

Sports Hub Consultee Responses: Reserved Matters Application for the Sports Hub (DC/26/0012)

No.	Comment	Applicant Response
West Sussex Fire & Rescue Service (16/01/2026)		
1.	Evidence will also be required that Fire Service vehicle access meets with the requirements identified in Approved Document B Volume 2: B5 Section 15, including Table 15.2 and diagram 15.3.	The proposed Sports Hub provides the same access and layout as the approved Sports Hub Reserved Matters Application of LPA reference DC/22/1026 which has been part implemented and remains extant. The referenced document is a matter for Building Control and by way of this response we can confirm the roadway will be designed to accommodate the vehicle loadings stated in the Approved Document.
London Gatwick (26/01/2026)		
1.	Please find a draft Bird Hazard Management Plan (BHMP) attached, if the applicant is in agreement it needs to be signed and dated and submitted to yourselves pursuant to the above-mentioned condition. We will need to object to these proposals unless the above mentioned condition is applied to any planning permission.	The Bird Hazard Management Plan has been completed and signed and is attached as part of this response.
WSCC Highways (30/01/2026)		

No.	Comment	Applicant Response
1.	However, WSCC Highways are concerned in terms of the potential parking and travel demands and mitigation included in the Car Park Management Plan and the Transport Statement. There are a number of points as set out below relating to the assumptions and end conclusions within the supporting information.	-
2.	The submitted documents very much focus on parking demands and consequently trips by car. There's relatively little in terms of an assessment of trips by walking and cycling particular for spectators for Roffey FC. The location offers a potential for walking and cycling trips but there is no particular quantitative assessment in these regard.	Assessment of walking and cycling trips contained in the WSCC Highways Consultation Comments response document attached.
3.	The submitted Transport Statement identifies the cumulative parking demands associated with Roffey FC and potential other uses within the sports hub. A peak parking demand of 272 spaces is identified. This peak demand is recognised as significantly exceeding the capacity of the proposed car park. WSCC fully appreciate that the issues raised here may only apply to peak times. With the peak demand, 250 spaces are identified as being associated with Roffey FC. This is indicated as being based on existing experience for important cup games and games against larger teams. For these more significant events, its accepted that additional measures would be required to manage the above average attendance and related demands. Ordinarily, a major events plan could provide a framework of measures to be implemented. For the purposes of the assessment, this should focus more on the typical/average matchdays (both weekend and midweek). Details should therefore be provided based on this and mitigation targeted at meeting these demands rather than the irregular significant events that would require very specific management.	A Major Events condition was not placed on the extant Sports Hub consent. The development remains materially the same, albeit with minor deviations to the location of some elements and the addition of stands. The proposed development does not produce any change of use from the extant scheme. Whilst the Applicant agrees in principle to an Events Plan being conditioned, we request that the condition relates only to the uplift of the stands, which may impact the scale of the use of the artificial grass pitch. We view that otherwise the condition is requested solely as a result of the named occupier, where such a condition would not be fairly or reasonably related to <i>the development</i>. We therefore suggest the following condition wording: <i>'Prior to first use of the artificial grass pitch, an Events Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Events Plan shall detail those measures that are to be employed to mitigate the highways and transport impacts arising from events on the site.'</i>

No.	Comment	Applicant Response
4.	Related to the above, it's assumed that the new facilities would offer an improvement above the existing provision. On that basis, it's then whether an up-lift would be expected; the ground will be based within a sizable residential development and may attract some new spectators. Likewise, the presence of a 3G pitch rather than natural grass could allow for a more intensive usage than at present. It would also be helpful to understand whether a specific Football Association ground grading is being sought and from that what the theoretical maximum capacity could be.	The 3G pitch was part of the extant RMA and is not a new element. The principal change to this part of the Sports Hub is the inclusion of covered spectator stands. Noted in the WSCC Highways Consultation Comments response document: <i>'The assessment of parking demand by Roffey Football Club assumes that there will be an uplift in demand due to the new facilities, but no specific Football Association ground grading is being sought that would further increase the parking demand in future.'</i>
5.	As a general comment in terms of use, it's whether what's proposed will result in increased use compared with the existing ground, and therefore whether this should be factored into the assessment.	The use has not changed from the extant scheme.
6.	In terms of accommodating parking demands, and notwithstanding the fact that the assessment is based on peak rather than average demands, there are particular issues with the potential overspill parking locations. As a point in principle, it's consider highly unlikely that a spectator would drive and park a distance away on the southside of the A264. This would be especially so in the winter months where games start or finish after dark. The use of Bohunt School and the health centre car park (currently unbuilt) are noted, but these are or will be private car parks and subject to use agreements that may be withdrawn. There is consequently no certainty that these can or will be used in perpetuity.	Noted in the WSCC Highways Consultation Comments response document: <i>'The peak car parking demand throughout the week and on typical match days of 142 spaces would be comfortably met by the Sports Hub car park and off-street parking available at a combination of the current Roffey Football Club and Roffey Robins Football Club sites to the south of the A264 as well as at Bohunt School on Bailey Road'</i>
7.	Inevitably parking demands will take place on-carriageway close to the proposed ground or take place informally on footways and verges along the access road to the sports hub; the lack of any reference to this potential within the supporting statements is very noticeable. Measures will be required to control how and where this can take place on those roads planned in the immediate vicinity of the site.	The off-street parking available on the south side of the A264 at the existing Roffey Football Club sites will only operate on match days and will be for use by players and staff, rather than spectators, who will be taken to the new football ground by minibus.

No.	Comment	Applicant Response
8.	There is also the matter as to whether on-site spaces will be controlled and allocated to those spectators that need them. Particular reference is made to the small number of disabled car parking spaces that may be insufficient.	Disabled spaces are shown on the submitted plans. Roffey Football Club as the end user of the Sports Hub will ensure that the disabled bays on the site are used by blue badge holders only.
9.	As a final comment regarding parking, the potential cumulative parking demands associated with Roffey FC and other uses within the sports hub is included in the TS. It's unclear exactly how the other uses will be controlled and whether these are intended as bookable or turn up and play. If they are bookable, it's then whether there is some ability to control and avoid clashing peak time uses or at least start times. It's also unclear whether parking will be allocated for uses; Roffey FC parking will otherwise dominate and force parking associated with other uses elsewhere.	The applicant is willing to accept a suitably worded planning condition that requires the approval and ongoing operation of a Car Park Management Plan if permission is granted for the approval of reserved matters. Through the operation of the Car Park Management Plan, Roffey Football Club as the end user of the Sports Hub will ensure that the spaces allocated for the MUGAs, BMX track and skate park are also only used for this purpose and not by users of the football club's facilities.
10.	With respects to walking routes from the south of the A264, WSCC acknowledge the improvements secured as part of DC/16/1677 for the Riverside Walk where this runs parallel to the southern side of the A264. This scheme will improve the surfacing and provide lighting and connect into the Mowbray development via the A264 underpass. This route may be used but it lacks overlooking. It may not be perceived as safe by some users in the hours of darkness. The most direct route across the A264 is via public right of way NOH 1586. This cuts directly at-grade across the 70mph A264 albeit via some steep steps on embankment approaches. There is mention of controls being implemented by Roffey FC to direct spectators away from using direct A264 ROW crossing on matchdays as well as a potential shuttle bus service. There remains the potential for this crossing to be used at other times though in association with the proposed ground. The nature of these routes are such that may not encourage walking trips, placing further emphasis of car use.	The WSCC Highways Consultation Comments response document sets out the various opportunities for travel to the site by active transport methods through its connections to the north, east and west to the Mowbray development, and from the south to the existing settlement of Horsham.

No.	Comment	Applicant Response
Sport England (03/02/2026)		
1.	The 3G pitch within the stadia facility is also to appropriate dimensions, and the technical information submitted confirms compliance with FIFA Quality accreditation. We would recommend that the testing to FIFA Quality standard, and placing the pitch on the FA pitch register, are a condition of approval.	No such condition was attached to the extant Sports Hub permission and should not be attached here. Moreover, delivering the pitch to FA standard is not required to make the proposals acceptable in planning terms and thus a condition to this effect would not be reasonable nor justified
2.	We note however that there doesn't appear to be any technical detail showing infill retention measures for the pitch. Measures should be taken to manage and minimise the loss of infill from the playing surface. BSI Standards, working with the European Committee for Standardisation (CEN), have developed a Technical Report describing the procedures that should be used to control infill migration.	The comments are noted, however these details were not required on the extant Sports Hub permission.
3.	Design measures and procedures to control infill migration include: • Fitting containment barriers on a pitch's perimeter fencing. • Installing decontamination grates and boot cleaning brushes at all player and vehicle entrance gates. • Ensuring all stormwater drains around a pitch have suitable microfilters to capture any infill being carried by surface run-off, etc. • Keeping a dedicated maintenance brush within the boundaries of the pitch, so it cannot carry infill into the surrounding environment. • Thoroughly removing any infill from maintenance tractors, etc. before they leave the pitch.	
4.	For the remaining ancillary facilities, our observations are primarily aligned to compliance with Step 4 stadium accreditation requirements – given the application proposed facilities to meet this standard – as well as general design recommendations/best practice. We would advise as follows:	Achieving a Step 4 grading is a longer-term aspiration for Roffey FC rather than an immediate requirement. We do not propose amending the scheme at this time to meet the

No.	Comment	Applicant Response
	• The WCs adjacent to the changing rooms are not located within the changing rooms themselves, but in a shared lobby area. This does not fulfil the necessary requirements. We recommend relocating the entrance door to the WCs to the area where the sink is indicated, allowing access from the changing rooms. • Unless there's a rationale for the lobby area along the northern edge of the pavilion, we recommend its removal. Access could be directly from the external of the building, providing independent access for opposing teams. • Whilst not a stadium accreditation requirement, the facilities are also intended to serve the other community pitches. Showers should be provided in cubicles (four per changing area), not as open shower areas. • Are the separate male and female WCs necessary? Could the disabled WC and baby change be moved to the location of the male WCs, and a single corridor of gender-neutral cubicles be provided? • There's a requirement for spectators to access the building for WCs, but there may be merit in having some accessible from the external of the building closer to pitch-side. This is applicable to the two natural grass pitches, as it is acknowledged there is an additional WC facility provided adjacent to the stands for the stadia pitch. • At Steps 1 to 5, there must be no Public Right of Way (see 'advisory' for definition) through an enclosed ground. The facility must prevent the ability for individuals from viewing the game comfortably from outside the ground (i.e. not have an unimpeded, significant view of the field of play, see both goal posts etc...). It is not clear whether this has been achieved via the proposal, therefore further clarity would be welcome. • There must be a safe, unimpeded passage for players and match officials between the dressing rooms and the pitch. The design of the secure walkway will inevitably differ from ground to ground and it will rarely guarantee the safe passage of players and match officials unless supplemented by stewards. A Club should implement procedures appropriate to the particular structure and be ready to respond to on-field situations which might affect spectator behaviour.	requirements, though it should be noted that this is not material to the eventual determination of the application.

No.	Comment	Applicant Response
	The use of protection designed products such as permanent structures or retractable tunnels to separate players and spectators is recommended and should be secured in place when in use. Given the changing facilities are within a pavilion external to the enclosure of the 3G pitch, we would welcome further detail as to how this will be managed. • Similarly, where segregation is deployed, refreshment facilities will be required in each segregated area of the ground. Where multiple large stands in a stadium exist, then refreshment facilities should be available so that all spectators have access to at least one facility. Detail as to how this requirement will be met is needed, as the pavilion facilities are outside the enclosure of the pitch. • For grade 4, 2 spectator entrances that must be controlled by fully operational turnstiles of the revolving type and must be suitably housed and lit, however these do not appear to be indicated on the plans. • There doesn't appear to be confirmation of the required directors' seats, as required by stadium accreditation. Nor press seating; all press seating must be provided with lighting and writing facilities for use by the press and other media. The press seating must have a clear view of the field of play. All press seating will ideally have an appropriate power socket for the charging of phones, laptops etc. per press seat. (2 are required at Step 4). We recommend the applicant reviews the above guidance and implements design revisions to support compliance with stadium accreditation requirements to meet step 4, as stated as intended within the application.	
5.	A Community Use Agreement (CUA) has been provided in support of the application. Owing to the development of facilities to meet identified community needs, we would wish to ensure a suitable affordable pricing policy is incorporated to maximise community outcomes and usage. The present policy states "A policy of competitive pricing shall apply to maximise Community Use and in accordance within the spirit of this Agreement" however it is common to state that pricing will be aligned to comparable local provision (i.e. 3G pitches) to provide a suitable benchmark. We would	The OPP (DC/16/1677) S106 includes obligations that already provide the mechanism for this (see Sch. 4, Part 16 and definition of Sports Hub Management Plan at page 88).

No.	Comment	Applicant Response
	welcome further detail on how the affordable pricing policy will be implemented, potentially with indicative pricing or suitable local facility comparisons included for reference.	
WSCC LLFA (06/02/2026)		
1.	Whilst permeable paving is included in the hydraulic calculations, it is not included within the drainage layout. It is important that all features of the surface water drainage system are on drawings, and that the drainage layout corresponds with the hydraulic calculations.	Please cross-refer to DJA Hard Surfaces and Boundary Treatments plans 2898-5-2-29-DR-2006 & 2007 & 2008-S) which show reinforced gravel in parking bays.
HDC Landscape (25/02/2026)		
1.	Not enough information has been provided in regard to natural turf pitch drainage. Given the challenges raised by draining clay soils, we recommend that HDC Parks and Countryside is consulted to comment.	There are no changes in pitch sizes between the current proposal and the extant Sports Hub proposal.
2.	We wish to highlight the Council's task and finish group research to investigate the use of local spaces and facilities from a Fair Space perspective, therefore there is opportunity for one of the MUGAs to adopt a high quality, inclusive design that addresses the unmet needs for young girls in the district. We acknowledge the previous permission did not include this request, but we do encourage the applicant to consider this. Please refer to 'Make Space for Girls' for resources and recommendations, such as zone subdivision to encourage more than one group to use the space at any one time.	The submitted Roffey FC Facilities Management Plan sets out Roffey FC's approach to supporting women's football, including encouraging and facilitating use of the premises by young girls.
3.	Rubber infill is a major source of microplastic pollution and has significant, persistent environmental risks, which is of key concern given the abutting waterbodies on site; an estimated 1.5 and 2.5 tonnes of infill granulate is lost from a standard football pitch each year. We note the ban on rubber infill use in the EU and therefore the long-term viability and maintenance for future Artificial Grass Pitches (AGPs). DEFRA is currently assessing the broad restriction of intentionally added microplastics in the UK, which includes rubber infill. We therefore recommend that alternative options are explored, incorporating a combination of the following options within proposals:	There are no changes to the 3G pitch between the current proposal and the extant Sports Hub proposal.

No.	Comment	Applicant Response
	a. A non-infill design b. Alternatives to infill materials such as cork or nut husks. c. Incorporation of a shock pad to reduce volume of infill and therefore maintenance d. Silt buckets within surface drains	
4.	At minimum, designs must incorporate containment barriers and boot cleaning stations at entrances; please include.	The proposed Sports Hub is materially the same as the extant scheme where such details were not provided.
5.	Areas of planting have been removed from within the bike track area in addition to 3no. trees. We request that these are reinstated.	The planting of DC/24/0917 was never implemented. The trees that have been removed from the design were removed following detailed design of the bike track, including drainage and health and safety concerns following advice from specialist bike track designers.
6.	As previously requested under DC/24/0917, for visual coherence and suitability given the proximity to the ecological buffer and wetland, we request an alternative species to <i>Lonicera nitida</i> , such as yew, privet or further mixed native species as seen in the illustrative planting palette.	This species was approved in the same locations in the original Sports Hub application and is unchanged in the updated application. No change will be made
7.	We continue to request that hedgerow is extended along the length of the south of the road in addition to the knee rail.	The extant scheme does not have a full-length hedge.
8.	As previously noted, wildflower planting areas are proposed in the EMMP but do not feature in the planting plans. Please provide indicative locations in plan and update the planting schedule accordingly.	No wildflower planting is proposed. Reference to wildflower planting has been removed from the amended EMMP enclosed.
9.	We continue to request ball stop fencing to extend along the bank, outside pitches, in order to better allow scrub planting to successfully establish within the AW buffer.	In the first instance, this is not the purpose of ball stop fencing. Nonetheless, the position and extent of the proposed ball stop fencing is largely the same as previously approved.

No.	Comment	Applicant Response
10.	HDC requires any timber equipment to be installed with steel footings to prolong their longevity and avoid rotting. Please update the furniture specification as necessary.	The furniture proposed is hardwood and does not require additional steel footings. There is no policy basis for this request.
11.	Lighting information has not been submitted for the natural pitches. Please confirm if no lighting is proposed in this location.	No lighting is proposed in that location.
12.	Woodland and hedgerows, which are key characteristics of the local landscape, are likely to deteriorate and can result in loss due to increasing levels of light pollution. AW and its associated buffer to the north as well as the ecological compensation area to the west are particularly sensitive and currently fall within the proposed floodlight spill. It is therefore key that measures are implemented and/or specification altered in order to reduce light spill on these landscape features. We therefore recommend the use of shields to better direct light spill. While section 6.40 of the Planning Statement refers to back guards, it is unclear if the plans reflect this in the lux levels and no specification has been provided. Please provide detailed specification and updated lux levels plans accordingly.	The only incursion of lighting into the Ancient Woodland Buffer Area to the north, and the ecological compensation area to the west is from the lighting columns on the northern side of the artificial grass pitch. The location of these columns has not changed from the extant Sports Hub scheme.
13.	We note that drainage proposals for the natural pitches have not been included within the drainage strategy. Please clarify and/or provide this information, highlighting that the area to the south-east is particularly sensitive given the immediate slope and run off to Channells Brook.	WSCC LLFA have not raised concerns for the drainage proposals in relation to the natural pitches in their comments (received 5 February 2026). Nonetheless, the drainage proposals for the pitches are previously approved.
14.	As such, and as previously requested under DC/24/0917, robust pollution protection measures must be proposed to avoid impacts to the landscape features, watercourses and other controlled waters in the long-term.	The proposed scheme is as previously approved.
15.	We recommend that chemical fertilisers, pesticides and herbicides including glyphosate are not to be applied at any time due to impacts on existing and proposed ecological features, particularly the abutting waterways and woodland. Please refer to pan-uk.org for guidance and resources, noting	There is no policy basis for this request.

No.	Comment	Applicant Response
	that herbicides including glyphosate must only be used on Schedule 9 species. Please amend the section 3.6 (table 5) of the Drainage Statement accordingly.	
16.	As above, and as previously discussed, please amend the following sections to clarify that no chemical fertilisers, pesticides and herbicides including glyphosate are to be used at any time, except for Schedule 9 species: a. Sections 130, 168, 210, 212, 221, 300, 330, 421, 675 of the Landscape Specification b. Sections 5.22, 5.123, 5.127, 6.4.j, 7.7.e and 7.14 of the LEMP c. Points 6.5, 6.6, 11.1, 11.2, 13.7, 13.8, 15.11, 15.12, 19.11, 20.13, 21.9, 21.10, 22.5, 29.5 and 29.6 of the Maintenance Schedule within the LEMP	As above.
17.	As previously discussed, in order to safeguard the genetic integrity of the abutting AW, planting stock should be locally sourced from suppliers of accredited UK Sourced and Grown stock, in accordance with Woodland Trust guidance. Only certain tree nurseries are suppliers of accredited UK Sourced and Grown stock, therefore we request supplier information for plant stock. We note the relevant aims and objectives within the LEMP, however this should be amended to include all proposed planting, as opposed to solely replacement planting. This may be secured via condition.	As above.
18.	Recommend Conditions Pre-Commencement Condition: No part of the development hereby permitted shall take place until the full details of all pitch design have been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include plans and measures addressing the following: • Details of artificial pitch design ○ To include containment barriers and boot cleaning stations at entrances ○ To consider alternative options to infill and minimising its loss. • Details of pollution protection measures to avoid impacts of pitch run-off to watercourses.	The suggested conditions repeat comments and responses above. L&G do not agree to any of the recommended conditions other than the following compliance condition (worded as per the extant Sports Hub permission): <i>The approved landscaping scheme shall be fully implemented in accordance with the approved details. Unless otherwise agreed as part of the approved landscaping, no trees or hedges on the site shall be wilfully damaged or uprooted, felled/removed, topped or lopped without the previous written consent of the Local Planning Authority until 5 years after completion of the development. Any proposed planting, which</i>

No.	Comment	Applicant Response
	Details of natural turf pitch construction and drainage. See points 1, 13 and 14 of landscape comments dated 25/02/2026 for more information. Reason: To ensure adverse landscape effects are satisfactorily mitigated, including during construction, and in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).	<i>within a period of 5 years, dies, is removed, or becomes seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.</i>
19.	Pre-Occupation Condition: Prior to the first occupation of any part of the development hereby permitted, full details of all hard and soft landscaping works shall have been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include plans and measures addressing the following: - Details of all trees and planting including: - Reinstatement of planting within the bike track area (see landscape comments under point 5 dated 25/02/26, and point 8 dated 20/08/24) - Alternative species to <i>Lonicera nitida</i> (see landscape comments under point 6 dated 25/02/26, and point 9 dated 20/08/24) - Hedgerow extending along the south of the access road (see landscape comments under point 7 dated 25/02/26, and point 9 dated 20/08/24) - Wildflower planting (see landscape comments under point 8 dated 25/02/26, and point 10 dated 20/08/24) - Ball stop fencing to extend along the bank, outside pitches (see landscape comments under point 9 dated 25/02/26, and point 4 dated 20/08/24) - Written specifications (NBS compliant) and LEMP to remove use of herbicides (see landscape comments under point 16 dated 25/02/26, and point 15 dated 20/08/24).	

No.	Comment	Applicant Response
	• Supplier information for plant stock – only locally-sourced planting stock should be used and only certain tree nurseries are suppliers of accredited UK Sourced and Grown stock (see landscape comments under point 17 dated 25/02/26, and point 12 dated 20/08/24) • Details of minor artefacts and structures – such as street furniture, play equipment and signage – including location, size, colour and specification. To ensure that timber equipment has steel footings pitches (see landscape comments under point 10 dated 25/02/26) • Details of all external lighting to include: ○ Specification and lux levels plan for the natural pitches (see landscape comments under point 11 dated 25/02/26) ○ Measures to reduce light spill on existing landscape features, such as specification for shields and an updated lux levels plan (see landscape comments under point 12 dated 25/02/26) The approved landscaping scheme shall be fully implemented in accordance with the approved details within the first planting season following the first occupation of any part of the development. Unless otherwise agreed as part of the approved landscaping, no trees or hedges on the site shall be wilfully damaged or uprooted, felled/removed, topped or lopped without the previous written consent of the Local Planning Authority until 5 years after completion of the development. Any proposed planting, which within a period of 5 years, dies, is removed, or becomes seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.	
HDC Leisure Services (03/03/2026)		
1.	We definitely need to get some clear conditions in about the detailed design and specification of the sports pitches. We do not have anyone within HDC who is qualified to sign these off, so we need to be sure any conditions cover this.	The extant Sports Hub permission is not subject to any of these requirements, though some of these requests overlap with OPP S106 obligations. The proposed Sports Hub

No.	Comment	Applicant Response
	The scheme needs to be designed by a qualified sports turf consultant who has done a detailed site investigation and topsoil analysis. I have put together some quite specific conditions, but these have not been verified by a qualified sports turf consultant.	application, in terms of matters relevant to these comments, is materially the same. We do not therefore deem that this information is necessary for the development to be approved.
2.	Detailed Site Investigation & Topsoil Analysis: Before construction, a survey of existing levels, soil structure, and hydrology must be approved. The soil must be suitable for a high-sand rootzone (typically 85-90% medium/coarse sand) to ensure durability.	
3.	Detailed Technical Specification: A construction method statement, designed by a qualified specialist, detailing the top layer (rootzone) composition, subsurface, drainage layout, drainage channel composition for primary, lateral and secondary drainage and turf or seeding mix.	
4.	FA/Sport England Standards: The design must explicitly comply with the FA/STRI Performance Quality Standard (PQS) for natural grass pitches and Sport England guidance for Natural Turf for Sport.	
5.	Drainage Implementation: Installation of a primary drainage system (pipe drains) at appropriate depths and spacing, supplemented by secondary drainage (sand slitting or gravel banding) to manage surface water, particularly on claybased soils.	
6.	Surface Leveling and Grading: The finished surface must be flat, even, and free from excessive undulations. It is important that the works are correctly timed and that soils are only worked in appropriate conditions (i.e. in the Spring or Summer when the soil is dry and friable). The max slope must not comply with Sport England Guidance.	
7.	Inspection and Approval: A requirement for a qualified independent sports turf consultant to sign off on each stage—site clearance, drainage, soil spreading, and turfing—before the next phase begins.	
8.	Establishment Period: The pitch must not be used until a minimum "grow-in" period approved by a specialist, has passed, allowing the turf to firmly root and the sward to reach a minimum agreed coverage.	

No.	Comment	Applicant Response
9.	Maintenance Schedule: A detailed maintenance plan (mowing, fertilizing, aeration, weeding) for the first 12 months, post-construction.	
10.	Final Inspection & Certification: Prior to the first match, the applicant must submit a report from an independent specialist confirming the pitch meets the PQS, including test results for surface evenness, drainage capability, and soil structure.	