| Ref No. | Name of Individual/ Organisation | Summary of Key Points | GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft) |
|---|---|---|--|
| Haslar Marina a | | | |
| General positive comments | | | |
| 12/22, 100/23, 203/22, 219/26, 225/13, 263/7, 266/21, 268/27, 272/18, 350/34, 248/19 | Local residents, Councillor Raffaelli, Councillor Bateman | Agree with principles identified - Development area is ambitious, but one of the better areas to make use of (203/22) - More detail needed (268/27) - Any redevelopment to this area to encourage business would be a good thing (272/18) - Agree that this is a good potential development site (225/13) - Creating an enhanced all weather pedestrian route between Haslar Bridge and Walpole Park also pedestrian walkways would be welcomed by many (248/19) | Support welcomed. The SPD sets out the overall concept. Any forthcoming developer will need to provide the details of any scheme in accordance with the principles set out in the SPD. These will be subject to further public consultation as part of any planning application. |
| 348/1 | Dean & Reddyhoff Marinas | Wish to ensure the Council continues to support the principle of development at Haslar Marina and more generally support the principle of redevelopment on underused sites. | Support noted. |
| 294/84, 336/63, 342/34 | Gosport, Society, Lee Residents Association, Gosport Heritage Open Days | Supports the objectives set out for this Character Area particularly the emphasis on the need to respect the setting of Bastion No 1and the views across Haslar Lake. | Noted- agree the setting of Bastion No 1 and views across Haslar Lake are important. The SPD sets out principles that aim to achieve this as part of any future development. |
| 24/32, 379/16 | Local residents | There is potential to increase facilities in and around this area for sailing (24/32) Could be extended - it would depend on supply & demand (379/16) | Agree there is certainly scope to boost the marine economy by making provision at this site and setting out the principles in the SPD. |
| 344/16 | Local resident | The marina is more than a tourist attraction with sailors and people visiting the submarine museum. | Agree- the sailing community brings additional revenue into the local economy. The Council believes that more can be done to increase spending in the local economy if the appropriate offer was available (for example retail, food and drink and other attractions). |
| 89/31 | Local resident | What do the yachtsmen need do we really need expansion? | Expansion can assist the local economy at this |

| Ref No. | Name of Individual/ Organisation | Summary of Key Points | GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft) |
|---|--|---|---|
| | | After all we are reducing areas for the boatmen in Mumby Road. | site. |
| Urban area boundary | | | |
| 294/85, 336/63 | Gosport Society, Lee Residents Association | Would support the inclusion of the whole of the area in the urban area boundary - to ensure consistency of any developments in this area and the need to respect the proximity of Haslar Lake. | The Council will review the boundary as part of the forthcoming Local Plan Review. It is considered that marine-uses at the site with access to the water can be considered to be a |
| 348/4 | Dean & Reddyhoff Marinas | The whole site is not currently within the Urban Area Boundary identified in the adopted Local Plan. Dean & Reddyhoff request this is revised as part of the review of the Local Plan to ensure the urban area boundary is extended to include the whole of Haslar Marina site. It is considered that the development of the site can be justified by the specific marine-related uses and associated enabling development. | reasonable exception to the policy due to the specific locational requirements required for such uses- access to the water, proximity to existing marina facilities. Associated enabling development is often more difficult to justify in principle and strong evidence would need to be made available to the Council in order to consider such proposals as 'other material considerations'. The SPD has been amended to provide further guidance on this matter. |
| Retain current position | | | |
| 5/20, 21/22, 28/22, 40/24, 63/32, 65/17, 102/22, 135/17, 197/18, 216/14, 221/22, 253/7, 262/8, 340/34 | Local residents | Should remain as it is Already thriving (340/34) | The marine economy is one of Gosport's key strengths and provides the Borough with a very strong locational advantage over other areas and is one of only the few sectors which Gosport has such a locational advantage. Consequently in a global economy it must therefore build on these strengths, taking opportunities to expand the sector wherever possible whilst respecting the high quality environment that we benefit from. Consequently, the SPD sets out principles for development if the marine sector were to expand on this site together with associated development. |
| 63/33, 251/7 | Local residents | Very attractive you are in a different world when you are walking along the waterfront promenade (63/33) | Agree the waterside path is very special. It is considered that the surface of the path can be |

| Ref No. | Name of Individual/ Organisation | Summary of Key Points | GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft) |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | Adds to the attraction of our special Waterfront.(251/7) | enhanced for users. |
| 23/19 | Local resident | Proposal would result in more boats not going anywhere month after month. | Any expansion to the berths of the marina would be modest due to the limitations of water available here. |
| 20/25 | Local resident | 'Only fit for rich people with too much money who think they can sail- make affordable housing'. | The marine economy is an important element of the Gosport economy providing local jobs and bringing additional money which supports a wider supply chain. The Council believes that this important sector can be expanded to bring additional benefits for local people. |
| 221/22, 262/8, 285/21, 286/16 | Local residents | Do not allow future development as there is limited access only by Haslar Road & a single carriageway bridge Will increase congestion on Haslar Bridge (221/22, 262/8) | It is clear from current experience that most traffic will be arriving from the north rather than via the Haslar Bridge. |
| Type of development | | | |
| 70/32, 291/22 | Local residents | Support following uses: - café opportunities (70/32) - gallery (70/32) - restaurant/bars- which would be supported by weekend sailors (291/22) | Such uses are considered acceptable in the SPD. |
| 304/24 | Local resident | What do the yachtsmen really need? | The marina conducts market research form time to time to ascertain these requirements which assists them in determining what uses will work on the site to serve the needs of visitors. |
| 348/2 | Dean & Reddyhoff Marinas | Supports principle of encouraging the development of marine businesses with the potential for some residential as enabling development. In order to maintain competitive and respond to market trends, the marina must provide modern and up-to-date facilities. | It is considered that marine-uses (such as creating a power boat) at the site with access to the water can be an important element to the local economy. The SPD supports the development of marine activities at the site. As mentioned previously with regard to the urban |
| 348/3 | Dean & Reddyhoff Marinas | Support for residential development. Recent changes in demand see motor boats becoming increasingly popular. Dean & Reddyhoff aim to redevelop and rebrand Haslar | area boundary such uses can be considered to be a reasonable exception to the policy due to the specific locational requirements required for |

| Ref No. | Name of Individual/ Organisation | Summary of Key Points | GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft) |
|----------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | Marina as a specialist power boat hub offering power boat maintenance, storage and associated retail facilities. Residential uses will be required as a method of enabling development which can be used to secure capital for investment in new facilities that will help the marina to remain competitive. The site is within a 10 minute walk of the town centre and the Gosport Ferry and therefore this area is considered a sustainable location for residential development. Dean and Reddyhoff wish to express their support for the principle of residential use on site and note that such uses will be crucial in securing a sustainable future for the marina. | such uses- access to the water, proximity to existing marina facilities. Associated enabling development such as residential is often more difficult to justify in principle and strong evidence would need to be made available to the Council in order to consider such proposals as 'other material considerations'. The principle of residential use on the site will need to be considered further as part of the forthcoming Local Plan Review together with the |
| 349/25 | Local resident | Residential development of the north or south end of the Haslar Marina car park should be permitted to include marina businesses and infrastructure. | position of the urban area boundary itself. The SPD has been amended to provide some further guidance on this issue. |
| 367/15 | Local resident | Haslar Marina is one bright spot but it does not need another restaurant or a new bridge linking what? | The SPD enables the expansion of commercial facilities associated with the marina such as a restaurant. There are no new bridges proposed at the Marina itself. Plan 20 does show a new bridge link between the Millennium Promenade and Bastion No 1 to help facilitate the Gosport Lines Walk. |
| 107/43 | Local resident | Object to proposal for a tall building on Haslar Marina and Gosport Marina Sites as it is unclear what het benefits would be. Without details it is hard to make informed comments. Including vague statements in the SPD without details imply approval and provide an assumed mandate for something that would not be wanted had better details been provided at the outset. | The SPD enables the opportunity for a landmark building to come forward. Detailed designs would have to be prepared as part of the planning applications process. Planning applications are subject to public consultation. |
| Design issues | | | |
| 294/86, 336/65 | Gosport Society, Lee Residents | Concerns about landmark building - concern that height will be out of character with | The entrance to Haslar Lake does offer a prominent location which could include a |

| Ref No. | Name of Individual/ Organisation | Summary of Key Points | GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft) |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|
| | Association | townscape. (294/86) | landmark building. This does not necessarily mean a tall building but a well-designed building appropriate to its context. Amend SPD to include this additional guidance. |
| Development issues | | | |
| 22/18 | Local resident | Development would be affected from flooding at extreme high tides. | Parts of the site are in flood risk areas which will increase over time. Therefore the SPD requires that appropriate measures are taken. Such proposals will need to accord with Policy LP45 of the GBLP. Water compatible uses such as those relating to marine uses are likely to be the most appropriate and will need to incorporate measures which are resilient to flood events. |
| 348/6 | Dean & Reddyhoff Marinas | Point 4 Key Opportunity Site relates to requirement to provide flood defences along Haslar Peninsula. Support in principle provision of flood mitigation measures where required. There is no current requirement for these around Haslar Peninsula. The site consists of commercial and marine uses which are not considered a vulnerable category of development in flood-risk terms. Although future residential development may come forward it is not considered this will be large scale and the site will continue to be employment led. As such new flood defences of this scale would be disproportionate to the proposed development and unjustifiable. Other site specific measures can be put in place to protect any future residences. Such defences are also considered likely to have a detrimental impact on the function and visual appearance of the marina. it is not considered that such defences are required or functional around Haslar Peninsula. It is considered the Council should re-asses the need for flood defences here and consider the removal of this reference from the SPD. | The SPD requires that the appropriate levels of flood defences are provided. This would therefore relate to the type of development being proposed in accordance with Policy LP45 of the GBLP. Consequently residential development would require a higher level of protection than water compatible development due to its vulnerability. The SPD is to be amended to refer to flood mitigation measures as it accepted that for some types of development physical flood defences will not be required. It is considered that if housing were to be proposed at some point in the future it is likely that some form of flood defences may be required to safeguard the site over the next 100 years. The proposed amendment to the wording of the SPD will cover all eventualities. |

| Ref No. | Name of Individual/ Organisation | Summary of Key Points | GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft) |
|---------|----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | It is also proposed to delete the purple, 'flood defence' line as it is accepted that it may not be necessary to construct flood defences along the entirety of this line as other mitigation measures may be more appropriate for certain types of development. The line may therefore be misleading. |
| 348/5 | Dean & Reddyhoff Marinas | Point 1 – Key Opportunity Site – Plan 20 – Although the potential development area is highlighted It would be beneficial if plan 20 clearly showed specific sight lines. There is currently no illustration or accompanying evidence base showing where or why development should be avoided. | Show additional information on the SPD plan. |
| 348/7 | Dean & Reddyhoff Marinas | Point 10 – Key Opportunity Site. Supported this is seen as part of the future enhancement of the Marina which can help to boost tourism and visitors to the site and anchor Haslar Marina as the southern point of the Town Centre. | Agree |
| 115/3 | Local resident | If any development is more than one storey high In the marina car park the view for existing residents will be blocked. - This is one of the most beautiful views in Hampshire - Bought the house three years ago and there was no hint of building in all the searches my lawyers undertook. | Any development would need to be considered in accordance with the policies of the GBLP including design considerations and those relating to residential amenities. Whilst private views are not a planning issue other factors such as overlooking and whether a building is overbearing are considered. Public views will be assessed as these contribute to the overall quality of the townscape. |
| | | | Development at this site would be outside of the urban area boundary as defined by the GBLP and would normally not be permitted unless they are appropriate recreational uses or development essential to the operations of public and other essential services. Consequently it would be necessary to consider whether there are any overriding other material considerations. The |

| Ref No. | Name of Individual/ Organisation | Summary of Key Points | GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft) | |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| | | | justification text of the Local Plan recognises that in certain instances there may be a need to locate outside of the urban area boundary and consequently it would be necessary for the developer to demonstrate the need for the development, the reasons why the development cannot be located within the urban area and why a particular site outside of the urban area boundary has been chosen. | |
| | | | This would need to be demonstrated in this instance. However the Council does believe in this instance marine-related development could be an appropriate type of use outside of the urban area boundary. The sector plays such a crucial element of Gosport's economy and such a justification could be offered in this particular location as such uses need particular locational characteristics (access to water, proximity to marina facilities). It will be necessary for such development to accord to the provisions of other policies in the GBLP such as those relating to nature conservation, residential amenities, design impact on heritage assets and flood risk. | |
| 358/28 | Local resident | More potential benefit from enhancing the marina rather than residential, bearing in mind future Blockhouse proposals. | Agree. Any future development should be focused on marine and marina-related employment. | |
| Proposed pedestrian access routes | | | | |
| 6/10, 70/31, 90/11, 110/9, 288/18, 294/56, 336/64, 248/20 | Meon Ramblers, local residents, Lee Residents | Support creation of all-weather pedestrian route between Haslar Bridge and Walpole Park. - Support proposal to create identifiable Creekside | Support welcomed. Add reference to interpretation and signage in the SPD. | |
| | Association, Gosport Society | walk to connect with the Gosport Lines and Millennium Promenade (294/56) - Support proposals for interpretation boards for | The SPD proposes an extended path which connects to Walpole Park. This will assist in cleaning this area up. | |

| Ref No. | Name of Individual/ Organisation | Summary of Key Points | GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft) |
|---|--|--|--|
| 6/11, 107/44, 203/22, | Meon Ramblers, | historic and natural features along this route (294/56) The area behind Hardy's could be cleaned up and the path extended to the cockle pond (90/11) A walking route following the Gosport Lines welcomed need to retain history of Gosport in all its forms. (248/20) Support pedestrian linkages into the proposed Gosport Lines | |
| 240/16, 261/19 348/9 | Dean & Reddyhoff Marinas | walk. More local signage (240/16) Regarding improvements to linkages through the Town Centre improving the path to link to Haslar Peninsula and extend the Millennium Promenade. It is considered a more legible walkway to the south of the Town Centre through the Haslar Marina site and along Haslar Peninsula will improve and improve access and encourage visitors to the Marina. The improvements of this path including signage is supported. However, reference to the 'all weather' nature of this should be clarified to set out that it relates to the provision of all-weather pathway and not that a cover or shelter would be required. | Welcome support for this route, clarify phrase 'all weather' as meaning an all-weather surface rather than a covered walkway. |
| Car park 59/8, 112/30, 115/2, 132/37, 378/6 | Local residents | Objection (378/6) concerns (59/8, 112/30, 115,2, 261/19) to development of marina car park with more buildings which themselves will require additional parking and consequently be less available for current marina users and businesses - Marina uses and businesses need large car park (112/30). - Less would discourage people from using this marina where will all the cars be relocated to? (115/2) - One of the reasons the marinas' success is it has adequate parking for its 600 berths and its on-site businesses. At peak times the car park is full where | Any proposals for the marina car park will need to ensure that appropriate provision to serve the site is maintained. This is highlighted in the SPD. It is also clear that this is also a very high priority from the marina itself who recognise that parking provision is one of the strengths of this marina. The operators of the marina will need to consider how the space is utilised effectively for its customers including how future events are accommodated. |

| Ref No. | Name of Individual/ Organisation | Summary of Key Points | GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft) |
|-------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | will the marina users park if there is no space? (378/6) The open space is an asset to the area and provides space for boat jumbles, marina shows and other events (378/6) Access restricted to Hardy's parking for the restaurant can be a problem (59/8, 261/19). The area is needed for car parking for the berth holders (132/37). | |
| 256/24 | Local resident | Haslar Marina Car park is under-utilised- could be used for housing. | It is recognised form the Council's own car parking surveys that the 'pay and display' car park within the Marina site is significantly underutilised. This gives the marina potential scope to re-organise the site to allow additional marine employment. For reasons highlighted above the principle of residential uses may be more difficult to demonstrate and if any proposals were forthcoming a compelling case would need to be put forward which demonstrated that this was a form of enabling development and should be considered as a 'other material consideration.' |
| Pontoons 90/8 | Local resident | Opening up the pontoons at Haslar marina would be | Agree the Council will continue to pureue this |
| 90/0 | Local resident | beneficial to both the public and the lighthouse café. | Agree the Council will continue to pursue this objective. |
| Management issues | | | |
| 22/19 | Local resident | 'Would they break any agreements as soon as they can as they have with lines hitting masts, trolleys on pontoons at all times of night etc'. Blocking pavements when goods are being delivered for hours at a time. | These are management issues on how the marina operates its business. The Council will intervene if particular conditions as part of any planning conditions or requirements of a legal agreement are not adhered too. The Council also have other powers under non-planning legislation (e.g. Environmental health) which may be applicable. Incidences should be reported to the Borough Council. |

| Ref No. | Name of Individual/ Organisation | Summary of Key Points | GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft) |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|
| Haslar Bridge and Has | slar Lake | | , |
| 344/16 | Local resident | Bridge needs widening. | Due to the costs and environmental considerations there are no proposals to currently widen Haslar Bridge. |
| 68/58 | Gosport Marine Scene | Haslar Bridge gives vehicle access to the Haslar peninsula but it effectively bars seaborne access to an important stretch of water in Haslar Lake. Historically, its predecessors had much higher mid sections that allowed gunboats and sailing boats to pass through at certain tidal states. The creation of a lifting span in Haslar Bridge would open up more use of the water for sailing and use of the waterside even with environmental constraints. | This is acknowledged. There are currently no plans for such a bridge. HCC as the highway authority would need to lead such a proposal and be convinced that a business case exists. |
| 292/6 | Local resident | Turn Haslar Bridge into a swing bridge, dredge Haslar Creek and provide deep water access to the Gunboat Sheds and a new marina in Haslar Creek. This will create employment opportunities and bring further investment into Gosport. | There are currently no plans for such a bridge. HCC as the highway authority would need to lead such a proposal and be convinced that a business case exists. It is also acknowledged that there is scope for the Gunboat Shed to be re-used for employment. It will be necessary as any proposal proceeds to liaise with the MMO and Natural England regarding dredging requirements. |
| Other comments | | | |
| 132/36 | Local resident | There are a couple of errors on the plan: Hardy's omitted from marine related use Residential / retail mixed use area, are there residential properties there? Word residential omitted from red line area. | Amend Plan as follows Amend label to include restaurant use Remove 'residential' for key label and instead name it 'Retained marine related commercial premises with restaurant.' |
| | | | It is considered appropriate to not include the word 'residential' from the 'potential development area outlined in red and this would not be the use we would be advocating but accept that it could come forward as enabling development in order |

| Ref No. | Name of Individual/ Organisation | Summary of Key Points | GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft) |
|---------|--|-----------------------|---|
| | | | to achieve additional marine-led employment. |
| | | | In the regard change label to 'Potential marineled employment area.' |