

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 18 July 2026 07:45:01 UTC+01:00
To: "Emma Rivett" <emma.rivett@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/26/1721

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 18/07/2026 7:45 AM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land At Corner Of Tanyard Lane And Handcross Road Staplefield West Sussex
Proposal:	(T1) Red Oak - Fell. (T2) Red Oak - Fell. (T3) Ash - Fell
Case Officer:	Emma Rivett

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	Silver Birches Handcross Road Staplefield
----------	---

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	Thank you for notifying local residents of the proposed tree works on the Common. I appreciate that the ash tree affected by ash dieback may require removal if it has been professionally assessed as unsafe. However, I am concerned about the proposed works to the two Red Oaks. Both trees appear to be in full leaf and make a significant contribution to the character, biodiversity and appearance of the Common. While I have noticed bracket fungi at their bases, there is no publicly available arboricultural report explaining the extent of any decay, the level of risk, or why the proposed works are considered necessary.
-----------	---

Before any work is undertaken, I respectfully ask that the Council publishes the professional arboricultural assessment on which these proposals are based. This should include the species of bracket fungus identified (if known), the findings of any decay testing or structural assessment, the level of risk posed by each tree, why the proposed works are considered proportionate, and whether alternatives such as crown reduction, selective pruning, ongoing monitoring or retention have been properly considered. Mature trees are invaluable assets and decisions affecting them should be transparent and supported by clear evidence.

I would also like clarification regarding the Council's procedures for notifying residents about tree works. Earlier this year, a very large mature tree directly opposite our property was removed, significantly altering the character of our view, yet we received no notification or opportunity to comment. Likewise, several mature trees on the Upper Common have recently been heavily cut back, with one being reduced to a substantial stump, again without any widespread consultation or explanation. In contrast, we have now received consultation letters regarding these proposed works. I would therefore appreciate an explanation as to why residents were consulted on this occasion but not in relation to the previous works. Could the Council also explain what criteria determine when consultation letters are issued and who undertakes the inspections and recommendations for Council-owned trees? Are these assessments carried out by the Council's own qualified arboricultural officers or by independent consulting arborists? If independent arborists are used, could details of the assessment process and supporting reports please be made publicly available?

More broadly, I am increasingly concerned about the gradual loss of mature trees within our village. Following previous tree removals, I contacted the Parish Clerk to ask whether replacement trees could be planted to compensate for the loss of canopy, wildlife habitat and the visual amenity these trees provided. Unfortunately, I was informed that this would not be possible. I find this disappointing. While I appreciate that different projects may be funded through different budgets or grants, it is difficult to understand why funding has been available for a new plastic children's playground, an additional southbound bus stop only a short distance from the existing southbound stop, and improvements to the cricket pavilion, yet there appears to be no commitment to replacing mature trees that have been lost. Trees are long-term community assets that improve biodiversity, air quality, carbon storage, shade, flood resilience, landscape character and residents' wellbeing. Once mature trees are removed, it takes decades for replacement planting to provide anything close to the same benefits.

I would therefore ask the Council to explain its long-term strategy for protecting and enhancing the village's tree canopy, whether it

has a replacement planting policy for trees removed from public land, and why replacement planting has apparently not been prioritised following recent losses.

I fully appreciate the importance of public safety and understand that trees affected by disease or posing an unacceptable risk may require appropriate management. However, mature trees are irreplaceable community assets, and where significant pruning or removal is proposed, the evidence supporting those decisions should be openly available for public scrutiny. I respectfully request that no irreversible works to the Red Oaks take place until the supporting arboricultural information has been published and properly considered. I hope the Council will view this representation not as opposition to necessary tree safety work, but as a genuine request for greater transparency, consistency and a stronger commitment to protecting and replacing the village's tree canopy for future generations.

Kind regards