

O/25/99506 - Navigator Quarter, Eastleigh, SO18 2NL

03/03/2026

Dear Liz,

The updated arboricultural impact assessment, and associated drawings, now include tree loss on Mitchell Way and greater detail on tree loss within the woodland (which was also submitted in the New Estate Road Alignment Note, dated November 2025). As such, we now have a complete picture of the impact from the proposal.

As stated previously, we are not supportive of this level of tree loss, but we acknowledge that the road is enshrined in policy. The critical issue then becomes whether the site can support the number of replacement trees – 593 – or whether some of those tree will have to be planted off-site.

The majority, if not all, of the declared tree loss is connected to the full planning application but, because of the design, the majority of the replacement trees, where they can be accommodated on site, will have to be planted in the area of the outline application. We will defer to the Landscape Officer regarding the landscaping of the scheme, but at Reserved Matters, full landscaping details will have to be provided.

If you are minded to approve the application, please condition the following:

The development must accord with the Arboricultural Impact Assessment, reference 12216-AIA. Reason - To minimise tree losses and protect the retained trees, which form an important part of the amenity of the locality.

No excavation, demolition or development related works shall take place on site until a detailed Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan are submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The approved arboricultural documents must be adhered to in full, and may only be modified subject to written agreement from the Local Planning Authority. Reason: to retain and protect the existing trees, which form an important part of the amenity of the locality.

Kind regards,

Chris.

25/11/2025

Dear Liz, We have now reviewed the New Estate Alignment Note, dated November 2025. The note aims to justify the roads position and quantify the number of trees lost for it.

We are broadly satisfied with the justification supplied for the road's alignment and accept the proposed tree replacement figures calculated on the tree survey plan (reference 11976-D-AIA) contained within the New Estate Alignment Note.

Whilst we are not actively supportive of the level of tree loss, we acknowledge that the road is enshrined in policy – and has been for a significant period of time. Replacement tree planting at Reserved Matters will be critical for the continuation of the canopy cover and for ecosystem service provision to the local environment.

26/08/2025

Dear Liz,

Arboricultural Documents

Tree Survey & Arboricultural Impact Assessment reference 11296/NH/BM Rev A.

Comments

During pre-app. discussions, we noted the following:

“There appears to be significant tree loss due to the access road. This is principally located on the central tree-belt, which runs east to west. Whilst it is noted that there is long standing policy support for a route through this area – and thus this tree-belt – and that there isn't a tree-free route available, we are not supportive of this level of apparent tree loss without justification.”

And:

“At full planning, we will require not only standard arboricultural information, as per British Standard 5837 and the Trees and Development SPD, but also evidence that other options have been assessed. The applicant should note Key Points 2 and 3 in the Trees and Development SPD in this respect.

We expect a more detailed tree survey of the central tree belt in order to make this informed decision, and to rule out an potential impacts on more significant habitat, such as ancient and veteran trees.”

At a meeting with stakeholders in November 2024, we expanded on what we would expect to see at full planning: namely that because tree loss within the woodland belt would be significant, the applicant must do two things:

1. Accurately quantify tree loss for the purposes of impact assessment and replacement tree planting; and
2. Demonstrate that the that the proposed route is the least impactful and/or justify that the proposed route is the only option, and reasons for that. Note

Unfortunately, neither of the above points have been covered in the supporting documents.

On point 1, the principal area of tree loss is W1, which has been given B categorisation. The woodland (W1) contains a number significant trees within the core area (as well as significant trees on the periphery, which have been individually surveyed). We accept that a standard approach to woodland would be to group all the trees together under one element, but this would only be appropriate where little or no impact was proposed. A significant area of W1 is due to be removed and we need to understand the impact.

The arboricultural report, at 4.4.2 states:

“The trees removed to facilitate construction of the access road will be mitigated for with replacement planting as per Appendix 1 of Eastleigh Borough Council’s Trees and Development supplementary planning document, a copy of which is included at Appendix I.”

However, we do not understand how this can be achieved without accurate quantification of tree loss. Further, tree loss along Mitchel Way does not appear to have been included in the arboricultural assessment.

Regarding point 2, whilst we accept that there is probably solid justification for this proposed route, it has not been made clear to us, as per our request. Coupled with point 1, above, we are unable to support the application without the required justification for the impact.

Therefore, we raise a holding objection at this stage based on the inability to assess the impact and the lack of justification regarding the specific route of the link road. We would request that the comments we made at pre-application stage are addressed before we are able to support the proposal.