

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 20 July 2026 11:45:12 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 20/07/2026 11:45 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:	2 Tanyards Tanyards Lane Staplefield
----------	--------------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	I wish to register my objection to the proposed removal of the two oak trees located on the village green. My primary concern is that the application appears to provide no clear justification for felling these trees. No detailed explanation has been provided regarding the alleged defects, no supporting evidence of disease has been made available, and there is no arboricultural report for public scrutiny. Before the irreversible decision is made to remove two prominent mature trees from our village, residents deserve to understand precisely why this action

is considered necessary.

I am aware that one tree surgeon has suggested the presence of Ganoderma, however no evidence has been provided to support this assertion. Equally, other qualified tree professionals who have viewed the trees have expressed the opinion that they are not diseased. Given these differing professional views, I strongly believe that an independent arboricultural assessment should be obtained before any decision is taken. Where the loss of mature trees is proposed, it is only reasonable that any diagnosis and risk assessment is supported by robust and impartial evidence.

These oaks may indeed have defects, as many mature trees do, but they remain in full leaf and continue to make a significant contribution to the character, appearance and environmental value of the village green. Mature oak trees provide habitat for wildlife, absorb carbon, improve air quality, offer shade during increasingly hot summers and contribute enormously to the visual amenity of a Conservation Area. The loss of such trees cannot be quickly replaced; it takes many decades, and often generations, for a newly planted tree to provide comparable benefits.

Furthermore, it does not appear that alternative tree management options have been properly considered. The removal of a mature tree should be a last resort, particularly within a Conservation Area. Where concerns exist regarding structural defects, decay or long-term viability, there are often management measures available that can significantly reduce risk whilst retaining the tree and its environmental benefits. These can include selective pruning, crown reduction, deadwood removal, weight reduction, fencing or exclusion zones, regular monitoring and inspection, or the installation of support systems where appropriate. In some circumstances, retaining a tree as a managed veteran or habitat tree can provide substantial ecological value whilst addressing safety concerns. Before irreversible felling is authorised, I believe the Council should be satisfied that all reasonable management options have been thoroughly explored and discounted by independent evidence.

This also raises a broader question for our village. Every time a mature tree is removed, should there not be a clear plan for replacement? We are fortunate that funding is regularly found for new facilities and improvements within the village. Surely we should be equally committed to investing in our tree canopy for the benefit of future generations.

Should the Council ultimately determine that removal is unavoidable, I would urge that suitable replacement planting be made a condition of any approval. Any replacement trees should be native species appropriate to the location and planted as part of a long-term programme to maintain and enhance the village's tree stock. Without such a commitment, the gradual loss of mature

trees risks permanently altering the character of our Conservation Area.

The precautionary principle should apply here. The permanent loss of two mature oaks is a decision that cannot be reversed, whereas further investigation, monitoring and alternative management options remain available. In the absence of compelling evidence that felling is the only viable course of action, the balance should favour retention.

For all of these reasons, I respectfully urge the Council to reject this application. The case for felling has not been adequately evidenced, there are conflicting professional opinions regarding the condition of the trees, and it has not been demonstrated that less drastic management options have been properly explored.

These mature oaks form an important part of the character, biodiversity and heritage of our village green and Conservation Area. Their loss would be immediate and irreversible, whereas further assessment and alternative management remain available. In the absence of clear, independent and compelling evidence that removal is necessary, the balance should firmly favour retention. I therefore ask the Council to refuse consent for the proposed works and to champion the protection, management and future replacement of our village's trees for the benefit of current and future generations.

Yours sincerely
Jane Newington

Kind regards