

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/26/1092	Case Officer:	Irene Fletcher
Application Type:	Tree Surgery		
Proposal:	Oak tree in garden - reduce by 1- 2m and no further than previous pruning points and crown raise by 1.5 - 2m.		
Site:	70 Coulstock Road, Burgess Hill, West Sussex, RH15 9XZ, , , ,		
Validation Date	14 May 2026	Overall Expiry Date:	4 Jun 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	24 Jun 2026
Target Date:	9 Jul 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	Irene Fletcher

Date Legal Agreement Completed: (if applicable)		No of Representations:	1
--	--	-------------------------------	---

Signed and Agreed By:	Beth Howland-Smith	Date:	2 Jul 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/26/1092

70 Coulstock Road, Burgess Hill, West Sussex, RH15 9XZ, , ,
Oak tree in garden - reduce by 1- 2m and no further than previous pruning points and crown raise
by 1.5 - 2m.
Mr Kelson Sewell

Permission is sought for the works as described.

This application has been amended to lesser, more appropriate works, with the agreement of the applicant.

The tree is located in the rear garden and visibility is limited to gaps through buildings and distant views. Works will repeat those previously carried and address issues of shading and overhang. The tree is a mature specimen.

With regard to the town council comments, a tree report cannot be required for pruning works, and, the application has now been amended.

A representation has been received making the following points :

- consider MSDC is inconsistent; we have previously applied for 2.5m plus, and been always been refused
- suggest a meeting with neighbours to discuss
- MSDC gave permission for several large trees to be felled to make way for a sports park
- we believe that an allowance should be made personally for us to be included in this application, rather than submitting again

With regard to these comments, two previous applications have been submitted by the representor, neither were refused (ref DM/16/3847 and DM/20/3479), although it is believed that the tree officer negotiated appropriate works. It should be noted, that this application has been amended from a proposed 3m reduction to a 1 - 2m reduction, therefore, it is not accepted that MSDC is inconsistent.

The tree officer is not aware of TPO trees being felled to create a sports pitch. In any event, this does not fall for consideration under this application.

There is no ability to include additional works within an application submitted by a different party.

The works are now considered appropriate to address the above issues.

Permission is recommended.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Irene Fletcher