

**5 Cranley Gardens
London
N10 3AA**

19th November 2011

Programme Officer for LDF Core Strategy
Haringey Council

Dear Ms Efthymiou

Thank you for your emails of 11th and 16th November. Could item 3 on the CD I brought in to the Planning Offices please be considered as part of the evidence for the MOL boundary on the Proposal Map? (For your convenience I have attached it again to this email.) Its relevance is that it justifies why the MOL boundaries on the proposals map for the LDF should correspond to those on the 1982 District Map. The document is an extract from the 1994 EiP which confirms that the MOL boundaries of the Parkland Walk were not to be altered for the 1998 revision of the 1982 District Map.

The reason I wanted this evidence taken into consideration is that it represents the only decision on Parkland Walk MOL boundaries at an EiP since Haringey's 1982 District Map, the one which first formally consolidated the MOL boundaries, was adopted. The relevant text, which is underlined and highlighted, proves that Haringey were not supposed to make any alterations to the MOL boundaries. Despite this EiP report, the 1998 Proposals Map features unauthorised changes to MOL boundaries of the Parkland Walk, particularly around parts of the Parkland Walk which Haringey Council subsequently sold off, such as the former garden centre one near the junction of Cranley Gardens and Muswell Hill Road, N10. The current 2006 UDP Proposals Map simply inherits the boundaries from the 1998 Map, but it's the 1998 one which is where the changes originate. The changes are not in accordance with the instructions in the submitted EiP document.

In the EiP document the Inspector clearly used the word 'notation' in its normal meaning of 'symbols' on the map. I do not understand why Haringey Council took the word 'notation', and used it as a pretext for making certain changes to the MOL boundary lines around the Parkland Walk as well improving the clarity with symbols.

Despite the changes to the MOL boundary on the proposals map, the LPA's Officers nevertheless continued to respect the 1982 map boundaries in respect of three planning applications for housing on the garden centre site in Cranley Gardens prior to selling the Parkland Walk land to a property developer. (Reports for HGY/2002/1860, HGY/2003/1669 and HGY/2004/0609 all refer to that land as being designated MOL.) It appears that the LPA may now be under pressure from the Developer to make decisions as if the transfer of ownership of 'Land at the Back of the Garden Centre Park of the Parkland Walk' also entailed dedesignation of its MOL status.

Sales of parkland are not within the control of the LPA, and given the current cuts in the public sector, it is presumably likely that there will be more such sales. I hope that the LDF process can clarify what the LPA's position should be when the Haringey Council as land-owner disposes of bits of MOL. I note that the LPA have not proposed any alterations to the MOL boundary either for this LDF or the previous UDP proposals maps.

Yours sincerely

Elizabeth Sutton-Klein