

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/26/0804	Case Officer:	Emma Rivett
Application Type:	Trees in a Conservation Area		
Proposal:	G1: Yew x 2 - Fell. T2: Yew - Crown reduce by 3m. T3: Beech - Monolith to just above cavity in main stem at approx 9 - 10m. T4: Oak - Crown raise low branches over road by 5.5m. T5: Oak - Crown raise (small branches only) branches overhanging barn to 9m (not main limbs) from ground. Selectively thin branches overhanging barn by 20%. Crown reduce by 2m. No large wounds - all cuts to be taken to suitable growth points as per BS3998.		
Site:	Knowles, Street Lane, Ardingly, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 6UJ, ,		
Validation Date	30 Mar 2026	Overall Expiry Date:	21 Apr 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	No Objection	Recommendation Date:	13 Apr 2026
Target Date:	11 May 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	Emma Rivett

Date Legal Agreement Completed: (if applicable)		No of Representations:	0
--	--	-------------------------------	---

Signed and Agreed By:	Beth Howland-Smith	Date:	30 Apr 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/26/0804

Knowles, Street Lane, Ardingly, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 6UJ,

G1: Yew x 2 - Fell. T2: Yew - Crown reduce by 3m. T3: Beech - Monolith to just above cavity in main stem at approx 9 - 10m. T4: Oak - Crown raise low branches over road by 5.5m. T5: Oak - Crown raise (small branches only) branches overhanging barn to 9m (not main limbs) from ground. Selectively thin branches overhanging barn by 20%. Crown reduce by 2m. No large wounds - all cuts to be taken to suitable growth points as per BS3998.

Mr Sean Rocks

The proposed work is as described. The description was written following consultation at a pre application meeting.

G1 Yew (group of two yew trees) - Both trees are in the front garden of the property but are shielded by the presence of other trees from public views. Both trees have lifted root plates. Should these trees fail, they would more than likely damage the property and could cause injury should anyone be using the driveway at the time of failure. As the stability of these trees has been compromised, there is no other option other than to fell them.

T2 Yew - This tree is growing into other trees and overhanging the driveway to the front of the property. It would be good maintenance to reduce this tree, to help prevent failure and to manage the size compared to other trees close by.

T3 Beech - This tree has several significant decay cavities both up the stem and at the base of the tree. It is difficult to determine the extent of the decay here but given the proximity to the main road, a monolith will minimise the risk of failure and maintain the tree as habitat. This is the best option for this tree with the multiple faults and weaknesses present.

T4 Oak - This tree overhangs the highway and may cause damage to high sided vehicles if left this low over the carriageway. The proposed work would raise the canopy over the highway, and this would allow for safe passage for high sided vehicles.

This work would not be of detriment to the health of the tree and would benefit it by preventing branches being torn from the tree should it be struck by a vehicle.

T5 Oak - This tree is in the front of the property and is visible from the public realm. It is a high-quality tree, but it significantly overhangs the adjacent barn and has more growth over the barn than on the other side, due to the presence of other competitive vegetation. The proposed work is to remove some of the weight on the side of the tree overhanging the barn. The idea being that this will reduce some of the pressure on the unions near the main stem and bring the tree to a more balanced form.

Whilst the Parish Council comments have been noted, the beech has multiple faults, including decay cavities at the base (extensive) and up the stem. It was explained to the Parish Council the reasons for the monolith. This is to be carried out for safety reasons only. A monolith will retain some of the ecological value, whilst reducing the risk of failure.

All the work is considered suitable and necessary.

No objection is recommended.

Decision: No Objection

Case Officer: Emma Rivett

