

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/3277	Case Officer:	Emma Rivett
Application Type:	Trees in a Conservation Area		
Proposal:	Crown reduction of up to 20% or 1.6m from each aspect to leave crown radius of 6.4m. Please note amended address		
Site:	15 Lewes Road, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 7SP, , , ,		
Validation Date	19 Jan 2026	Overall Expiry Date:	9 Feb 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	No Objection	Recommendation Date:	16 Feb 2026
Target Date:	2 Mar 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	Emma Rivett

Date Legal Agreement Completed: (if applicable)		No of Representations:	4
--	--	-------------------------------	---

Signed and Agreed By:	Beth Howland-Smith	Date:	17 Feb 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/3277

**15 Lewes Road, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 7SP, , ,
Crown reduction of up to 20% or 1.6m from each aspect to leave crown radius of 6.4m. Please
note amended address
Mr Piers Bryant**

The proposed work is as described.

The tree is situated in the garden of number 15 Lewes Road and is close to the boundary of number 17 Lewes Road. It is visible from the public realm, both up close and from a distance. The tree is not upright but leaning towards number 17. It is difficult to determine why the tree is leaning so much without further investigations being carried out.

There is visible ground disturbance around the roots in the garden of number 15, but it is only surface digging from badgers or foxes, probably searching for food, rather than actual excavation.

The tree sits on raised ground, as number 15 is at a higher level than number 17. The tree is quite imposing from number 17.

The proposed work is to reduce the canopy by 1.6m all around. This would reduce the weight of the tree by a significant amount. It would also lessen the sail, which would reduce the biomechanical pressure on the root plate, in the event of strong winds.

The comments have been noted from the objections received.

Firstly, the tree would not be removed, so it would still be visible and therefore, still contribute to the visual amenity of the Conservation Area. It is agreed that there is no evidence of damage caused by the tree. As for previous works to other trees within the property of number 15, this cannot be considered in this application. The administrative error has been corrected and the deadline for public consultation extended, accordingly.

Secondly, another comment referring to the pressure put on the tree owner by the applicant. This would be a private civil matter and can not be considered as part of this notification.

Thirdly, the final objection refers to the tree being maintained in its current condition. The proposed work would not be of detriment to the health of the tree and would go some way to reduce the risk of the tree failing.

All things considered, the tree would not be a candidate for TPO, and therefore, no objection is recommended.

Decision: No Objection

Case Officer: Emma Rivett