

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
Gosport Waterfront – Area North of Mumby Road			
<i>Principles of developing this area</i>			
12/16, 99/14, 133/13, 201/19, 219/19, 261/4, 268/22, 258/25, 294/67, 336/48, 342/25, 362/4, 362/17, 365/3, 365/4,248/21	Local residents, Cllr Bateman, Lee Residents Association, Gosport Heritage Open Days, Gosport Society	Broadly agree with principles identified <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Makes use of disused building (261/4) - More detail needed (268/22) [Specific concerns raised by some of these respondents are addressed later in this section]	Support welcomed. The SPD sets out key principles and potential concepts. Detailed proposals would need to be produced on a site-by-site basis. These will be subject to public consultation. A number of respondents supported the general principles but had some particular concerns which are dealt with under each section below.
118/3	Local resident	These areas are what Gosport is about – sea & shipping & businesses associated with these (118/3)	Accept that this area contains important industries associated with Gosport and the SPD is clear that much of the land associated with marine industries should be retained, particularly where there is access to water. Indeed the SPD promotes additional marine industries at the retained Area at RCY. The SPD also highlights some opportunities for other uses.
22/14, 23/16, 45/7, 197/15, 216/8, 221/17, 349/15, 359/7	Local resident	This area does need regenerating <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - does need planning (45/7) - The whole stretch from the Castle Tavern to Aldi and from Aldi to the surgery needs redeveloping (221/17) - The North side of Mumby Road should be redeveloped for mixed uses (further marine related facilities, a hotel and residential development (349/15) - This area has potential for new development, nothing since Aldi (359/7) 	Support for potential development in these areas is welcomed.
5/14, 40/19, 79/2, 80/13, 216/8, 118/4, 2476,	Local resident	Leave this area alone <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - But improve aesthetics (40/19) 	It is proposed that this area will be a mix of retained marine uses with some further

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
252/3, 253/4, 280/1, 340/28,		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nothing wrong with Gosport that good repair, clean & tidy up would not remedy (118/4) - Gosport Waterfront is currently open and welcoming and does not need any more intensive development – particularly high rise – the existing residential tower blocks provide sufficient height and mass (280/1) - This area has already been “transformed” with more building work going on – soon there will be nothing left but concrete tower blocks wherever you look in Gosport (340/28) 	residential development and mixed uses. This would be at a scale to suit their particular location.
203/2	Local resident	Overdevelopment would destroy the atmosphere of the waterfront and restrict access –Rope Quays for example	<p>Agree that over-development would detract from the character of the area.</p> <p>The SPD promotes access along the waterfront. There is an area available for public usage along the waterfront at Rope Quays which will be opened once the access is secured at either end. Policy LP37 of the GBLP secures public access to the waterfront as and when opportunities arise.</p>
57/37	Local resident	The waterfront should not be overcrowded with new building.	There is only a limited opportunity for tall buildings on the waterfront.
<i>Residential development</i>			
34/11, 260/14, 349/15	Local resident	<p><i>Agree with residential in this location</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>As part of mixed use development</i> to reflect the existing high rise properties (349/15) - New homes along Mumby Road are a good idea. Infrastructure required (34/11) 	Residential will form one element of uses in this area together with predominantly marine employment uses. Any infrastructure required will be secured through the provisions in the GBLP.
20/19,48/10,70/7, 102/16, 350/26	Local residents	<p>No more housing (48/10,70/7) flats (20/19) in this area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No residential on Mumby Road as it is a busy road not suited to residential 	The Council considers that there is scope for some additional residential development in this area whilst maintaining important waterside marine employment sites. The dwellings will help meet Gosport’s housing requirements as set out in the GBLP. Mumby Road has scope to take additional traffic although it is recognised that any

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
			proposal will need to meet HCC requirements regarding access and highway safety, which would be considered as part of any detailed planning application.
240/4, 240/10	Local resident	If housing is added to the Waterfront it needs to be good quality and not just the usual poor quality housing used so much these days.	Agree that new dwellings would need to be of a good standard. The principles in the SPD set out some key development principles and any proposal will be determined in accordance with the policies in the GBLP and the Design SPD.
28/13	Local resident	Needs fewer exclusive OAP flats.	OAP developments will form part of the overall mix in the town centre generating new investment and footfall in the vicinity. It is important that this forms just part of a wider mix of housing both in the town centre area and across the Borough as a whole.
68/32	Gosport Marine Scene	<i>Inevitably developers will wish to extract maximum value from investments by building to the edge of sites and building as high as possible. The new McCarthy and Stone development beside Gosport Boatyard exemplifies the oppressive results. By producing a clear plan with wide public support and asserting its intentions forcefully and publicly, even without formal powers to prevent cavalier use of space and skylines, GBC can resist unwelcome development.</i>	The SPD sets out design principles for new residential development and aims to protect important waterfront sites for marine employment.
72/9, 80/1, 110/10, 112/22, 336/49	Local resident, Lee Residents Association	Tower block would be inappropriate for this location. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wind effect around the tower (72/9) - Access to views of the waterfront (72/9) - Four high rise blocks on the boatyard parking storage area will block view of the harbour from flats in Wise Court(110/10) - No very tall buildings- we are not New York(112/22) - A policy similar to the Marine Parade Special Character area one should be implemented. (336/48) 	It is recognised that there are only a limited number of sites which could accommodate taller buildings on the waterfront. Each building will need to be assessed against the design criteria set out in Policy LP10 of the GBLP relating to amongst other things design and amenity consideration as well as the design guidance set out in the Design SPD and the specific references to taller building set out in Section A of the Waterfront and Town Centre SPD.

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
			Strategic public views will be a consideration when determining a planning application as it will be important that such buildings do not detract from the townscape.
<i>Marine industries</i>			
33/20, 112/21, 203/17, 349/15, 355/21	Local resident	<p>The continuation of important marine industries is important</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Retain and enhance the marine Industry along the waterfront (355/21) - could be threatened by residential development nearby (33/20). - Inherent noise being incompatible with quiet residential use (33/20). - Need to ensure marine firms have space to extend their activities (112/21) - All marine employment should be retained (203/17) - The North side of Mumby Road should be redeveloped for mixed uses (further marine related facilities, a hotel and residential development (349/15) 	<p>The SPD tries to find a balance between ensuring existing marine employment sites are retained and where possible additional ones developed (such as the Retained Area at SPD and opportunities at Haslar Marina) and enabling some sites without access to the water to be developed for residential uses to meet the Council's overall housing requirements.</p> <p>Agree that there can be issues created by residential development in close proximity to marine uses and it is proposed to amend the SPD to ensure that residential development in such locations incorporate high standards of noise insulation. This would provide more explicit guidance relating to this issue and is compatible with the requirements of Policy LP46 (points 2 and 3).</p>
133/15	Local resident	Retain slipway and create car park for people using it.	The slipway will be retained as set out in the SPD. There are currently no opportunities to create a car park.
<i>Other uses</i>			
34/21, 109/15, 255/16	Local resident	Potential for restaurants and bars in this area	Acknowledged that such uses may come forward as part of developments along the waterfront.
349/15	Local resident	The North side of Mumby Road should be redeveloped for mixed uses including a hotel (349/15)	
84/16	Local resident	Swimming pool with dome and interior beaches.	There may be insufficient space for such a facility along this stretch of the waterfront given the need

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
			to retain marine industries. The SPD encourages leisure facilities in the SPD area but does not advocate this particular facility in this location.
109/15	Local resident	Somewhere with a view of the harbour is needed. (109/15)	Views of the harbour can be gained from the waterside path which will be maintained and extended as opportunities arise. Views from a higher vantage point could be secured as part of the Bus Station development and the SPD has been amended to aim to achieve this objective.
<i>Gosport Marina and Endeavour Quay</i>			
68/55	Gosport Marine Scene	There is a view that the current site of Endeavour Quay is too close to the TC, residential buildings and barring the completion of the Millennium Walkway and waterfront access. If Premier Marinas were prepared to make the investment, RCY would be a better site with longer deep water frontage, more space for hauling out and servicing, and separation from residential housing. However, the existing site has strong historical connections, which could be reflected in a museum housing the Camper and Nicholson archive and other yachting heritage exhibits.	<p>The owners of Endeavour Quay have indicated that they wish to remain on the site and this use with its important deep water access and lifting crane is fully supported.</p> <p>It is proposed that the Retained Area at RCY could be used for additional marine employment generation as this site also benefits from deep water access.</p> <p>The point regarding the heritage of Camper and Nicholsons is noted and the SPD will be amended to highlight opportunities to reflect the significant maritime heritage of this site.</p>
132/11	Local resident	Disagree that the Premier Marina has the potential to attract new residential use due to the lack of parking provision for the existing marine services. The parking area also provides for STS defence and other on-site marine businesses. Gosport Marina's parking is currently below what it should be and the possibility of developing residential would use existing spaces which are required already.	As part of any redevelopment there may be scope to increase parking provision on the site including for example the use of undercroft parking. Proposals would need to be considered as a whole-site masterplan approach to provide an understanding of how functions can co-exist and whether there is sufficient parking etc.
67/20, 132/12	Local resident	The entire Premier Marina site should be retained for marine employment - especially given the proposed storage unit	It is proposed that much of the Premier Marina site will be retained for marina related uses but it is considered some of the frontage along Mumby

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		<p>application. (132/12)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If you wish to keep jobs in Gosport leave this alone (67/20) 	<p>Road could be redeveloped for residential. Proposals would need to be considered as a whole-site masterplan to provide an understanding of how the functions can co-exist and whether there is sufficient parking etc.</p>
304/17	Local resident	Where will cars park and boats be over wintered if this area is developed.	<p>The marina and marine related operations are the prime function of the site and this will be retained. Any other proposals such as residential will need to consider the marine operations. Consequently such proposals would need to be considered as a whole-site masterplan to provide an understanding of how the functions can co-exist and whether there is sufficient parking etc.</p>
89/23	Local resident	Where are all the cars going to park and boats wintered if this land is used we will be turning boatmen away not encouraging them to moor on Gosport	
132/13	Local resident	<p>Disagree with a tall building on the waterfront on the Gosport Marina site if it is residential and replaces industrial (STS defence) or marine related uses. Employment is need in the town.</p> <p>Disagree if it blocks the Harbour view from Mumby Road.</p> <p>If it is built adjacent to and in the style of the Quarterdeck this building could include the Boat House restaurant, the nearby portacabin facilities and some residential if there is space to accommodate the required parking.</p>	<p>The STS site is not considered appropriate for a tall building, although a low level residential use may be appropriate for the Mumby Road frontage should the existing business decide to relocate to an alternative site (preferably in the Borough).</p> <p>Public access and views along the harbour frontage will be retained and consequently any buildings on the frontage will not block out the views of the Harbour.</p> <p>It is considered that a tall building on the waterfront adjacent the Quarterdeck may be possible incorporating a mixture of commercial uses on the ground floor. However it is recognised that a landmark building does not necessarily mean a tall building but could also include a well-designed shorter building with particular prominence. These principles are set out in the SPD.</p>
214/6	Local resident	Major weakness of the appearance of the waterfront. Its	The existing working boat yard at Endeavour

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		position adjacent the Ferry and Falkland Gardens is not a welcome sight. - Any proposals that it can be screened off	Quay is major employment asset in the Borough which includes deep water access and a heavy boat lifting crane. The Council fully supports the retention of this facility. The site's history as the Camper and Nicholsons yard is also of significance. It is therefore proposed to provide some form of interpretation at Falkland Gardens for residents and visitors alike to understand what happened at this site and the maritime heritage of the yard. This could also include some form of viewing platform and interpretation.
223/2	Local Resident	Would Camper and Nicholson build/allow a multi-storey car park to be built on their land to serve visitors to Portsmouth and beyond as well as their own customers?	The SPD mentions undercroft parking to serve parts of the development, which may be the most appropriate solution from a design point of view, whilst serving new development. Multi-storey parking is not ruled out as a solution but its overall appearance would need to be considered in accordance with the policies of the GBLP. Any proposals for multi-storey parking at the Gosport Marina would need to be considered in relation to the parking requirements of the existing and future potential users of the site first rather than serving the needs of visitors to Portsmouth.
<i>Mumby Road</i>			
365/4	Local resident	Agree the street frontages on Mumby Road needs improving (365/4).	Support for this idea is welcomed.
358/10	Local resident	Support the provision of tree planting along Mumby Road.	Welcome support.
<i>Rope Quays</i>			
18/15	Local resident	Rope Quays- gated communities create an unfriendly feeling especially in busy areas	Noted. The frontage along Rope Quays will be opened up when the existing path is connected at either end.
101/1, 142/2, 269/1	Local residents/	An alternate route should be proposed for the pedestrian	It is considered appropriate to investigate a route

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
	Managing Agent	route from Rope Quay to RCY retained are to avoid running under Harlequin Court which could suffer from noise and anti-social behaviour. Object to the proposed footpath running under Harlequin Court. Would like to see the route diverted to the shoreline	in this location as originally envisaged. A path has been built on the front of this site with the intention of linking it at both ends as opportunities arise. The detailed routing of any path would need to be considered further. Policy LP37 of the GBLP aims to ensure waterside access is secured wherever opportunities arise.
<i>Clarence Wharf Industrial Estate</i>			
33/9, 67/20132/16, 355/21	Local residents	Retain Clarence Wharf Industrial Estate. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clarence Wharf is a thriving estate and should not be developed for residential. will result in the loss of jobs (33/9) - not clear where the industrial units and uses will be relocated. (33/9) - Who pays the removal costs? - Residential-You're joking! 	It is considered that the Clarence Wharf Industrial Estate would be retained for the time being. However there may be opportunities over the long-term to redevelop this key prominent site in future for residential and employment uses. The waterfront site would be retained for marine uses. It will be necessary to ensure that there is sufficient employment space in the Borough for businesses to relocate if necessary.
349/15	Local resident	The small commercial trading estate to be demolished (349/15) and be developed for a mix of uses (could include residential, hotel and marine related industries (349/15).	It is also recognised that the site may offer opportunities to include marine related uses. Also explicit reference should be mentioned to extend the waterside footpath link to adjoining sites. It is considered necessary to amend the SPD to mention that vehicular access to the waterfront needs to be retained through the site.
<i>Mumby Road Lorry Park</i>			
194/8	MoD/DIO	The SPD proposals for the Mumby Road Car Park/Lorry Park are noted	Noted.
67/20, 132/14, 256/37, 258/32, 358/21	Local residents	The lorry park is very underused and could be redeveloped <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - for residential (67/20, 358/21) - for starter homes (258/32) - Development on this site could work as long as it is done tastefully and takes account of issues 	It is considered that the site is suitable for some form of appropriately designed residential development. Include this site as a separate sub-section and

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		(highlighted in this section). - Lorries could use the long stay car parks overnight as they are generally empty then (358/21).	bullet point existing and additional principles outlined below more explicitly.
294/51	Gosport Society	Concern about the loss of the Mumby Road Car/Lorry Park due to the effect this could have on the adjacent Listed Engineers Mews cottages	The proposal will need to be fairly low in height and orientated in a particular way not to detract from the adjacent Mews, and the amenities of the residents of Rope Quays. The impact on heritage assets including the Engineers Mews cottages will be of particular concern. Amend SPD to specifically highlight this issue.
233/2	Local resident	Concerned about loss of privacy for Rope Quays if flats built on the site.	Alternative lorry parking will need to be found as part of any redevelopment of this site. Options would include existing long stay car parks but could also include other options such as space available in industrial estates elsewhere in the Borough.

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
112/25, 233/1, 219/21, 294/50, 350/20	Local residents, Gosport Society, Cllr Bateman	<p>Concern about the loss of the Mumby Road Car/Lorry Park due to loss of visitor parking:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concerned that the proposal to build on the lorry park will result in loss of visitor parking for the town centre and Rope Quays (233/1) - due the fact that availability of parking in this area is already very limited (due to the acknowledged lack of sufficient public/visitor parking within the developed part of Royal Clarence Yard) (294/50). - the need for parking for the Waterside Medical Centre will need to be considered. No parking on the road and little space at the surgery (112/25) - Proposal ignores that people use free parking at Cooperage Green rather than pay for GBC car parks, also customers of the pharmacy and Waterside Medical Centre will have nowhere to park. - Essential to retain and expand where possible car/lorry parking facilities in the whole area. In confidence that redevelopment in the waterfront/town centre area will result in a greater numbers visiting, staying and enjoying the area (219/21). - 	<p>This car park is significantly under-utilised and offers a very good opportunity to improve the appearance of this importance entrance to the town centre area by enhancing public realm on the corner of Weevil Lane/Mumby Road and providing an attractive low level residential development on the remainder of the site. This would be in scale and need to consider both the low level Royal Engineers development and the tall Rope Quays scheme. Such a proposal would also lessen the impact of the height of the Rope Quays when approaching the Town Centre from the north and west.</p> <p>Car parking surveys has shown that there is ample visitor car parking in the town centre. There are also proposals for more prominent public car parking at the near-by Cooperage area of RCY.</p> <p>It is recognised that parking at the Waterside Medical Centre may be an issue at times. There are 31 spaces at the site with space for dropping off/picking up. Consequently the parking in this area as a whole may need to be considered as part of the Council's forthcoming car parking strategy. Parking arrangements at RCY – Cooperage may assist with this. It may also be necessary for the practice to limit parking bays at the practice for those with particular mobility issues.</p>
95/3, 112/23, 64/28, 64/29, 268/3, 365/4	Local residents	<p>A new location for the lorry park needs to be found before the current one is lost. (95/3) Needed to be retained unless reprovided (268/3) How about Jamaica Place? (95/3)</p>	<p>Agree an alternative lorry parking facility would need to be investigated as part of any redevelopment of this site. This requirement is referenced in the SPD.</p>

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		Where will the lorries go? (112/23)(64/28) Issues with lorries parking in the north of the town (64/29) Very concerned about where the alternative lorry park might be – no plan evident (365/4). Lorry Park to remain with a separate entrance and exit positions it is safe for large vehicles to manoeuvre. (371/27)	It is considered important to relocate the lorry parking from this prominent town centre site which provides opportunities for more intensive forms of development. The site is under-utilised as a lorry parking facility as evidenced by GBC surveys and instead alternative provision can be made available elsewhere in the Borough incorporating the necessary access arrangements.
371/15	Local resident	The Lorry Park to remain where it is. To be correctly re-painted and spaced to hold commercial vehicles who park in Clarence Road. Gosport resident's lorries/ trucks to have parking permits and visitors lorries pay and display. All car parking spaces to be re-painted and made wider and longer to reflect larger modern vehicles	
132/14, 233/3	Local residents	Development will need to takes account of - the Southern Water infrastructure on site - possible sewage facility under the car park	Southern Water have been consulted as part of this SPD and will be consulted as part of any forthcoming planning application
132/15	Local resident	The area could be further improved with cobbled paving and sympathetic furniture and paint jobs outside the Clarence Public House.	The SPD supports townscape improvements in Theme A which requires an action plan of suitable public realm improvements. This suggestion will be added to the Ideas Compendium
<i>Old School House</i>			
294/68	Gosport Society	Welcome proposals to remove unattractive later extensions to the Locally Listed Old School House.	Support welcomed.
67/20	Local business	Old School House) – If you wish to keep jobs in Gosport leave this alone	It is considered that this building could accommodate either commercial or residential given that it is adjacent both commercial and residential uses. The key thing here is to improve the quality of this Locally listed building as part of any development.
<i>'Island Site'</i>			
52/2	Local resident	The Council let Aldi / McCarthy and Stone build on the waterfront and we have lost all that.	No public access to the waterfront has been lost to this development. It could be argued that the quality of the public realm has been improved in this area with new paving and tree planting.

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
233/4	Local resident	Inadequate parking provision provided at McCarthy and Stone site.	It is acknowledged that the parking provision on this site was at a level of less than 1 car per household. The Council's Car Parking SPD allows lower rates of parking if sufficient justification can be made. In this instance the developer highlighted several points including lower rates of car ownership in this ward, the proximity to genuine transport choices (close to the ferry and bus station), the proximity to town centre services and the availability of public car parking.
203/24	Local resident	Corner plot by Aldi on the market, should go up not out.	It is envisaged that the corner plot at the Aldi site will be limited in scale. The current consent is for a 274 sq.m. commercial unit (Classes A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, B1 and D1).
<i>Waterside Medical Centre</i>			
258/22	Local resident	Do not close the Waterside Clinic	This is a very important facility in the Borough and is protected in the Local Plan as a community facility. There are no plans to close this clinic.
<i>Waterfront access</i>			
4/19, 6/7, 18/7, 20/20, 21/16, 29/16, 36/9, 68/54, 70/23, 83/14, 99/13, 113/1, 132/9, 133/16, 136/1, 192/8, 203/17, 210/5, 241/23, 260/13, 266/23, 294/52, 349/15, 336/50, 355/22, 357/23, 362/17	Local residents, Meon Ramblers, Gosport Marine Scene, Lee Residents Association, Gosport Heritage Open Days, Gosport Society	It is important that the waterfront walkway (Millennium Promenade) is maintained and extended. <i>Principle</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Should be opened up for everyone (20/20, 29/16, 70/23) - Should not be blocked-off –just for rich people (20/20) - Easier pedestrian access towards Royal Clarence Yard (83/14, 113/1, 133/16). - Support the harbourside walk/ Millennium Way extension.- would reduce walking time to Ferry from RCY (99/13, 113/1) 	Agree and support for waterfront access is welcomed. The extension of the waterfront access is one of the key principles of the SPD and is referenced in various sections. It complements Policy LP37 of the GBLP which aims to secure waterfront access wherever opportunities arise. Precise routing will be considered as each opportunity arises. It is the Council's intention to extend the

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Linking the Millennium Trail will help the area come alive. (135/12, 192/8) - It would be great to have a walkers access away from the busy road (241/23) - Welcome the proposals for the Millennium Promenade (294/52) to run more closely along the waterfront as originally intended (342/18), and the proposal to create a circular link with the Gosport Lines (294/52, 342/18). - Council needs to work with landowners and developers to ensure that the original vision is realised and the route is as close to the waterside as possible (preferably neither along Mumby Road and Weevil Lane. (294/52) - The redevelopment to include access pathways linking with the new promenade and providing views of the Harbour to the benefit of visitors and the local community(349/15) - The harbourside walkway for pedestrians and cyclists would make Explosion and Priddy's Hard much more attractive to visitors. (136/1) <p><i>Link between Falkland Gardens and Gosport Marina</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support a link between Falklands Gardens and Gosport Marina (4/19,6/7) <p><i>Crewsaver building and boatyard</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Route round Crewsaver should be marked as potential (132/9) - Open it up along the boatyard (362/17) <p><i>In front of Rope Quays</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continuation of the Millennium Walkway along the front of Rope Quays would make it much easier to connect to Royal Clarence Yard 	<p>Millennium Promenade between Falkland Gardens and Royal Clarence Yard and this will be secured in sections when opportunities become available. This is why the SPD takes a long term strategic view highlighting the aspiration at this stage. Consequently certain sections may seem unlikely at this moment in time but may be forthcoming in the future.</p> <p>The section through Endeavour Quay is recognised as a particularly difficult section to secure given that the site is a working boatyard and that the boatyard is very much a use which the Council supports. However through discussions various management options can be explored. It is important that the SPD, as the first stage, highlights this as a long term aspiration.</p> <p>The routing in front of the Crewsaver building was not considered practical for that particular site and the route along Harbour Road through to Gosport Marina will provide an attractive walk. Similarly it may be difficult to open it up through the Gosport Boatyard itself but instead a route is being secured just behind it.</p> <p>A harbourside path has always been intended in front of Rope Quays and indeed a path has been created there which will need to be linked either end as opportunities arise.</p> <p>It is considered that some arrangement at Clarence Wharf industrial Estate could be secured. There may be different short and long-term solutions</p>

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		<i>Clarence Wharf</i> - The route along behind Rope Quay and Clarence Wharf may be difficult to achieve due to need to walk through industrial estate (132/9)	
132/37	Local resident	Route of Millennium promenade around Crewsaver different on separate plans.	Amend Plan 12 to reflect most realistic route around the Crewsaver buildings (to match Plan 21) (as numbered in the consultation draft of the SPD)
132/10	Local resident	The Millennium Promenade is broken between Premier Marina and Harbour Road; it also needs to be maintained.	It is recognised that improved signage and use of the Millennium Promenade paving bricks will need to be added to reinforce the link. Such issues will be considered as part of a public realm audit.
336/25	Lee Residents Association	Welcomed proposals to improve the lighting on the Millennium Promenade.	Noted
<i>Heritage and design</i>			
342/25	Local resident	not in favour of the suggestion that any further tall buildings should be permitted as we believe this could damage the character of the Waterfront and Town and also restrict public views of the Harbour (342/25)	It is considered that there are limited opportunities for taller buildings in this area and each proposal would need to be considered on its merits taking into the character of the area including the proximity to heritage assets, residential amenities and impacts such as overshadowing and overbearing. The SPD recognises that there may be an opportunity within the Gosport Marina site but otherwise opportunities for tall buildings are limited on the this stretch. It is also recognised that the suggested landmark building in the Gosport Marina site could be a lower building but have a presence through its detailed design. This option is identified in the SPD.
294/46	Gosport Society	<i>Concern about additional housing on the waterfront and suggestions that this could include any more tall buildings. Any development should be low-rise and in keeping with the height of the buildings in the Town core (294/46)</i>	
365/3	Local resident	A landmark <u>lower</u> building is a good idea subject to no loss of light and sunshine. (365/3)	
24/28	Local resident	Consider the restoration of Clarence Square	
			This could be considered in the future should the opportunity arise.

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
24/29	Local resident	Need to avoid cheap looking architecture (such as the McCarthy and Stone building which looks dated and utilitarian)	Materials will be considered as part of each individual planning application.
237/17	Local resident	Promote Fort Charles	Agree- amend SPD to mention this point
<i>Transport and Traffic management</i>			
364/4	Local resident	Suggest some form of traffic calming or realignment of the road in the area from the pedestrian crossing to the Castle Tavern which is virtually a blind bend and is often taken at excessive speeds for the visibility and prevailing conditions	The issue of road safety at the Southern end of Mumby Road currently being considered by HCC.
299/11	HCC Strategic Transport	Insert improved cycle routes.	Agree that this needs to be considered. Amend SPD accordingly
<i>Nature</i>			
57/26, 95/4	Local resident	Mudflats close to the Gosport Ferry are used by birds and should be retained - and is currently a dumping ground for unwanted things (57/26).	Noted. The SPD does not propose any particular schemes for this area.
19/5	Local resident	The area should include flowers, trees and benches	Theme A includes a section which encourages public realm improvements which need to be considered as part of a detailed action plan.
<i>Flood management</i>			
71/6	Local resident	Need to ensure area is protected from flooding	Agreed and the SPD aims to secure this, as does the policies of the SPD.