

[REDACTED]

Sent: 22 April 2026 15:35
To: Planning
Subject: Fw: DC/26/0501 - Removal of Condition 5 from previously approved application DC/25/0721

Categories: Comments Received

Dear Planning,

Bethan Tinning has asked me to forward me email to this email group. Please see my concerns below.

Thank you and regards

Robert Hamp

Sent: 18 April 2026 21:41
To: Bethan.Tinning [REDACTED]
Subject: DC/26/0501 - Removal of Condition 5 from previously approved application DC/25/0721

Dear Bethan,

It is some time since we last communicated and I hope all is well with you.

Can you please clarify what is going on here.

Firstly, I believe this is an invalid application. The King George V Recreation Ground in Partridge Green is a registered charity (Charity number: 1078417). West Grinstead Parish Council do not own the KGV, rather they are trustees for the charity. Please note that the application comes from Cllr Nicholas Hare of **Partridge Green Parish Council**. Partridge Green Parish Council does not exist.

Secondly, Cllr Nicholas Hare has applied to remove Condition 5 but this comes from him alone. The removal of this condition has not been discussed with, or approved by West Grinstead Parish Council.

Thirdly. The primary use for the Multi Use Games Area is as a five a side football pitch. The recognised standard for this is a third generation (3G) pitch with rubber crumb infill. This provides a softer, quieter, less slippery surface and reduces the risk of fall injuries. The application is to remove Condition 5 so that a cheaper sand infill, second generation (2G) pitch can be used. While sand infill 2G pitches are considered suitable for hockey it is not FIFA approved and is being replaced by 3G and 4G pitches for football. Are Horsham District Council really going to allow this MUGA to be built with an unsuitable, more dangerous and noisier playing surface?

Fourthly. A vital document is missing from the application. Where is Cllr Hare's email to Sport England? There is a reply from Owen Neal (described as Planning Manager for various counties but not West Sussex). The reply states "Sport England understands the rationale for the removal of the condition given that the type of artificial surface proposed will no longer be 3rd generation rubber

crumb infill". We need to know what Cllr Hare wrote to Sport England to be able to understand the "rationale". I am sure you will agree the attachment of Cllr Hare's email is essential for proper consideration of this application.

Finally. The request for a noisier sand infill 2G pitch makes the need for a Noise Impact Assessment even more essential. I remind you that there is residential property approximately 30 metres from the proposed MUGA development.

Can you please assure me that this application will be rejected until these errors and omissions have been corrected? This is essential so that there can be proper consideration of this extraordinary request from Cllr Nicholas Hare.

Thank you for your time spent on this. Please feel free to call me [REDACTED] if you would like to discuss.

Regards

[REDACTED]