

**Consultation Response from KC,  
Trees**

**2026/90471 11 , Wood Street, Skelmanthorpe, Huddersfield, HD8 9BN**

**Discharge of details reserved by conditions 8 (CEMP), 10 (boundary retaining wall), 12 (planting), 13 (Biodiversity Enhancement Plan) on previous permission 2024/91934 for demolition of existing dwelling and erection of four dwellings**

**Date Responded: 06.03.2026**

**Responding Officer: H Irving**

**Responding Ref: 03/22**

AMS Report Reference: AMS-2559-1 25, dated February 2026 has been reviewed. There are concerns which must be addressed before Condition 11 can be discharged. Please see below:

1. The tree protection fencing should exclude all access from the root protection area to avoid any soil disturbance or compaction. "Ease of access" is not justification for the specification of lesser protection within the RPA, particularly as there is an existing access road which can be used. In the absence of a reasonable justification, the fencing must be aligned to exclude all access from the RPA of T5.
2. Arboricultural supervision is required during the works to the retaining wall to ensure that exposed roots are pruned appropriately and kept damp as specified within the AMS.
3. Further details regarding working timeframes and air spading would be appreciated in relation the repair work affecting the RPA of T5. Excavated roots should be re-covered with topsoil as soon as possible to avoid desiccation.
4. Significant crown reduction works have been specified for T5 i.e. 2m height and 3m radial reduction to compensate for the loss of rooting area. The existing crown spread has an 8-9m radius. Given the age and species of T5 this reduction is considered excessive. A mature sycamore is unlikely to tolerate this degree of a reduction. KC Trees can agree to a maximum of a 10-15% reduction in crown volume, to be carried out during the winter months (November to March). This would help address any shortfall in the tree root/shoot ratio and alleviate biomechanical stress by reducing both the leverage and the sail area, without compromising the health of the tree by removing the existing framework of healthy small-diameter branches and twigs (leaf-bearing structure), capable of producing dense leaf cover during the following growing season.

These amendments will help to minimise damage and protect the long-term health of the protected tree T5, and the significant amenity value it affords the surrounding area. The AMS should be updated to reflect these changes.

**There is a holding objection from an arboricultural perspective for the reasons given above. The proposal 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"*