

Haringey UDP Inquiry - Inspector's Report

PARKLAND WALK [Site 23]

HIGHGATE STATION CUTTING  
FORMER TRACK BED - HIGHGATE WOOD  
FORMER RAILWAY LAND - FINSBURY PARK

POLICY OP 3.1

SCHEDULE 5 Existing MOL Nos 4 & 5: Parkland Walk  
PMOL Nos 4, 5 & 6

Objection summary

6.13.62 Muswell Hill Metro Group [2]72/484 & 486], Mr E Nice [129/216-217] and Bird [141/232] object to the existing MOL designation along the Parkland Walk and the PMOL adjacent to Highgate Wood and Finsbury Park and in Highgate Cutting. Although the MOL designations along the Parkland Walk are appropriate, these designations would probably prevent development of a light rail line. An ideal solution would be to leave the land as MOL, but reserve it in some way for a light railway. As the Council say this is not possible, the existing MOL and PMOL has to be deleted from the Proposals Map. The land should be given a designation denoted by the letter "T" on the Proposals Map; this would show that the land was subject to an investigation into a tramway proposal. PC 113 should be amended to allow for a light rail line investigation. All these changes would help the Council to have more flexibility and to avoid another public inquiry. Rosefield [791/1838], Taylor [262/391] and Friends of Parkland Walk [788/1791] say the Muswell Hill section of Parkland Walk is not clearly designated as MOL or LNR.

Inspector's conclusions

6.13.63 Arguments from supporters of the light railway hinge on whether existing MOL and PMOL designation on these pieces of land are justified or whether there are exceptional reasons for abandoning this designation.

6.13.64 I find that the arguments submitted for retaining the existing MOL or accepting the PMOL do not focus on whether these open land designations are appropriate in terms of the advice in paragraph 60 of RPG3. Despite this I consider it is important to establish whether MOL is appropriate in these areas. I see the Council relies heavily on the Inspector's comments in 1982 to support the MOL designation. From my site inspections along this 4.5 mile ribbon of land, it is reasonably clear to me that this is a narrow, but rare and valuable stretch of open land in the Borough. It also has the potential to serve more than the interests of just Haringey's residents; it has recreational value of wider than Borough significance. For these reasons I find that the land merits designation as MOL. I deal with the Highgate Station Cutting in more detail in paragraphs 6.13.144-6.13.149.

6.13.65 This leads me to examine the claim that the intention to investigate a proposal for a light rail line on the land is more important than its designation as MOL. This claim is closely linked to the objection to Policy TSP 4.9. I decided with that objection, in paragraphs 7.20.1-7.20.11, that it was inappropriate to propose an intention to carry out a public transport investigation as a development plan policy. I concluded that the alleged connection between this investigation into the possibility of a

light rail line and clear land use considerations was far too remote. I also found that the proposed policy was most uncertain about implementation and had no clarity or precision in terms of dealing with future planning proposals.

6.13.66 Given these conclusions, the arguments supporting deletion of existing MOL and PMOL are seriously weakened. I am not convinced that MOL designation should be changed on the grounds of speculative ideas however well intentioned they may be. As I find the MOL designation is fully justified on the land in question, this means that there must be exceptional circumstances to warrant deletion of existing MOL or PMOL. I do not regard an investigation into a speculative idea as amounting to exceptional circumstances.

6.13.67 As for the proposed "T" designation, I do not find that this is justified for the reasons given in the last paragraph. Similarly I do not consider that PC 113 should be modified. I prefer the Council's arguments on this matter and agree that this change concerns the whole of the Borough. As for the tentative suggestion that perhaps a light rail line would be compatible with MOL designation, I was given insufficient information to convince me that the character and appearance of the MOL would not be adversely affected by such a development along this confined stretch of open land. I did not have specific proposals to consider and therefore am unable to come to firm conclusions on the impact.

6.13.68 I agree with the Council's intention to alter the Proposals Map to clarify the MOL and LNR notations on the Muswell Hill section of Parkland Walk.

#### Recommendation

6.13.69 The MOL and LNR designations on the Muswell Hill section of the Parkland Walk should be made clearer on the Proposals Map by use of the MOL and LNR notations.

#### RED CROSS GROVE LODGE [Site 7]

POLICY OP 3.1

SCHEDULE 5 Existing MOL No 7: Alexandra Park

POLICY OP 4.1 Site of ecological importance

#### Objection summary

6.13.70 British Red Cross [753/1697] says there is no evidence available as to why the objection site was designated MOL in the 1982 Haringey District Plan. There is no information as to why the MOL boundary was chosen, and no evidence of any resurvey of the boundary for the UDP. The logical MOL boundary runs along the chain link fence. The adjoining former allotment site is now under construction for housing. The objection site is physically contiguous and should be given similar treatment. Part of the site is covered with unattractive buildings and a parking area which do not meet RPG3 criteria. Another part of the site is self seeded vacant land, which is