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

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.

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.