

Dear Litha

Further to the discussion around possible inaccurate boundaries of MOL in the borough yesterday, I thought it would be useful for the Inspector to see the copy of correspondence between Elizabeth Sutton-Klein and Lynne Featherstone MP,. I think it will help to resolve the question around digital mapping and actual physical boundaries can differ from old historic maps showing open space. I will send the accompanying maps to this email.

Kind regards

**Eveleen Riordan**

Haringey Council  
Planning Policy/Place Planning Project Manager

Tuesdays and Wednesdays: 020 8489 5132 (UE)

Fridays: 020 8489 3607 (CYPS)

Email: [eveleen.riordan@haringey.gov.uk](mailto:eveleen.riordan@haringey.gov.uk)

[www.haringey.gov.uk](http://www.haringey.gov.uk)

**Please note that I am part time and usually only work on Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Fridays**



Think of the environment...please don't print this e-mail *unless you really need it*

---

**From:** Gunning Matthew  
**Sent:** 04 July 2011 13:36  
**To:** Riordan Eveleen  
**Cc:** Whelehan Ciara; McGuirk Clodagh  
**Subject:** FW: LBH/65494 - MOL/ Parkland Walk

FYI

---

**From:** Gunning Matthew  
**Sent:** 14 July 2009 17:48  
**To:** Tomkins Paul  
**Subject:** RE: LBH/65494 - MOL/ Parkland Walk

Dear Lynne,

I am writing in regards to your e-mail dated 1st July and accompanying e-mail from your constituent in which concerns are raised about the Council's position in safeguarding the MOL status of the former Cranley Gardens 'Garden Centre' site.

As your constituent has outlined there have been a significant number of planning applications for the site, including a very recent application for the erection of a double garage and additional vehicle crossover onto Cranley Gardens, which was refused permission by the Council in February 09 and which is presently subject to a planning appeal. In terms of the site's planning history the most important of these applications is the April 2007 decision of the Planning Inspectorate to allow the erection of four dwellings on this site, following the Council's refusal of this application.

While the Local Planning Authority were disappointed with the outcome of this decision I would point out that the Council had argued that such a development would have been by reason of its scale, height and site coverage a cramped and unduly dominant form of

development; which would have detracted from open character of the locality and would have had a prominent position adjacent to the Parkland Walk. In terms of the most recent application to erect a garage building for one of the new dwellings on site, we have put forward a similar case of argument. The Council has submitted a detailed statement of case (19 pages) to the Planning Inspectorate in respect of the current application which deals comprehensively with the planning history of the site and Unitary Development Plan (UDP) designations of the site and adjoining land; as well as strong reason as to what the development should not be permitted.

Turing to the issue of the designation of this site I would point out that, and has been previously pointed out to your constituent, the actual former 'Garden Centre' does not fall within Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) under the current (2006) or previous (1998) UDP. Parkland Walk which adjoins the site in question is designated MOL as well as an 'Ecologically Valuable Site of Metropolitan Importance' and a 'Site of Importance for Nature Conservation'. For your convenience I attach a map which shows the boundaries of the MOL.

While the Council accept that some of the earlier UDP maps (based on 1936 Ordnance Survey Maps) did show part of this site as falling within MOL, the actual boundary of MOL in recent UDP maps was changes to reflect new Ordnance Survey data / digital maps and the actual physical boundary of the site.

As has been pointed out to your constituent in a Freedom of Information request, the Planning Inspector's Report/ Public Inquiry into the UDP (November 1994) specifically recommended that the designation of the Muswell Hill section of Parkland Walk MOL be made clearer on the proposals map. This was subsequently done.

Based on the position the Council has taken in respect of the different applications for the site and the clarification provided in respect of the matter of the boundary of the MOL we would strongly reject the assertion that the Council is neglecting its statutory responsibility to safeguard MOL.

In a sense the defying moment for the development of this site was the granting of permission on appeal by the Planning Inspectorate in April 2007. For that appeal the Inspector had all the relevant information including the status of the site relative to the MOL, and he made that his decision in light of the planning policy relevant at the time of the appeal. That appeal decision, however regrettable, is not one which can be 'undone', so there is little point in trying to go back in time to an earlier period when the MOL boundary might have been different.

I hope the above helps clarify the Local Planning Authority's position in respect of this matter. Should you require further assistance on this matter please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,

Paul Tomkins  
Head of Development Management  
North Area Team

---

**From:** Lynne Featherstone2 [mailto:lynne.featherstone.mp@parliament.uk]  
**Sent:** 01 July 2009 14:54  
**To:** Planning Members  
**Subject:** LBH/65494 - Request for intervention as MOL in Haringey is threatened by a planning appeal  
**Importance:** High

Dear Tay,

Re: Planning{Our Ref:Sutt004[1]01/07/09 14:35:48}

I write to you regarding the concerns of one of my constituents over the safeguarding of MOL on the site of the former garden centre between Cranley Gardens and the Parkland Walk.

Ms Sutton-Klein highlights the problems of the planning application for the MOL area in the email I have forwarded to you. I would be grateful if you could review this situation, and I hope we can find a reasonable solution to this issue.

Thank you for your kind assistance and I look forward to your reply.

Kind regards,

**Lynne Featherstone**  
**Member of Parliament for Hornsey and Wood Green**

020 8340 5459

#### DATA PROTECTION

Whilst your MP will treat as confidential any personal information which you pass on, she will allow authorised staff to see the information if this is needed to help and advise you and may pass all or some of this information to agencies such as the DSS, Inland Revenue or the local council if this is necessary to help your case. She may wish to write to you from time to time to keep you informed or related issues that you may find of interest. Please let her know if you do not wish to be contacted in this way.



Please consider the environment before printing this email.

---

**From:** FEATHERSTONE, Lynne  
**Sent:** 17 June 2009 10:54  
**To:** 'lynne.featherstone.mp@parliament.uk'  
**Subject:** FW: Request for intervention as MOL in Haringey is threatened by a planning appeal  
**Importance:** High

---

**From:** elizabethsuttonklein  
**Sent:** 03 June 2009 08:11  
**To:** lynne@lynnefeatherstone.org  
**Cc:** Jeremy Klein  
**Subject:** Fw: Request for intervention as MOL in Haringey is threatened by a planning appeal  
**Importance:** High

Dear Lynne

I don't know if you'll be aware of this but Haringey Council has been neglecting its statutory responsibility to safeguard its MOL.

I've become aware of this from following the developments on the skinny site of the former garden centre between the top of Cranley Gardens and the Parkland Walk. I've investigated and found that the part of the site, 'the land at the back of the garden centre', which until July 2006 was in separate ownership from the garden centre, had been designated as MOL. This was acknowledged in documents from Planning and Property Services up to as recently as September 2006, but since then MOL has been omitted from Officer's reports for planning applications and appeals.

Originally approved plans (HGY/2006/1445 appeal ref APP/Y5420/A/06/2028661) for 4 x 4 bedroom two storey houses with integral garages on the garden centre site have been augmented bit by bit by multiple planning applications. Sequential planning permissions have expanded the scheme as absolutely every 'minor amendment' is sufficiently small that it has got approved. There is now another live planning appeal, this time against Haringey Council's refusal to allow a proposed new detached garage and crossover for the western-most (top) house in the scheme. It's actually the ninth application or appeal for the same development of new houses, but this time as the appeal site specifies the top house only, from the point of view of the Planning Inspector it's the first appeal on the site. Consequently there is no planning history to the current appeal site, and critically no reference by the main parties to its MOL status.

The dwellinghouse on the appeal site already has consent for off-street parking provision for two cars (one in an integral garage, and another on hardstanding), so providing a garage seems unnecessary and inappropriate. It is possible that the proposed new garage may be just an attempt to establish the principle of planning permission for a particularly sensitive part of the site (which through subsequent applications for amendments could then morph into another dwellinghouse). It might set a precedent which could harm the character of the neighbourhood. My understanding is however that such factors would not be sufficient reasons for a Planning Inspector to dismiss the appeal, whereas the fact that the land has been designated as MOL would.

Please can I ask for your help to safeguard the MOL at stake in this appeal?

1. Would you be able to try to persuade the Mayor's office to act on my letter very speedily as there is a deadline of Wednesday 10th June for representations to the Planning Inspectorate?
2. Please could you also send a representation to the Planning Inspectorate asking for MOL to be safeguarded from inappropriate development in accordance with the London Plan 2004, for the appeal to be changed from written representations to a hearing or public enquiry, and perhaps for it to be 'called in' or for the timetable to be suspended pending investigations.

I have attached a letter I am sending to the Mayor about this asking him to intervene in this appeal, plus two other letters which it refers to. The appeal reference number is APP/Y5420/A/09/2102136.

Kind regards

Elizabeth Sutton-Klein

**From:** elizabethsuttonklein  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 03, 2009 6:35 AM  
**To:** [Mayor of London](#)  
**Subject:** Request for intervention as MOL in Haringey is threatened by a planning appeal

The attachments are a letter to the Mayor, and two enclosures referred to in it.

They concern a planning appeal for a proposal to develop on MOL in the London Borough of Haringey. The deadline for representations to the Planning Inspectorate regarding this appeal is next Wednesday, 10th June. Please the contents of this email therefore be forwarded most urgently to whoever deals with metropolitan open land (MOL) matters.

Kind regards

Elizabeth Sutton-Klein

---

—

This email has been scanned by the MessageLabs Email Security System.  
For more information please visit <http://www.message-labs.com/email>

---

—