

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/2144	Case Officer:	Emma Rivett
Application Type:	Trees in a Conservation Area		
Proposal:	(T1) Copper Beech: Crown reduce by 2.5m and crown raise by 4.5m from ground.		
Site:	The Holt, 78 High Street, Lindfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 2HP, ,		
Validation Date	22 Aug 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	17 Sep 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	No Objection	Recommendation Date:	29 Sep 2025
Target Date:	3 Oct 2025	Recommending Officer Signature:	Emma Rivett

Date Legal Agreement Completed: (if applicable)		No of Representations:	2
--	--	-----------------------------------	---

Signed and Agreed By:	Beth Howland-Smith	Date:	2 Oct 2025
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/2144

**The Holt, 78 High Street, Lindfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 2HP,
(T1) Copper Beech: Crown reduce by 2.5m and crown raise by 4.5m from ground.
Mr David Crowther**

The proposed work is as described. The description has been amended, with the agreement of the applicant, as the previously description was considered to be excessive and could potentially be detrimental to the health of the tree. The lesser reduction, which was agreed following a site meeting, is considered acceptable and would not harm the health of the tree.

The tree is in the back garden of The Holt, and although it can be seen from a distance, and has a footpath running underneath it, the proposed work would not be noticeable from any public space. A TPO, was considered, but not deemed necessary, following negotiations and change of description.

Whilst the Parish Council, and neighbour comments have been noted, the proposed work would be acceptable, even if the tree was protected by TPO. As the proposed work has been reduced, and is more acceptable in arboricultural terms, the threat has been removed and the criteria required to make a TPO is no longer met.

The comments from Rosemary Cottage have been carefully noted. Since the description has been amended to more appropriate works, the first two points made are no longer relevant. With regards to erosion of the twitten, and the branches overhanging it, these will remain hanging over the twitten and will be reduced over the shed of the applicant, only. The branches are only slightly above the shed currently, and on a windy day or with some rain would more than likely be touching/ rubbing the roof of the shed. Debris will still fall from the tree, as the proposed reduction would only reduce lower branches. As removal of whole branches is no longer proposed, that point is no longer relevant. It is a reduction of the lower branches, rather than removal. The visual impact of the tree, following the amended description, will not be visible from near or distant views.

The comments from The Holt have similarly been carefully noted. The four branches are only to be reduced, not removed, following negotiations with the applicant. This lesser amount of work would also address the other concerns of the amenity value of the tree being compromised, as the proposed work would only be noticeable from the applicant's property and would not be of detriment to the health or affect the stability of the tree. With regards to the position of the shed, there is no action the local authority may take in respect of this.

No objection is recommended.

Decision: No Objection

Case Officer: Emma Rivett