

Eastleigh Borough Council Tree Preservation Order and Conservation Area Assessment Form

Application Number	T/25/100108
Surveyor	AM
Address	79 HURSLEY ROAD, CHANDLER'S FORD, EASTLEIGH, SO53 2FS
Proposed work	1no. Fir Tree - Remove.
Assessment Date	10 th November 2025
Officer comments	Tree protected as T49 of 58-H, confirmed 30th August 1955. The application tree is a mature Lawson cypress comprising of two main stems from just above ground level, each measuring approx. 40-50cm diameter and overall approx. 20-25m tall (all estimated by eye). Vitality is normal. The tree has been cut back from the utility pole leaving an unsightly roadside gap in foliage which will not recover owing to the way in which most conifers respond to pruning. The tree is sited in the front garden of the property, approx. 4-5m from the nearest corner of the building and immediately adjacent to the highway. It is clearly visible to the public. The road is one of the main roads through Chandlers Ford so the tree is seen by a large number of people each day. The proposal is to fell the tree on the basis that the tree is causing property damage in the form of cracking and difficulties in closing doors. It has also been noted as lifting the driveway, with damage reported as progressing each year. A "General Structural Inspection" report, completed by a Structural Engineer in September 2025 has been supplied. This report provides limited information as to the alleged involvement of the tree and does not demonstrate, on the balance of probabilities, that the tree is contributing to the specified damage. No evidence has been supplied in relation to vegetation, monitoring data, soils, roots or repair proposals. The supplied report states that damage in the form of 1-2mm cracks around the front left-hand doorway and cracks to 1mm around the front right-hand doorway. The front porch has been noted to be in poor condition showing signs of extensive movement and requires complete replacement. Diagonal cracking to 3mm width has also been noted at the front bay windows. The report states that this may have been caused by differential settlement of the shallower bay foundations but raises

	concerns about the potential effect of the tree. The supplied evidence only correlates the damage to the presence of the tree; it does not confirm that the tree has influenced the foundations. The report states that the property may stand on London Clay. This is a bedrock which is known to be shrinkable and is implicated in a large number of subsidence cases. However, the British Geological Society (BGS) mapping (accessed 12th November 2025) indicates that the property stands on the Wittering Formation. This includes layers of clay, some of which may be shrinkable. There are also superficial river deposits of sand and gravel which would not be shrinkable. It should be noted that BGS mapping is not precise but provides a general overview of the likely underlying bedrock at any point. There is also variation across geological layers, sometimes with higher proportions of non-shrinkable components (silt, sand, gravel etc.). Accurate soil analysis can only come from boreholes being sunk on site. Such boreholes would also have been able to give crucial information on foundation depth, the presence of roots, moisture content, soil plasticity. This testing has not taken place. The property is certainly within the <i>zone of influence</i> of the tree. It is likely that had a borehole been sunk at the front of the property, that it would have detected roots. However, the supplied evidence lacks evidence of seasonal movement i.e. the shrinkage/downward movement of soil in the summer (while the tree is actively transpiring) and recovery/upward movement in the winter as the tree becomes dormant. Evidence which would support this form of movement would include a statement regarding the timing of the damage/when it was first noticed (typically noticed first at end of hot, dry summer) and level monitoring showing a pattern of seasonal movement which can only be attributable to the influence of vegetation. No advice has been provided in respect of driveway damage. Whilst damage to the building is acknowledged, there is no evidence to convincingly link this to the influence of the tree. Should the application be refused permission, the Applicant would reserve the right to apply for compensation to cover the cost of the building repairs with the tree remaining in situ. The success of such compensation claims relies on the application and particulars accompanying it to have made the case that the damage was reasonably foreseeable. As the application lacks most of the evidence required on the 1App form, I do not consider that the evidential threshold has been met.
--	---

	The proposed work would remove a sound and healthy amenity tree. This has not been suitably justified. As such, the application should be refused permission.					
Decision	Consent	Refuse	Part consent/ Part refuse	Withdrawn / Invalid	Conservation Area	
					Raise no objection	TPO
			X			
Decision notice	Refuse Permission: The proposed felling would remove a prominent amenity feature from the side of major road through Chandlers Ford. The supporting Engineers Report does not demonstrate, on the balance of probabilities, that the application tree is contributing to building damage. The 1app Guidance Note for Works to Trees (available from the Planning Portal) provides advice as to the range of evidence that would be expected to be supplied as part of a TPO application of this nature.					
Conditions	N/A					
Notes to applicant						
Parish comments	None received.					
Public objection/ support	Support		Objection		Observation	
	0		0		0	
Objection/ support consideration	None received.					