

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

