

Application Site: Padnell Grange, Waterloooville, PO8 8ED

Proposal: Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 90 dwellings with associated works

Arboricultural Report: MW.2512.PGW.AIA by Mark Welby Consulting Arborists dated 31 March 2026

Principal Arboriculturist Consultation Response - Objection

Having reviewed the submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan, whilst it is to a high standard I raise an objection to the development proposal on arboricultural grounds.

Whilst efforts have been made to retain many of the site's higher quality trees, the submitted information does not satisfactorily demonstrate that the development can be delivered without unacceptable impacts to protected trees, veteran tree interests and the site's long-term arboricultural value.

Protected Tree Losses

The proposal includes the removal of several TPO-protected trees, including T111, T138, T143, T169 and T171, together with a number of Category B Oaks. The justification provided for the loss of T169 and T171 is to facilitate service installation; however, insufficient evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that alternative service routes or trenchless construction methods have been fully explored.

The loss of mature, protected Oaks for service provision has not been adequately justified and is contrary to the principles of BS5837, which seeks the retention of trees wherever practicable.

Encroachment into RPAs

The report acknowledges incursions into Root Protection Areas and relies on modified protection fencing to compensate for these losses. However, no site-specific evidence, such as root investigations or technical justification, has been provided to demonstrate that these encroachments will not adversely affect retained trees. As a result, the likely impacts remain uncertain.

Veteran Tree Impacts

The report identifies Hawthorn T103 as a veteran tree listed on the Ancient Tree Inventory, yet a no-dig footpath is proposed within its buffer area. Whilst no-dig construction is preferable, insufficient information has been provided regarding impacts to the veteran tree's rooting environment or to demonstrate that the buffer could not be avoided altogether.

Given the importance of veteran trees and the requirement to protect both the tree and its surrounding habitat, the submitted assessment is not considered sufficient.

As an identified tree on the ATI – it does require this level of protection.

Play Area Within RPAs

The proposed play equipment within the RPAs of retained mature Oaks raises concerns regarding long-term impacts from increased footfall, soil compaction, maintenance activities and future pressure for pruning or removal. No assessment has been provided to demonstrate that these indirect impacts have been properly considered.

Future Pressure on Retained Trees

A number of dwellings and amenity spaces are proposed near retained mature trees. I am not satisfied that sufficient account has been taken of future pressures arising from shading, branch overhang, leaf litter and perceived safety concerns. This relationship is likely to generate future requests for pruning or removal, potentially undermining the long-term retention of the site's tree cover.

T111 - Potential Veteran Tree

I also have significant concerns regarding the proposed removal of T111, a TPO-protected Oak currently categorised as a Category U tree. Whilst the tree may be in decline, no detailed assessment has been provided of its potential veteran characteristics or habitat value. Trees in decline frequently possess features of high ecological and arboricultural importance, and Category U status alone does not justify removal.

Given the age, habitat features and protected status of the tree, I consider that a specialist veteran tree assessment is required before its removal can be properly considered. Until such information is provided.

Conclusion

The proposal would result in the loss of several protected trees, including TPO and Category B Oaks, without sufficient evidence that these losses are unavoidable. Concerns also remain regarding RPA encroachment, impacts to veteran tree interests, future pressure on retained trees and the proposed removal of T111.

For these reasons, I recommend that the council objects to the application and seeks amended proposals of lower density unit numbers on site that compliment the tree stock rather than compete with it.

Best wishes

Jamie Gargett FICFor
Principal Arboriculturist