

**Consultation Response from KC,  
Trees**

**2024/92727 Land adjacent to, Ashbourne Drive, Liversedge**

**Erection of residential development 67 dwellings with associated access, parking, public open space, landscaping and infrastructure**

**Date Responded: 06/01/2025**

**Responding Officer: Hazel Irving**

**Responding Ref: n/a**

**The submitted tree survey information cannot be accepted, as all the tree positions and measurements are estimated. We require the tree information to be accurate to properly assess the impacts of the proposals on the tree constraints within the site. Additionally, the drainage layout and any ground level changes should be included as part of the amended arboricultural impact assessment.**

**We will be able to comment fully on the tree information once the required level of detail is supplied within the reporting.**

---

**Provisional comments:**

The submitted reporting suggest that the development of the proposals would require the removal of 2 Cat B trees (T30 and T31), 2 Cat C trees (T17, T18), 2 Cat B groups (G1 and G20), plus one complete hedge (H32) and one partial hedge (H16).

To align with Local Plan Policies LP33 and LP24(i) plots 51, 52 and 53 should be dropped to allow for the retention of T30 and T31. These are Cat B trees which offer good amenity value to the surrounding area and contribute to the environment.

Plot 26 threatens retained Cat C trees from G23 (Cat B) and G25 (Cat C). Access facilitation pruning is suggested within the AIA. However, buildings and other structures should be sited allowing adequate space for the natural development of trees, with due consideration given to predicted height and canopy spread. Plot 19 threatens T19 (Cat B), which appears on the AIA as retained but within the report is suggested for removal along with T17, T18 and G20.

RPA incursions also affect T3, T12, G15, G27.

**There is a holding objection from an arboricultural perspective. The reporting must be completed with accurate tree information, including tree positions, DBH, RPAs and crown spreads. Furthermore, the proposal includes the removal of Category B trees and conflicts with adopted Kirklees local plan policy 33 and 24 (i):**

*LP 33: "The Council will not grant planning permission for developments which directly or indirectly threaten trees or woodlands of significant amenity value.*

*Proposals should normally retain any valuable or important trees where they make a contribution to public amenity, the distinctiveness of a specific location or contribute to the environment, including the wildlife Habitat Network and green Infrastructure networks. Proposals will need to comply with relevant national standards regarding the protection of trees in relation to design, demolition and construction."*

*LP 24: "Proposals should promote good design by ensuring:- i) the retention of valuable or important trees"*