

Friends of the Parkland Walk - Holding objection - Local Plan consultation online form faulty.

Policies Map – Parkland Walk boundaries and notation.

The Friends of the Parkland Walk object to a practice that it regards as unsound of having the notation of a housing development site shown outlined in red on the policies map over an area of Metropolitan Open land, Nature Reserve, Green Chain, green corridor and SINC. A similar objection has been made to the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan and the view expressed there and repeated here, is that the developable land should be the site designated and allocated (in this case as SA 40 – in the case of the Neighbourhood Plan, KS5) and that the link referred to should be a different notation (in this case it could be the Green Chain notation to cover the desired link between the walkable part of the Parkland Walk and the connections to the north (in this case the footpath adjacent to Highgate Library). Also in respect of this Nature Reserve, the Friends question whether it is wise to have the Nature reserve notation covering the Shepherd's Hill allotments that are not managed as part of the Nature Reserve. The Friends would prefer to see the mapping presented to be consistent with the allotments further East in Shepherd's Hill MOL and SINC (of different level of importance) or, if not of importance, no SINC status (as are the allotments at Mount Pleasant Villas).

Also in respect of Policies Map, the Friends consider it is unsound to vary the extent of Metropolitan Open Land without discussion with ourselves as stakeholders, nor the opportunity to be consulted on proposed changes. The Friends note that there was discussion about the notation in the Inquiry in 1994 but the Friends are of the view that there has never been a debate, discussion or proposal to reduce MOL boundaries since they were originally designated in 1982. We note that in other places there have been some additional designations. The Friends endorse the mapping notation that maintains the MOL, Nature Reserve and SINC boundary on the lines of the fences of the original boundary as purchased from British Rail in the areas where sales have been made or leases for the temporary use of the Walk as residential garden extensions. A note is made at the end of this representation about the practice and administration of this asset.

In respect of the Policies Map, alterations have been made to properties at Church Crescent, Muswell Hill; Treeside Place, Cranley Gardens; Land to the west of the house at 3 Francis Place off Holmesdale Road; a strip of land opposite Coleridge School in Crescent Road and the Mind Centre (formerly Station House, Stapleton Hall Road). In all these cases MOL could be de-designated by stealth by a mapping change, to which an objection is made as an unsound practice. As far as the Friends are concerned this appears to repeat mapping errors made before, but as in the case precedents of the Green Belt, the designation is as first made, unless changed as a formal proposal to de-designate or move the boundary in the plan making process. This has not been addressed through community engagement.

In respect of the land that has been annexed to residential gardens, the Friends deplore this practice of selling or leasing areas of the Nature Reserve and parcels of MOL to become garden extensions. The land thus affected is neither parkland nor open. It does not contribute to the linear open land when used this way and it appears that no temporary planning permission was considered or granted for a temporary period to coincide with the leases given nor permanent permission applied for in the case of land actually sold. The Friends consider that the acquisition of rights (for lawful use over 10 years) is not the proper way to change the use, and in the case of leases which may expire, to secure the reversion to the nature reserve when the lease period and with it a temporary land use, expires). In respect of the alteration to the character of MOL, the practice of granting leases or sales damages the extent and character of the MOL. When land is lost, it is the expected practice to replace it with land of equal value.

The Friends will raise with the Inspector at the Examination whether it is appropriate for him to consider the original boundary to be maintained and restored on reversion and, where not practical, to arrange for an area of replacement land to be designated in place of the losses. The Friends will put forward alternatives for replacement in due course.

Elizabeth's qu8 on the Local Plan Consultation e-form

Q8 If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

Friends of the Parkland Walk considers it necessary to participate at the oral examination in order for our response to be presented to the Planning Inspector.

The local plan pre-submission form does not allow for either submissions other than text comments or for files to be attached.

Friends of Parkland Walk's consultation response on the Local Plan relates specifically to Haringey Council's spatial representation of it, the map. In response Friends of the Parkland Walk have made detailed maps showing the points we refer to in our submission, and request that this evidence is taken into consideration in the Planning Inspector's assessment of soundness. Our maps form our evidence, but owing to the online local plan consultation form not allowing for attachments to be uploaded, please can the Friends of the Parkland Walk participate at the oral examination so that the evidence can be submitted and presented to the Inspector?