



Horsham  
District  
Council



# **GATWICK AIRPORT NORTHERN RUNWAY PROJECT**

Planning Inspectorate's Reference: TR020005

## **Legal Partnership Authorities**

### **Comments on The Applicant's Response To The ExA's Written Questions (ExQ1)**

#### **Response to [\[REP3-096\]](#) | Land Use and Recreation**

**DEADLINE 4: 15 May 2024**

Crawley Borough Council (GATW-AFP107)

Horsham District Council (20044739)

Mid Sussex District Council (20044737)

West Sussex County Council (20044715)

Reigate and Banstead Borough Council (20044474)

Surrey County Council (20044665)

East Sussex County Council (20044514)

Tandridge District Council (GATW-S57419)

## Legal Partnership Authorities' Comments on the Applicant's Responses To The ExA's Written Questions (ExQ1)

### Response to [\[REP3-096\]](#) | Land Use and Recreation

The Legal Partnership Authorities are comprised of the following host and neighbouring Authorities who are jointly represented by Michael Bedford KC and Sharpe Pritchard LLP for the purposes of the Examination:

- Crawley Borough Council
- Horsham District Council
- Mid Sussex District Council
- West Sussex County Council
- Reigate and Banstead Borough Council
- Surrey County Council
- East Sussex County Council; and
- Tandridge District Council.

In these submissions, the Legal Partnership Authorities may be referred to as the “*Legal Partnership Authorities*”, the “*Authorities*”, the “*Joint Local Authorities*” (“*JLAs*”) or the “*Councils*”. Please note that Mole Valley District Council are also part of the Legal Partnership Authorities for some parts of the Examination (namely, those aspects relating to legal agreements entered into between the Applicant and any of the Legal Partnership Authorities).

#### **Introduction**

1. The Legal Partnership Authorities have now had the opportunity to review the Applicant's responses to ExQ1 in conjunction with their specialist consultants and legal advisors.
2. The Applicant provided their response to ExQ1 in the form of 19 separate written submissions to the examination together with annexes. For the ExA's ease of review, the Legal Partnership Authorities set out their comments on the Applicants responses in the final column of the table below.
3. Where the Legal Partnership Authorities have decided not to comment on one of the Applicant's responses, this question has been deleted from the table below.
4. For the avoidance of doubt, where the Legal Partnership Authorities have decided not to comment on one of the Applicant's responses this should not be taken to indicate that the Legal Partnership Authorities agree with the response.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question and Applicant’s Response	Legal Partnership Authority’s Response
<b>LAND USE AND RECREATION</b>			
LU.1.13	The Applicant	<p><b>Museum Field – Informal Recreational Space</b></p> <p>Concern has been raised in Table 11.1 of the Joint West Sussex LIR that the new route would be relatively inaccessible as access would be via an indirect permissive route and the remote location of the space would have poor links to existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW). This would therefore result in a barrier to effective use by the nearby community [REP1-068]. Please provide comment in respect of this concern and confirm whether improved connectivity could be achieved?</p> <p>The land to the west of the River Mole including Museum Field is proposed as an area of ecological and landscape mitigation. The outline designs for the area include informal public access to this area through a new link from the existing permissive footpath route along the River Mole. The commitment to the provision of this footpath route is included at paragraph 4.4.2 of the <b>OLEMP</b> [[REP2-021]. This ecological and landscape mitigation area is not being proposed to be provided as a designated area of open space. Designated areas of open space are proposed in areas adjacent to the Church Meadows</p>	<p>The Authorities remain concern about the connectivity of this area via a permissive path to the wider footpath network as based on the limited detail provided in the Sketch Landscape Concept (Figure 1.2.1 of the OLEMP) [REP3-031], the drawing does not show a footpath connection along the western bank of the River Mole on land within the DCO Limits. This is also unclear from the works plans drawing GA 990002 Rev P03 [REP3-011] and it is noted that the permissive paths are also excluded from figure 19.6.4 in the ES Chapter 19 [APP-058].</p> <p>The Authorities still consider that a link into the Museum Field would be beneficial from Horley Road notwithstanding there is not footpath along the southern side of the road to provide an alternative route to any permissive path as the routes along the River Mole including the adopted rights-of-way are very wet and at times are impassable.</p>

	<p>and within Car Park B, north and south.</p> <p>The current permissive route located on the western bank of the River Mole acts as a rural footpath to walk south along the river and is used regularly by walkers and dog walkers who enjoy views across the River Mole and the wider Gatwick airfield. Access to this route can be gained from the Sussex Border Path which also runs along the western bank of the River Mole.</p> <p>The Applicant did review the possibility of providing a pedestrian access to the north western part of the ecological area which borders the Horley Road from the pavement footpath which connects to Charlwood Village. However, the winding nature of the road compromises sight lines in this location and, together with the proximity to the change in speed limit, does not make for a safe pedestrian crossing either where the paved path currently terminates or indeed to either side of this location. In order to create a safe and compliant crossing with good sight lines, it is likely that removal and re-alignment to portions of existing hedgerows and movement of utility poles would be required. A bridge would also be required across the highways ditch on the south side of the road. The location of the 30mph speed limits might also have to be moved further east towards Brook Farm. The Applicant also considered that an unintended consequence of providing the connection could be that people wanting to access the area would park their cars on the</p>	
--	---	--

		pavement or soft verge, which would again be undesirable, reduce amenity to existing residents, affect access to their driveways, and overall be unsafe.	
--	--	--	--