

Introduction

This note identifies the issues that have been considered to inform the alignment of the proposed new estate road that is required to serve the Navigator Quarter development and designed so that it could also form the first part of a future Chickenhall Lane Link Road.

The Navigator Quarter site is divided into two plots, separated by a tree belt that runs east-west across the site. To connect the southern plot with the northern plot as well as Chickenhall Lane to the north, the estate road will need to be routed through the tree belt. Appendix A includes the submitted Illustrative Site Layout Plan and shows the route which was chosen.

Following validation of the hybrid application on 17.07.25, comments from the Council's Tree Officer were provided on 03.09.25, which requested additional survey information of the section of trees which will be felled to clear space for the estate road. This was requested to understand the number of trees that would be lost to provide this new piece of infrastructure. This survey is provided at Appendix B.

The Tree Officer also requested that the applicant *"demonstrate that the proposed route (of the estate road) is the least impactful and/or justify that the proposed route is the only option, and reasons for that"*. This note has therefore been prepared to explain the considerations taken to determine the most appropriate alignment for the estate road.

The road is in general alignment with the proposed route of the Chickenhall Lane Link Road route that is identified as a safeguarded route in the Eastleigh Local Plan.

A route for the Chickenhall Lane Link Road (CLLR) has been safeguarded to ensure that this infrastructure can come forward. This safeguarded route is shown on Eastleigh BC's Planning Policy Map (North) that forms part of the adopted Development Plan, part of which is reproduced below as shown by Figure 1. This safeguarded route is shown by the dashed purple line. Policies E7 and E9 of the Local Plan states that the CLLR shall be provided *'..with an alignment as indicated on the policies map...'*. As the proposed estate road that forms part of the hybrid application will comprise the first part of the CLLR, the alignment of this safeguarded route shown on the Policies Map directly informs this application to ensure that it is in accordance with Policy E6. Using the safeguarded route to inform the application is of particular importance to ensure that this new Estate Road can connect to the other part of the safeguarded route to the north as this is effectively a fixed point.

It should also be noted that since the Policy Map was prepared, the airport runway has now been extended and this has reduced the available extent of land to the west. The new Estate Road needs to be positioned so that it can be accommodated in the remaining land at the end of the runway.




Figure 1: Extract from Planning Policy Map (North)

Policies E7 and E9 allow for flexibility in the exact route of the CLLR and the proposed design of the new Estate Road is not exactly the same as the safeguarded route. The detailed design ensures that site constraints and design standards are taken into account. The specification of the CLLR was not agreed or set out in the Local Plan and the scope of this has now been reviewed with the Local Highway Authority. The alignment of the Estate Road is a sufficient geometry to allow for all potential road users, including HGV's and also accommodates an active travel route alongside it, which has informed the route set out in this planning application.

The land on the other side of the railway line is also subject to a safeguarded route for the CLLR. This has now been formalised following the grant of planning permission by Hampshire County Council (ref. CS/22/92463) to build a Material Recycling Facility. Figure 2 shows the Site Layout for this development to the north. This provides a strip of land to the west, which is reserved for the CLLR. To facilitate connection to this site to the north. This therefore established a fixed point for the CLLR on the northern side of the railway.



Figure 2. Site Layout of the Material Recycling Facility to the north of the site.

The design also needs to meet technical design standards to ensure that it is safe and fit for purposes. This includes making sure that the geometry of the road is suited for the design speed.

The proposed routing enables a smooth, single curve with appropriate visibility to be constructed. The result is a safer and more efficient road for all vehicle types travelling in either direction. If the estate road was to be pushed to the north where it interacts with the tree belt, then the curve would be tighter and would not meet the relevant design standards/agreed specification. If the alignment was moved further to the south/east to a narrower section of the tree belt, then it would need to have a sequence of curves to ensure that the new road could connect to the area of land to the north of the railway. Adding in a number of curves would introduce more risk as drivers need to undertake more manoeuvres. Furthermore, given the tree coverage there would be the prospect of needing to remove a wider section of the tree belt to ensure appropriate visibility and space for the road as it would need to be crossing this tree belt at an angle to ensure alignment to the safeguarded land on the other side of the railway line.

It is important to note that the route will be used by HGVs, which can be up to 16.5m in length, and therefore require longer, sweeping road bends to turn efficiently without stopping or causing conflict with oncoming traffic. For reasons of safety and efficiency, the proposed alignment was therefore determined to be the most suitable.

Flexibility is needed for the development of employment plots. The estate road is better located to the northern part of the site to ensure the effective and efficient use of land so that this can accommodate a range of different unit types and sizes.

As figure 1 shows, the Council intend for the connection to Chickenhall Lane be made from the northernmost corner of the North Plot. To access this point, it is proposed that future extensions of the estate road run alongside the western boundary of the North Plot, to minimise encroachment into the developable area of the plot and enable the most efficient use of land. Were the route to connect the plots further along the tree belt, in order to reach Chickenhall Lane, the estate road would be required to diagonally cross the North Plot, splitting it into two irregularly shaped spaces, which would be less efficient to develop. This would counteract Chapter 11 of the NPPF, and specifically paragraph 129, which encourages developments to make effective use of land.

Under Policy E7 of the adopted Local Plan (2016 – 2036), the North Plot is also allocated for approximately 34,000 sqm of employment floorspace. If the estate road leading to Chickenhall Lane was to cross the North Plot in an irregular and inefficient way, it would restrict the plot from delivering the levels of floorspace expected by the Council.

To minimise the disturbance to local wildlife.

The proposed road alignment through the closest section of the tree belt reduces the relationship between the estate road and the tree belt to its shortest distance. Were the road to connect the plots further along the tree belt, it would be required to run alongside the tree belt for longer, potentially covering the root protection area of a greater number of trees. Figure 3 demonstrates how this has been considered.

The road will also require streetlighting to be fitted alongside, and therefore if the road extended further along the tree belt, there would be a longer stretch of trees exposed to light spill, which can disturb both flora and fauna.

It is important to note that the tree belt also acts as a corridor for wildlife. It is therefore likely that wildlife will move from the tree belt and cross the road and therefore in the interest of both wildlife preservation and the safety of drivers, it is important to shorten this interface between traffic and the tree belt.

Given that fragmentation of the wildlife corridor cannot be avoided to create the Chickenhall Lane Link Road, it makes sense to intersect the tree belt while maintaining the most meaningful form of habitat possible. It is therefore preferable to intersect the tree belt at a position which will keep the largest possible section of tree belt instead of intersecting further along the corridor, creating two smaller fragments of tree belt, where the more westerly one would be cut off, which would be more damaging for local wildlife.



Figure 3. Extract from the Illustrative Site Layout plan showing the proposed relationship between the road and the tree belt (green) as well as alternative routes (orange), whereby the road would run alongside the tree belt for longer.

Land take for the road is informed by the need to include a suitable active travel connection alongside for use by cyclists and pedestrians, as required by the Local Highway Authority.

The proposed estate road has been designed in the most suitable way to accommodate a segregated pedestrian and cycle path along the southern side of the estate road. This has been provided to facilitate sustainable and active travel connections to the site, to reduce the development's reliance on private vehicles, and this is in accordance with the requirements of the Local Highway Authority. Therefore, while the construction of the estate road will result in some tree loss, the proposed alignment of the estate road will enable a more direct and attractive route for those travelling by bicycle or on foot.

Conclusion


This note sets out the factors, which have been taken into account to inform the alignment of the estate road linking Plots 1 and 2 at the Navigator Quarter. The proposed route has been determined based on consideration of a number of issues, such as safety, efficiency, impact on local ecology, facilitating active travel as well as the Council's own vision for the road, including connections with land uses to the north.

Accordingly the proposed alignment is considered to be the most appropriate taken these issues into account, and to ensure that it most fully accords with the requirements of policies E7 and E9 of the adopted Development Plan as well as the NPPF.

APPENDIX A – Illustrative Site Layout Plan



© MICHAEL SPARKS ASSOCIATES
COPYRIGHT RESERVED.
SUBJECT TO STATUTORY CONSENTS.
SUBJECT TO SURVEY.
BASED ON OS MAP REPRODUCED BY PERMISSION OF
CONTROLLER OF HM STATIONERY OFFICE © CROWN
COPYRIGHT AND DATABASE RIGHTS 2024. OS
AC000813445.
FOR PLANNING PURPOSES ONLY.
DO NOT USE ELECTRONIC VERSIONS OF THIS DRAWING
TO DETERMINE DIMENSIONS UNLESS SPECIFICALLY
AUTHORISED BY MICHAEL SPARKS ASSOCIATES.
IF USING AN ELECTRONIC VERSION OF THIS DRAWING,
FIGURED DIMENSIONS TAKE PRECEDENCE. PLEASE
NOTIFY MICHAEL SPARKS ASSOCIATES OF ANY
DISCREPANCIES.



LEGEND:

- APPLICATION SITE BOUNDARY
- - - PLOT BOUNDARIES

PROPOSED NEW ROAD LAYOUT TAKEN FROM
BURROWS GRAHAM DRAWING NO:
30228-BGL-XX-XX-XR-C-00014 P06
DATED: 16.04.25

GROSS SITE BOUNDARY TAKEN FROM TITLE PLAN
HP882317 & DRAWING EASTLEIGH - REDLINE
DATED: 27.04.22

PL04	28/05/25	Scale amended	sd	mt
PL03	19/05/25	Red line & road layout updated.	sd	mt
PL02	23/04/25	Road layout updated.	sd	mt
PL01	09/04/25	First Issue	sd	mt
REV	DATE	NOTES	DRAWN	CHECKED

MICHAEL SPARKS ASSOCIATES
11 PLATO PLACE ST DIONIS ROAD LONDON SW6 4TU
CHARTERED ARCHITECTS 020 7736 6162 WWW.MSA-ARCHITECTS.CO.UK

PROJECT TITLE
**NAVIGATOR QUARTER,
SOUTHAMPTON**

CLIENT
BLOCWORK (EASTLEIGH) LLP & SIAL

DOCUMENT TITLE
ILLUSTRATIVE SITE LAYOUT PLAN


SCALE
1:2000 @ A1

DATE
19/05/25
DRAWN
SD
CHECKED
MT

DOCUMENT NUMBER
NQS-MSA-SI-XX-DR-A-2002



STATUS
PLANNING

REV
PL04



APPENDIX B – Tree Survey prepared by Haydens

Tree No	Species	DBH	Distance	General Notes	No of Replacement Trees
2015	Point Item - Dead Tree	0	0	Hawthorn, Dead.	0
2016	Point Item - Dead Tree	0	0	Dead Willow.	0
2017	Point Item - Dead Tree	0	0	Dead Willow.	0
2018	Point Item - Dead Tree	0	0	Dead Hawthorn.	0
2019	Point Item - Dead Tree	0	0	Dead Hawthorn, Multi-stemmed. Not plotted on TOPO.	0
2020	Point Item - Dead Tree	0	0	Elder, Collapsed.	0
2021	Point Item - Dead Tree	0	0	Dead Elder.	0
2022	Point Item - Dead Tree	0	0	Dead Willow.	0
2023	Point Item - Missing Trees	0	0	Hawthorn, Opposite side of bridleway. Size ensures little root encroachment beyond.	0
2024	Point Item - Missing Trees	250 (Average)	3	Hawthorn, Single, twin and multi-stemmed trees. Shelterbelt planting. Separate from woodland. No TOPO information but trees range from circa. 100 to 300mm DBH with a few exceptions. Estimated circa. 40 trees require felling.	80
2026	Point Item - Missing Trees	350 (Average)	4.2	Area inaccessible. Dense undergrowth and bramble throughout. Mainly Hawthorn and Willow. Estimated circa. 30 trees require felling.	90
2027	Point Item - Stem	240	2.88	Hawthorn, Twin-stemmed.	2
2028	Point Item - Stem	590	3.08	Hawthorn, Multi-stemmed.	1
2029	Point Item - Stem	170	2.04	Hawthorn.	1
2030	Point Item - Stem	150	1.8	Willow, Twin-stemmed.	1
2031	Point Item - Stem	170	2.04	Elder, Multi-stemmed.	1
2032	Point Item - Stem	150	1.8	Hawthorn, Not on TOPO.	1
2033	Point Item - Stem	660	7.92	Willow, Not on TOPO.	6
2034	Point Item - Stem	400	4.8	Hawthorn, Multi-stemmed. Ivy clad. Crown failure.	4
2035	Point Item - Stem	400	4.9	Hawthorn.	4
2036	Point Item - Stem	270	3.24	Ash.	2
2037	Point Item - Stem	310	3.72	Hawthorn, Multi-stemmed.	3
2038	Point Item - Stem	140	1.68	Ash.	1
2039	Point Item - Stem	300	3.6	Hawthorn, Multi-stemmed.	2
2040	Point Item - Stem	420	5.04	Hawthorn, Multi-stemmed.	1
2041	Point Item - Stem	210	2.52	Hawthorn.	2
2042	Point Item - Stem	150	1.8	Hawthorn.	1
2043	Point Item - Stem	220	2.64	Hawthorn.	2
2044	Point Item - Stem	130	1.56	Hawthorn, Twin-stemmed.	1
2045	Point Item - Stem	220	2.64	Hawthorn, Twin-stemmed.	2
2046	Point Item - Stem	160	1.92	Hawthorn.	1
2047	Point Item - Stem	290	3.48	Hawthorn, Twin-stemmed.	2
2048	Point Item - Stem	120	1.44	Hawthorn.	1
2049	Point Item - Stem	270	3.24	Hawthorn, Multi-stemmed.	1
2050	Point Item - Stem	240	2.88	Hawthorn.	1
2051	Point Item - Stem	120	1.44	Hawthorn.	1
2052	Point Item - Stem	220	2.64	Hawthorn.	2
2053	Point Item - Stem	140	1.68	Hawthorn.	1
2054	Point Item - Stem	370	4.44	Hawthorn, Twin-stemmed.	3
2055	Point Item - Stem	210	2.52	Hawthorn, Twin-stemmed.	2
2056	Point Item - Stem	200	2.4	Hawthorn.	2
2057	Point Item - Stem	230	2.76	Hawthorn.	2
2058	Point Item - Stem	170	2.04	Willow.	1
2059	Point Item - Stem	160	1.92	Hawthorn.	1
2060	Point Item - Stem	200	2.4	Hawthorn.	1
2061	Point Item - Stem	350	4.2	Hawthorn.	1
2062	Point Item - Stem	400	4.8	Hawthorn, Twin-stemmed.	1
2063	Point Item - Stem	340	4.08	Willow.	1
2064	Point Item - Stem	680	8.16	Willow, Multi-stemmed. Partially collapsed.	2
2065	Point Item - Stem	520	6.24	Willow, Twin-stemmed. Partially collapsed.	1
2066	Point Item - Stem	290	3.48	Hawthorn, Not on TOPO.	1
2067	Point Item - Stem	340	4.08	Hawthorn, Multi-stemmed.	1
2068	Point Item - Stem	490	5.88	Ash, Multi-stemmed.	1
2069	Point Item - Stem	550	6.6	Hawthorn, Multi-stemmed. Ivy clad.	1
2070	Point Item - Stem	250	3	Hawthorn, Multi-stemmed.	2
2071	Point Item - Stem	520	6.24	Willow.	1
2072	Point Item - Stem	380	4.56	Willow, Twin-stemmed. Partially collapsed.	1
2073	Point Item - Stem	350	4.2	Hawthorn, Multi-stemmed.	1
2074	Point Item - Stem	210	2.52	Hawthorn.	2
2075	Point Item - Stem	350	4.2	Hawthorn, Multi-stemmed.	3
2076	Point Item - Stem	270	3.24	Hawthorn.	2
2077	Point Item - Stem	400	4.8	Hawthorn, Multi-stemmed.	4
2078	Point Item - Stem	410	4.92	Hawthorn, Multi-stemmed.	4
2079	Point Item - Stem	140	1.68	Hawthorn.	1
2080	Point Item - Stem	210	2.52	Hawthorn.	2
2081	Point Item - Stem	230	2.76	Hawthorn.	2
2082	Point Item - Stem	310	3.72	Hawthorn, Twin-stemmed.	2
2083	Point Item - Stem	240	2.88	Hawthorn.	3
2084	Point Item - Stem	120	1.44	Hawthorn, Not on TOPO.	1
2085	Point Item - Stem	240	2.88	Hawthorn, Multi-stemmed.	2
2086	Point Item - Stem	240	2.88	Willow.	2
2087	Point Item - Stem	340	4.08	Willow.	3
2088	Point Item - Stem	120	1.44	Hawthorn, Not on TOPO.	1
2089	Point Item - Stem	340	4.08	Willow, Multi-stemmed. Partially collapsed.	3
2090	Point Item - Stem	380	4.56	Hawthorn.	3
2091	Point Item - Stem	250	3	Hawthorn, Multi-stemmed. Not on TOPO.	2
2092	Point Item - Stem	210	2.52	Hawthorn, Multi-stemmed. Not on TOPO.	2
2093	Point Item - Stem	230	2.76	Hawthorn, Multi-stemmed. Not on TOPO.	2
2094	Point Item - Stem	230	2.76	Hawthorn, Multi-stemmed. Not on TOPO.	2
2095	Point Item - Stem	510	6.12	Willow, Multi-stemmed.	5
2096	Point Item - Stem	220	2.64	Hawthorn.	2
2097	Point Item - Stem	370	4.44	Hawthorn, Multi-stemmed. Not on TOPO.	3
2098	Point Item - Stem	460	5.52	Hawthorn, Multi-stemmed. Not on TOPO.	4
2099	Point Item - Stem	190	2.28	Hawthorn, Not on TOPO.	1
2100	Point Item - Stem	230	2.76	Hawthorn, Twin-stemmed. Not on TOPO.	2
2101	Point Item - Stem	230	2.76	Hawthorn, Multi-stemmed. Not on TOPO.	2
2102	Point Item - Stem	180	2.16	Willow, Not plotted on TOPO.	1
2103	Point Item - Stem	140	1.68	Hawthorn, Not on TOPO.	1
2104	Point Item - Stem	250	3	Hawthorn, Multi-stemmed. Not on TOPO.	2
2105	Point Item - Stem	210	2.52	Hawthorn, Not on TOPO.	2
2106	Point Item - Stem	210	2.52	Hawthorn, Multi-stemmed. Not on TOPO.	2
2107	Point Item - Stem	150	1.8	Hawthorn, Not on TOPO.	1
2108	Point Item - Stem	230	2.76	Hawthorn, Not on TOPO.	2
2109	Point Item - Stem	130	1.56	Hawthorn, Not on TOPO.	1
2110	Point Item - Stem	240	2.88	Hawthorn, Multi-stemmed. Not on TOPO.	2
2111	Point Item - Stem	470	5.64	Hawthorn, Multi-stemmed. Not on TOPO.	4
2112	Point Item - Stem	140	1.68	Hawthorn, Not on TOPO.	1
2113	Point Item - Stem	220	2.64	Ash, Not plotted on TOPO.	2
2114	Point Item - Stem	100	1.2	Hawthorn, Not on TOPO.	1
2115	Point Item - Stem	100	1.2	Hawthorn, Not on TOPO.	1
2116	Point Item - Stem	80	0.96	Hawthorn, Not on TOPO.	0
2117	Point Item - Stem	200	2.4	Hawthorn, Not on TOPO.	2
2118	Point Item - Stem	150	1.8	Hawthorn, Not on TOPO.	1
2119	Point Item - Stem	110	1.32	Hawthorn, Not on TOPO.	1
2120	Point Item - Stem	240	2.88	Hawthorn, Not on TOPO.	2
2121	Point Item - Stem	180	2.16	Hawthorn, Not on TOPO.	1
2122	Point Item - Stem	410	4.92	Willow, Not plotted on TOPO.	4
2123	Point Item - Stem	210	2.52	Hawthorn, Not on TOPO.	2
2124	Point Item - Stem	180	2.16	Hawthorn, Not on TOPO.	1
2125	Point Item - Stem	100	1.2	Hawthorn, Not on TOPO.	1
2126	Point Item - Stem	200	2.4	Hawthorn, Not on TOPO.	2
2127	Point Item - Stem	230	2.76	Hawthorn, Not on TOPO.	2
2128	Point Item - Stem	180	2.16	Hawthorn, Twin-stemmed. Not on TOPO.	1
2129	Point Item - Stem	210	2.52	Hawthorn, Not on TOPO.	2
2130	Point Item - Stem	200	2.4	Hawthorn, Not on TOPO.	2
2131	Point Item - Stem	170	2.04	Hawthorn, Twin-stemmed. Not on TOPO.	1
2132	Point Item - Stem	230	2.76	Hawthorn, Not on TOPO.	2
2133	Point Item - Stem	160	1.92	Hawthorn, Twin-stemmed. Not on TOPO.	1
2134	Point Item - Stem	520	6.24	Hawthorn, Multi-stemmed.	5
2135	Point Item - Stem	160	1.92	Hawthorn, Not on TOPO.	1
2136	Point Item - Stem	490	5.88	Hawthorn, Multi-stemmed. Ivy clad. Crown failure.	4
2137	Point Item - Stem	380	4.56	Hawthorn, Multi-stemmed. Not on TOPO.	3
2138	Point Item - Stem	230	2.76	Hawthorn.	2
2139	Point Item - Stem	260	3.12	Hawthorn, Multi-stemmed.	2
2140	Point Item - Stem	370	4.44	Hawthorn, Multi-stemmed.	3
2141	Point Item - Stem	180	2.16	Hawthorn, Crown failure. Not plotted on TOPO.	1
2142	Point Item - Stem	410	4.92	Hawthorn, Multi-stemmed.	4
2143	Point Item - Stem	340	4.08	Hawthorn, Multi-stemmed. Not on TOPO.	3
2144	Point Item - Stem	260	3.12	Hawthorn, Multi-stemmed. Not on TOPO.	2
2145	Point Item - Stem	330	3.96	Hawthorn, Multi-stemmed. Not on TOPO.	3
2146	Point Item - Stem	190	2.28	Hawthorn, Twin-stemmed. Not on TOPO.	1
2147	Point Item - Stem	250	3	Birch, Not plotted on TOPO.	2
2148	Point Item - Stem	270	3.24	Birch, Twin-stemmed. Not plotted on TOPO.	2
2149	Point Item - Stem	310	3.72	Birch, Not plotted on TOPO.	3
2150	Point Item - Stem	220	2.64	Hawthorn, Multi-stemmed.	2
1004	Oak	370	4.44	Oak.	3
1034	Oak	650	7.8	Oak.	6
1035	Ash	1050	12.6	Ash.	8
Total Replacement Trees					400



TREE PROTECTION STATUS

Hayden's sourced TPO & Conservation Area status from the Local Planning Authority's Online Mapping System on 13/03/2025.

We were informed that:

- No TPO's are present on site
- The site is not located within a conservation area

We would advise it prudent that before any tree work commences, this is checked directly with the Local Planning Authority to confirm that their online mapping system is definitive.

CATEGORY AND DEFINITION

Trees unsuitable for retention	
Category U	Trees in such condition that they cannot realistically be retained as living trees in the current land use for longer than 10 years
Trees to be considered for retention	
Category A	Trees of high quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years
Category B	Trees of moderate quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years
Category C	Trees of low quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 10 years, or young trees with a stem diameter below 150mm

NOTE:
Hayden's Arboricultural Consultants were provided with a Topographical Survey but these do not always show the positions of all the trees/features on site. The locations of any additional features have been fixed using GPS. As such the position of the trees/landscape features should not be taken as exact but gives a fair distribution of their locations on site.

LEGEND	
	Existing Tree/Hedge BS 5837:2012 Category A
	Existing Tree/Hedge BS 5837:2012 Category B
	Existing Tree/Hedge BS 5837:2012 Category C
	Line of Root Protection Area (RPA) - calculated following guidelines set in BS 5837:2012
	Additional feature which doesn't meet BS 5837:2012 categorisation but is included for reference
	Dead or Dying Tree
	Existing Tree/Hedge to be removed to allow for development BS 5837:2012 Category B
	Existing Tree/Hedge to be removed to allow for development BS 5837:2012 Category C
	Additional feature which doesn't meet BS 5837:2012 categorisation to be removed for development
	Existing Tree to be removed shown in its original position on the development proposal

22/09/2025 GM Based on 42270_T_UD_REV2.dwg & NCD/MSA-S-X/CDRA-2002-PLA Illustrative Site Plan.dwg

Rev: Date: By: Revision: The position, condition, and dimensions of the trees are based on a site survey undertaken on 03/03/25

"The original of this drawing was produced in colour - a monochrome copy should not be relied upon"

Scale 1:500
0m 10m 20m 30m 40m 50m



5 Moseleys Farm Business Centre
Fornham All Saints,
Bury St Edmunds
Suffolk IP28 6JY
Head Office: 01284 765391
Southern Office: 01722 657423
Email: info@treesurveys.co.uk

Client: Michael Sparks Associates Drawing Title: TS & AIA

Site: Land Adjacent to Southampton Airport, Southampton

Date: 22/09/25 Drawn By: CM Cdl File Ref: CdlProl11976-D-AIA.dwg

Scale: 1:500 (A0) Checked By: NH Drawing No: 11976-D-AIA Rev: -