

DC Admin

From: Louise Bearcroft
Sent: 24 March 2026 15:15
To: DC Admin
Subject: FW: Objection Planning Application 2025/92713 Re: TPO Number 05 of 2025

Categories: Hannah

Hello,

Please can you log this as an objection to 2025/92737 and 2025/92713.

Kind Regards

Louise Bearcroft
Senior Planning Officer

Planning and Development Service
Place Directorate
PO Box 1720, Huddersfield, HD1 9EL
Tel: 01484 221000 (Shortcode: 74126)
Website: www.kirklees.gov.uk

Please note my working days are Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday

From:
Sent: 24 March 2026 14:43
To: Louise Bearcroft <Louise.Bearcroft@kirklees.gov.uk>; Hazel Irving <Hazel.Irving@kirklees.gov.uk>; DC Admin <DC.Admin@kirklees.gov.uk>; Harry Garland <Harry.Garland@kirklees.gov.uk>; Kevin Walton <Kevin.Walton@kirklees.gov.uk>; Trees Planning <Trees.Planning@kirklees.gov.uk>
Subject: Re: Objection Planning Application 2025/92713 Re: TPO Number 05 of 2025

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

Good Day,

I have had no response, acknowledgement or reassurances from any of the above officers to the attached email I sent on the 23 February 2026.

I received a letter from Harry Garland, Legal Officer at Kirklees Council dated 28th March 2025 giving me formal notification of the making of TPO Order NO 5 of 2025 on the trees in my garden. I then received a letter dated 6th June 2025 from Harry Garland, confirming this TPO order had been made.

Despite numerous emails to planning officers, TPO officer and legal officer the plans for planning application 2025/92713 and 2025/92737 have not been updated to show the correct sizes, location

and classification of these trees having a TPO on them. Consequently the root protection area on these plans are not of the correct dimensions.

Even though many amended plans have been uploaded onto the above planning applications, for this development, since the date of my email, none have had these trees updated with the correct classification or sizes.

The most recent plan uploaded by Kirklees Planning [id1130493] dated 12.03.2026 is still showing tree T16 as its actual size but showing G17 group of trees, smaller, just marginally larger than the garage shown to the right of them. Therefore the root balls are shown as extending only just over the boundary whereas the branches of these trees extend further over the boundary than T16's do. As stated in my original email some of the branches from these cherry trees extend to approx. 5 metres over this proposed development site.

I am now getting concerned these important details are going to be ignored when construction starts.

Please log the above objection against the case files for both planning applications 2025/92737 and 2025/92713.

Regards

On Mon, 23 Feb 2026 at 16:46,

wrote:

Ms.Louise Bearcroft.

Once again, I have viewed a new plan submitted for this proposed PPJ development. I have done my utmost to protect 8 beautiful, very large wild cherry trees that are in good health, from this development. Once again the developers agent has submitted a new Proposed Site / Block Layout [id 1124987] dated 4th Feb 2026 Planning Application 2025/92713, that shows fully grown and growing trees **that have been miniaturized on this plan and now appear to be some sort of big hedge, in my garden. These very large trees are not a hedge and do have a Tree Protection Order on them.**

Details of the TPO are:-

Tree Preservation Order No. 05 of 2025

Your Reference PLA/HG/GDM/D26-1461.dated 06 June 2025

Mr. Harry Garland.

Letters and Notifications are all available

Despite me contacting planning officers at Kirklees Planning asking for the developer or his agent to be informed about this TPO, it would appear that the developer or his agent is either ignoring planning, or does not understand what he has been told.

This TPO does not seem to have been acknowledged because the true **status, size and quantity** of our cherry trees have not been updated on these amended plans. This means the size of the trees and the root balls are being shown to be considerably smaller than the tree growing to the left, (**West**) on the plan labelled Proposed Site / Bock Layout [id 1124987 **T16 (Protected TPO Tree)**]. Some of our mature cherry trees are as big as T16. Therefore the trees in my garden have been given far too little root protection area that should have been allocated, to protect these beautiful trees, from this developer.

.I really don't know what more I can do? I really do care and I have done my best! Some of the branches from these cherry trees extend to approx. 5 metres over this proposed development site and will be the first to be hacked off by a contractor with a chainsaw. This will put the trees out of balance. Doesn't Kirklees Planning TPO Department have the authority to deal with this?

Why should I bother, if you don't? I always believed that TPO's were designed to protect trees. Apparently not?

Let me tell you this. I am taking all these TPO emails, all the others, and everything else, to a specialist barrister. Proof of what I have tried to do needs to be seen by someone independent of the Kirklees Planning Department and documented! Do not come at me in two or three year's time, trying to blame me, if these lovely trees die. That is now your responsibility.

Can you and the Tree Protection Officers:-

- 1) Please can the developer and his agent be advised that these trees have a TPO on them?
- 2) Please can the developer and his agent be advised to update his plans and show this TPO and re-submit the corrected plans that show our trees on them?
- 3) Please can the developer and his agent be advised to update his planning application plans, to show that the trees, with-in our boundary (curtilage) are shown to be **the correct size, the correct quantity and in the correct positions?**
- 4) Please can the developer and his agent be advised to show the tree canopies on his plans that are the correct size, proportion and diameter as TPO Tree T16, as people may be **mislead** into thinking that these trees are smaller than they really are.
- 5) Please can the developer and his agent be advised that Planning Permission must be obtained before any work to these trees, branches, cutting back, lopping, topping and root work, can be undertaken?
- 6) Please can the developer and his agent be advised that excavation works and any form of digging must be done **outside** of the root protection area, only after seeking the TPO officer's advice and permission?

Regards

cc BB (Hard copy only).