DC Admin

From:
Sent: 02 December 2025 14:37
To: Louise Bearcroft; DC Admin; Hazel Irving
Cc: Trees Planning; Yorkshire and North East TSOs; england@woodlandtrust.org.uk
Subject: Fwd: Planning Applications 2025/61/92713/E- Consultation Response - Ref 46/96

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Ms Bearcroft, and all Ohers Concerned

Please see attached email I am forwarding to you as I have had no response from Hazel Irving, Kirklees Tree Responding Officer. I am concerned my email may have not been delivered to her and as today is the closing date for comments to be registered against the planning application for the site at 27-43 Moor Lane, Gomersal, BD19 4LF, I am registering this objection with you. The plans for both planning applications for this site are showing the TPO trees mentioned below, incorrectly.

Please register this email and this attached document as an objection against the case files for both planning applications, 2025/92737 and 2025/92713.

Thank you

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From:
Date: Mon, 1 Dec 2025 at 01:22
Subject: Planning Applications 2025/61/92713/E- Consultation Response - Ref 46/96
To: <hazel.irving@kirklees.gov.uk>

Dear Ms Irving

Re: Planning Applications 2025/61/92713/E

On the above planning application you have submitted a Consultation Response from KC, Trees.

Date Responded: 25/11/2025

Responding Officer: Hazel Irving

Responding Ref: 46/96

I have reviewed the AMS which has been submitted Ref. 220218b, dated 10.11.2025 that you have based your decision on, this is not showing the trees in our garden correctly classified and they are not in the correct location. The last page of the AMS Ref 220218b prepared by James Royston Tree Protection Plan to BS5837:2012 at Moor Lane, Gomersal is showing our trees referenced as G17. These trees are located in our

back garden at 21 Summerdale, Gomersal, Cleckheaton, BD19 4AH. On this plan G17 is showing 4 trees, there are in fact 8 trees. These 8 trees have a TPO on them. The TPO number is 05 of 2025.

The location of the trees appears to be incorrect and the size they are depicted as is far too small. Some of these 8 trees are as big and tall as the tree marked T16 on these plans.

I submitted photographs and dimensions of all the trees when I applied for the TPO.

I have measured the correct distances of the 8 trees and here are those details:

Distance of nearest tree from 21 Summerdale garage 11.5 metres

Distance from the western boundary 2.7 metres

Distances from the wooden boundary fence in 21 Summerdale's garden, the 2 nearest trees to this boundary are 36 centimetres and 28 centimetres

These trees are over 30 years old and very good health.

They are a centre for wildlife and we have seen many different birds and animals using them throughout each year.

I am concerned this development does not appear to be protecting the root ball of these TPO trees as adequately as it should, when compared to the other trees on the plan, a few metres away further west.

The lower branches on these trees are at least 7 metres over the boundary into the proposed plot. I am frightened that future workers will just come along with a chain saw and cut them back to the boundary, without getting TPO permission. This would put the trees out of balance and possibly kill them. Damage done now may not be visible for years after the developer has left the site. Any resultant damage from a falling tree etc. on a new house or garden could be charged to me. I find this grossly unfair as I have done everything I can to protect these trees. Can the developer be advised that these trees have a TPO on them and planning permission must be sort before any work can be undertaken?

Is it possible for you to send me laminated notices that I can fix to the fence in front of the trees. This will leave construction workers in no doubt that extreme care has to be taken.

I have now, because of this anomaly, looked at other plans on both applications (2025/44/92737 and 2025/61/92713) for this site and **all** the plans seems to be showing our trees incorrectly classified as G17 and the wrong number of trees shown. Do these plans need amending?

Regards