reference to an informal permissive public footpath. Plus, the existing bridleway to the east of the site is also shown in the same colour scheme as the others referenced. If the routes are to be diverted, then the end points should link to the same highway as the original footpath, this is not happening in all cases.

It may be more appropriate to consider a Public Path Order that stops-up and creates, rather than diverts.

In addition, clarification is sought on the alternative alignment for public footpath Tyldesley No. 159, as this must connect to Tyldesley No. 160.

I appreciate that I am probably missing the correct plan and information, but considering that this application is making specific reference to the diversion of public footpaths, it would be useful if the plan clearly showing what is intended was clearly labelled.