

Daedalus Supplementary Planning Document:

Appendix B: SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Introduction

Gosport Borough Council conducted consultation on the Daedalus SPD: Consultation Draft between 24th January and 4th March 2011, and received 110 representations, of which 77 were from residents and 33 from a range of organisations. This document sets out a summary of comments received together with an officer consideration of each comment together with any proposed changes to the SPD. The comments are set out in the order of the Consultation Draft of the SPD with overarching general comments set out at the beginning and a number of miscellaneous comments set out at the end of the document. The document also contains comments related to the associated Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report.

The original comments are available to view at the Council Offices and the reference number enables the particular comment to be found easily in the original letter/e-mail. The document is available on-line should anyone wished to use the 'find' function to identify specific comments.

Abbreviations used.

CMP	Construction Management Plan	HRA	Habitats Regulations Assessment	RSPB	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
CPO	Compulsory Purchase Order	LDF	Local Development Framework	SEEDA	South East England Development Agency
DE	Defence Estates	LTP	Local Transport Plan	SPD	Supplementary Planning Document
EA	Environment Agency	MCA	Maritime and Coastguard Agency	StAG	Strategic Access to Gosport (study)
GBC	Gosport Borough Council	MoD	Ministry of Defence	TA	Transport Assessment
FBC	Fareham Borough Council	NE	Natural England	TfSH	Transport for South Hampshire
HCC	Hampshire County Council	PUSH	Partnership for Urban South Hampshire		

RESPONSE TABLE: DAEDALUS

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
1. OVERALL COMMENT ON THE SPD			
D1/25/1	Homes and Communities Agency	Supports Gosport Borough Council's approach and objectives. The HRA recognises the significant local and regional importance of the site and welcomes the publication of key enabling policy to bring forward the comprehensive and sustainable regeneration of Daedalus.	Noted.
D2/10/1 D2/14/1 D2/16/5 D2/18/1 D2/43/1 D2/62/1 D2/73/1 D1/11/1 D1/22/1 D1/27/1	Local Residents (7) Defence Heritage Support Group Lee-on-the-Solent Residents' Association Environment Agency	General support for proposals (with additional concerns detailed comments/exceptions elsewhere).	Noted.
D1/4/1	Queen's Harbour Master	The Queen's Harbour Master has no objection to the proposal proceeding.	Noted.
D1/19/1	Natural England	Whilst welcoming the consideration given in the document to a range of sustainable development issues, it is considered that the conservation and enhancement of the natural environment should have a higher profile within the SPD. These should reflect policies CS5,8,11,20 and 21 in the Core Strategy: Preferred Options.	These issues are addressed to specific Natural England comments later in document.
D1/35/6	Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	The Daedalus SPD is premature without the findings of a full Habitat Regulations Assessment being taken into account. Until such time as this completed and the findings taken into account the SPD should be withdrawn.	An Appropriate Assessment has been undertaken to accompany the proposed final version of the Daedalus SPD. This stage of the HRA has been undertaken at a level of detail which is appropriate

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		A further public consultation on the SPD should take place once it has been revised in the light of a full HRA.	for a guidance document given the level of certainty relating to the eventual scale and type of proposals at this stage. This Appropriate Assessment takes into account comments received at the Screening Stage/Consultation Draft stage. No further consultation is considered necessary particularly as the SPD itself provides a broad framework rather than detailed proposals. Such detailed matters would need to be subject to a project level Appropriate Assessment at the planning application stage. Instead the Appropriate Assessment accompanying the SPD identifies potential impacts, how these can be avoided and/or mitigated and what control measures may be required at the detailed planning application stage.
D1/1/1	Advanced Marine Innovation Technology Subsea Ltd	The SPD will not achieve a pleasant effective place to live and work. It would obliterate the ecology of the area and produce a result a very long way below what could be achieved.	The SPD is a framework to consider future applications not a proposal in its own right. It is up to a developer to come forward with proposals and these will be considered against the elements detailed in the SPD. The development considerations section (Section 5) aims to ensure that due regard is given to make Daedalus a pleasant and effective place to work including ecological issues.
D1/1/4	Advanced Marine Innovation Technology Subsea Ltd	Some of the sustainability requirements are politically correct but would never achieve any real effect. This approach will result in the opportunities for real solid results being bypassed.	Securing sustainability benefits is a key function of the planning system. It is clear that we are currently using the world's resources at a rate that cannot be sustained with serious consequences for the health and well-being of future generations. Achieving local sustainability benefits is not only positive to the health of local residents; it can also ensure a development is less dependent on increasingly

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
			expensive fossil fuels. There are also business opportunities in this sector.
D2/20/1	Local Resident	Glad to see that the SPD has used much of the work undertaken by SEEDA.	Noted.
D2/39/1	Local Resident	Have seen many refinements to the Daedalus plans over the years. This current one appears to be an acceptable compromise.	Noted.
D2/441	Local Resident	Surprised GBC is making such radical plans for Stubbington and Hill Head considering residents pay their Council Tax to Fareham Borough Council (FBC) and yet will be the most affected by some of the proposals.	GBC has been working with FBC to ensure comprehensive development of the site. The SPD reflects the policies set out in the submission version of FBC's Core Strategy but only provides guidance for the area within Gosport Borough.
D2/57/7	Local Resident	Whilst transport improvements are difficult to achieve there is a great opportunity for Gosport, Fareham and Hampshire Councils to do the right thing and find a long-term and sustainable solution to the infrastructure issues that exist.	HCC recently completed the Strategic Access to Gosport (StAG) Study which assesses long term transport issues to the Peninsula. The two Borough Councils will work with HCC to help implement the findings of this report.
Cross boundary working			
D1/25/1	Homes and Communities Agency	The boundary between Gosport and Fareham Boroughs is a potential challenge to bring the site forward. Has a joint approach been considered and is there any potential for amalgamating the proposed SPDs into one clear and comprehensive policy document?	There has been close liaison between the two authorities but for a variety of reasons a joint SPD will not be produced.
D2/45/7	Local Resident	Why has the SPD not been jointly produced by Fareham and Gosport Borough Council's. There is a real risk of Fareham and Gosport following divergent paths.	
D1/23/1	Highways Agency	It is important that Gosport Borough and Fareham Borough Councils work together to consider the transport (private car and public transport) implications of the Daedalus site as a whole prior to the adoption of the SPDs	Agree
D2/43/1	Local Resident	Would have been useful to see more detailed proposals for the Fareham area.	The most detailed policy requirements for the Daedalus site within FBC area are included within

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
			FBC's Core Strategy (Submission version) which is reflected in the SPD.
D2/45/11	Local Resident	Are we being asked to comment on the whole Daedalus site or only on the Gosport Borough part? The summary leaflet states that the SPD provides a planning framework for the Gosport part of the site but then includes a Draft Masterplan for the whole site. A joint document should have been prepared.	The Borough Council is asking for comments on the Gosport SPD which covers the Gosport part of the site. A whole-site Plan has been included to inform residents and businesses and demonstrates that the entire site has been considered together. The Plan provides the context for the Gosport part of the site. Whilst there is considerable merit in preparing a joint SPD for the site due to various constraints, Gosport Borough Council wanted to put in place a framework for the site prior to the determination of future planning applications. This would help guide developers and provide the local community with information of how the Borough Council will consider development issues arising from the site.
2. WHOLE SITE PLAN (1) AND PLAN FOR THE GOSPORT PART OF THE SITE (2)			
D2/26/1	Local Resident	Plan 1 and 2: It not obvious where the leisure is- i.e. no pink	Leisure is shown in the Hangars area – denotation revised
D1/32/1	SEEDA	Plan 1: This plan should be limited to identifying existing site constraints and overall areas of development. The identification of suggested land uses within the Waterfront area is too prescriptive. GBC should ensure the proposed floorspace quoted in the plan is consistent with GBC's and FBC's respective Core Strategies. Figures should be quoted on a maximum gross basis.	The plans are indicative to give developers guidance on the Council's priorities. The key has been amended to highlight the indicative nature of the land uses with a link to the relevant paragraphs in the text. The figures quoted are consistent with the emerging Gosport Core Strategy and Fareham Borough Council's Core Strategy Pre-Submission version. Figures quoted are gross figures.
D1/32/3	SEEDA	Plan 2 should be deleted (see comments D1/32/1)	
D1/18/2	Defence Estates	SPD suggests if the Married Quarters are not required it	The Borough Council does not wish to be overly

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		might be appropriate to consider employment on the northern part with residential on the southern part. Plans 1, 2 and 6 show employment use across the whole vacant MoD site.	prescriptive on the extent of residential and employment for this area and consequently shows the potential for both uses across the area.
D1/18/4	Defence Estates	Allocation of the MoD land for development of the Married Quarters is supported on Plan 1, 2 and 6 .	The label on the plan 'Potential MoD Married Quarters' has been removed in the light of the Council's decision to refuse a renewal of outline consent due to the lack of justification. Instead the Council's support for Married Quarters should there be a demonstrated need is highlighted in the relevant text of the SPD.
D1/18/5	Defence Estates	Allocation of the MoD land for employment is not supported on Plan 1, 2 and 6 .	The Borough Council considers that this part of the site is suitable for some employment as shown in the original Development Strategy (1997) agreed with Defence Estates.
3. VISION			
D1/19/4 D1/27/9	Natural England Environment Agency	Agencies advocate inclusion of a specific reference to the protection and enhancement of the coastal natural environment. [text supplied by NE]. Given its waterfront location the vision should be more visionary and endeavour to incorporate, protect and enhance the positive aspects associated with a waterfront location.	Amend to include short statement relating to the waterfront location. Originally a Vision including all aspects of the Daedalus site was considered but this became unwieldy and diluted the key messages. NE text is too detailed for a Vision but some text has been included elsewhere in the document.
D1/6/6	Lee Business Association Representative	The future development of Daedalus is seen as a huge opportunity not just for Lee but for all in Gosport.	Noted.
D1/16/1	Hovercraft Museum	Support the vision of mixed use and conservation particularly the emphasis on employment based upon aviation and maritime industries.	Noted.
D1/24/3	The Provincial Society	Agree with Vision statement in that development is prestigious which will be an identifiable place in its own	Noted.

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		right. and well related to, and benefitting the wider community'	
D2/45/3	Local Resident	The Vision is written with definitive 'wills' but the quantum and mix of developments is written with 'could' and 'mays' This gives the impression they are being asked to agree to anything and that developers will given undue flexibility to vary their proposals in the long term.	The SPD provides a framework for the Council to make decisions and needs to include an element of flexibility as it is impossible to cover every eventuality. This flexibility is provided in a framework so developers and the local community can have some certainty of what elements are not acceptable or are undesirable.
D2/45/12	Local Resident	The Vision makes no reference to the possibility of substantially more residential development.	The Vision has been written to reflect the key aspirations for the site. Whilst residential development is an important and necessary part of the site, the Council wishes to emphasise the employment potential of the site as part of a mixed use scheme.
D2/76/1	Local Resident	Vision is 'pie in the sky'. To say that the site will be 'prestigious' and 'identifiable' is laughable particularly as Gosport is on a peninsula with traffic congestion problems.	The Vision sets out the overall ambitions for the Daedalus site as perceived by the Borough Council. Whilst it is acknowledged that certain aspects will be challenging it would be wrong for the local authority to downplay the opportunities for the site. The detailed risks and opportunities of the site are set out elsewhere in the SPD.
4. INTRODUCTION:			
Purpose and Status of SPD			
D1/32/3	SEEDA	Para 1.2 SEEDA welcomes GBC's clear statement that 'sufficient flexibility' needs to be provided when setting the scale and mix of future proposals for the site in order to 'address changing market demands'.	Noted.
D1/32/45	SEEDA	Concern that parts of the SPD are unreasonably prescriptive at this early stage- for example preference to residential in Conservation Area. These limitations stymie creative design and artificially limit the opportunity for	The SPD aims to provide guidance to developers on what it considers the most appropriate uses on the site and where these should be located. The Plans themselves are illustrative and it is clear from the

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		<p>developers to come forward with alternative, imaginative and viable uses for buildings for areas of the site which may otherwise be in keeping with the overall vision of Daedalus.</p>	<p>SPD that alternative proposals will be considered. It is not accepted that the SPD itself stymies creative design or limits opportunities. To the contrary it provides developers flexibility to explore solutions to deliver a comprehensive redevelopment of the site.</p> <p>However it is accepted that the illustrative nature of the plans could be made clearer on the plans themselves.</p>
D2/20/2	Local Resident	<p>Para 1.2: What does the phrase 'significant certainty' mean?</p>	<p>The phrase 'significant certainty' tries to convey that the SPD will provide as much certainty that a local supplementary planning document can give in the context that the local authority will ultimately determine future planning applications and will use the SPD as a key material consideration. It will also have to consider any other material considerations.</p>
D2/45/14	Local Resident	<p>Para 1.2: 'The SPD will be used by the Borough Council as a key consideration...' implies that the document will have limited importance and relevance in influencing the final outcome. Government Inspectors determining residential appeals may take this view.</p>	<p>The SPD is an important consideration which supplements the adopted development plan for the area. This is currently the saved policies of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review (adopted 2006). This will eventually be superseded by an adopted Core Strategy. The Council's approach has been set out in an earlier consultation version of the Core Strategy 'Preferred Options' which has also helped shape the SPD. The Inspectors will view residential appeals within this planning framework.</p>
D2/45/13	Local Resident	<p>'In providing sufficient flexibility to be able to address changing market demands' the document allows for the possibility of wholesale residential development exceeding existing housing targets for Gosport and Lee.</p>	<p>The SPD makes it clear that it envisages that housing on the site will be within the Local Plan Review allocation (i.e. a total of 500). However in order to achieve its key objectives (employment and heritage) there may be circumstances where additional housing is required. The exceptional</p>

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
			circumstances for this will need to be clearly demonstrated. A wholesale residential development on the site does not accord with the Council's vision or objectives.
D2/45/16	Local Resident	Para 1.4 omits to state that the SPD for Fareham will be prepared by Fareham Borough Council. Concern that they will develop housing on their part of the site.	FBC's Core Strategy makes it clear its intention to maintain the strategic gap with no proposals for housing for any part of Daedalus within its boundary.
D1/27/10	Environment Agency	Support principle of ongoing consultation with potential developers and other key stakeholders. Consultation with the EA is encouraged in relation to forthcoming planning applications.	Noted.
D2/45/17	Local Resident	Para 1.5 states that the SPD is 'not intended as the end of the design process and GBC is committed to ongoing consultation with developers'. This paves the way for ceaseless change reducing the relevance of the document. Will the public be consulted on major deviations as they have at this stage?	The SPD is a framework for making decisions, deviations from the adopted document will need to be justified and these would be reported in a Board Report. The public will be consulted as part of the planning application and there is increasing onus in forthcoming legislation for developers to undertake pre-application consultation.
Progress so Far			
D1/32/4	SEEDA	Para 1.6-' <i>The SPD has been prepared by Gosport Borough Council with support for its preparation by from SEEDA</i> '	Amend paragraph to reflect the consultation process. Delete reference to SEEDA as they do not necessarily support the SPD.
D2/45/18	Local Resident	Para 1.7- Will the 'overarching document' for the whole site continue to be relevant following SEEDA's demise?	Yes- SEEDA's Vision Statement has informed the planning policy framework for both Boroughs'. It has no status in its own right.
D2/45/19	Local Resident	Para 1.9 – More than close liaison with FBC is necessary. They control better access to the airfield from Peel Common Roundabout increasing the possibility of residential development serviced there from.	GBC has a strong working relationship with GBC regarding the Daedalus site. FBC have no intention to develop Daedalus for residential development. The ambitions for the Fareham part of the site are reflected in their Core Strategy and as such are

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
			reflected in the whole site plan in the SPD.
D1/18/7	Defence Estates	Para 1.8 states that the Policy and Organisation Board considered that residential development should accord with the Local Plan allocation or as may be indicated in the LDF. The proposed Married Quarters meet those criteria.	Noted.
5. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS			
History of Daedalus			
D1/9/2	Hovercraft Society	The site's links to the history of hovercraft should be acknowledged.	Add short additional reference.
D1/2/1	Maritime and Coastguard Agency	The SPD should refer to the MCA's facility on the site as 'MCA's Search and Rescue (SAR) Helicopter Unit' <u>not</u> 'MCA Headquarters'.	Amend all references in the SPD accordingly including 2.9, 3.2.3.
Site assessment			
D1/32/5	SEEDA	Paras 2.11-2.15 SEEDA have more up-to-date floorspace figures for each area (data supplied).	SEEDA's latest Design and Access Statement include the same figures for the site as in the consultation SPD, thus retain original figures.
D1/22/6	Lee-on-the-Solent Residents' Association	Para 2.15- assumes that the MCA will retain the airfield and that it will be available to businesses. Given the financial pressures on MCA is there not a risk that the airfield might be sold with MCA only retaining a helipad? Perhaps the SPD should include the intention to safeguard the airfield for use by on-site businesses and how this might be achieved.	Agree need to make it clear the intention to safeguard the airfield for use by on-site businesses. This is more appropriate in the development considerations section. Need to amend Para 5.15 to better reflect latest known situation and address future uncertainties regarding MCA operations.
D1/2/2	Maritime and Coastguard Agency	None of the plans show MCA's ownership.	Plan 4 has been re-evaluated and it is considered no longer necessary to show ownership within the SPD, particularly in the light of uncertainty regarding the ownership of SEEDA's land.
6. PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT			
National policy			
D1/32/6	SEEDA	Par 3.3: Amend final sentence to read: 'Consequently, Daedalus is particularly suitable for higher	Consider no change is necessary in the context of the national policy section.

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		density development'.	
Sub-regional context			
D1/32/7	SEEDA	Acknowledges that GBC can meet the housing figure in the South Hampshire Strategy and that it has a five year supply. The flexibility of allowing a level of housing above set targets as identified in Para 4.28 should be re-iterated in Para 3.8.	Consider no change is necessary. The paragraph sets out the sub-regional context in relation to the Council's housing supply. The point about allowing a level of housing above the housing allocation for Daedalus in exceptional circumstances is clearly stated in Para 4.28 as part of the development strategy-this is not particularly relevant to setting the sub-regional context and places too much evidence on what the Council views as an exceptional circumstance.
Transport			
D1/26/1	Hampshire County Council	Para 3.9 should be amended to fully reflect emerging LTP3 (text supplied in HCC's submission).	Update.
D1/23/2	Highways Agency	The two Borough Councils will need to consider the Implementation Plans being developed by TfSH to support South Hampshire's LTP3.	HCC's Strategic Access to Gosport study is a key document for infrastructure planning on the Gosport peninsula and is considered in the SPD.
D1/22/9	Lee-on-the-Solent Residents' Association	Para 3.9 relevant parts of the Local Transport Plan 3 could perhaps be included as an Appendix	Add link to relevant web page.
D2/20/3	Local Resident	Given that LTP3 is not due to be published until 1 st April 2011 it would be better to firm up the SPD after these outcomes are published.	The SPD has been updated to include the provisions of LTP3 including provisions for Newgate Lane.
D1/23/3	Highways Agency	The Strategic Access to Gosport study goes some way to satisfy the requirements of PPS12 (paras 4.8-4.12) as it identifies some transport issues and potential schemes. More details regarding the associated costs, timescales for delivery and gaps in funding will need to be further considered.	Noted- further work is being undertaken by HCC.
D1/22/10	Lee-on-the-Solent Residents' Association	Para 3.11: Question how an 'increased reliance on developers' will solve access on and off the peninsula.	This is an acknowledgement that over the next few years there will be less funds available for transport improvements and therefore in relative terms that

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
			there would be increased reliance on private sector funds i.e. developers. Agree that it is unlikely that funds would be sufficient to solve access issues on the peninsula. The Council's Strategy to enable jobs on the site is viewed as potentially the best way of reducing out-commuting in the area.
D2/45/20	Local Resident	Para 3.11 - Respectable economic sources advise that the bankers' crisis and consequences will remain until about 2035 hence pressures on Government spending until that date, not for 5 years as statement.	Accept that there will be uncertainty regarding future Government funding for a long period of time. The statement does state at least 5 years.
Minerals and Waste			
D2/20/4	Local Resident	Para 3.12 indicates that the possibility of sand and gravel extraction still exists, if this happens has the additional heavy traffic that it will generate been considered?	The extraction of sand and gravel is not considered a possibility for the foreseeable future as it is not identified as a potential site in the Hampshire Minerals Local Plan. Daedalus will not be considered as a mineral site whilst it remains an operational airfield. If a proposal were to come forward a full Environmental Impact Assessment would be required. This would include an assessment of additional heavy traffic in the area.
D2/45/21	Local Resident	No reference is made of the possibility of mineral extraction areas at the Daedalus site/ airfield being used subsequently for waste disposal, thereby posing a threat to future commercial and residential occupiers nearby.	The site has not been identified for mineral extraction nor subsequent waste disposal due to the impact this would have on a working airfield.
Local Policy: Strategic Gaps			
D2/45/23	Local Resident	Para 3.19: Object to statement that the Borough Council recognises that the northern strip of the site within the GBC area which is within the strategic gap is appropriate for development. Reasons cited: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If GBC is not prepared to support retention of the Strategic Gap, Fareham Borough Council is unlikely to do so either; 	It is considered that the strip of land relates well to the built up part of the site and helps to maximise employment opportunities on the site as it would be well-related to the airfield. Indeed the new MCA building has been built within this area. It is considered that development in this area would not detract from the gap both physically or visually.

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"> • Will reduce GBC's ability to criticise FBC for abandoning the Gap; • The Core Strategy has not yet been adopted and therefore strictly speaking has no force at present and should not be taken into consideration. • It will reduce GBC influence to oppose any applications which would reduce the Gap. 	<p>FBC have a very firm commitment for retaining the gap and this is clearly shown in the FBC Core Strategy. GBC supports the retention of the Gap between the settlements.</p> <p>The SPD sets out the reasons why an exception is being made in this case. The SPD will be taken as a material consideration when dealing with any application.</p> <p>There would be a presumption against development elsewhere in the Gap in accordance with the saved policies of the Adopted Local Plan Review (the statutory development plan). Therefore GBC's ability to refuse applications elsewhere would not be diminished.</p> <p>As stated the weight given to the emerging Core Strategy at this stage would be limited.</p>
Core Strategy			
D1/32/9	SEEDA	Whilst accepting the Core Strategy does not form part of the statutory Development Plan reference should be mentioned to it in Section 3.	Amend accordingly.
Local Policy: Plan 5			
D1/32/6	SEEDA	Should include that planning policy designations and allocations are taken from the Gosport Local Plan Review.	Amend accordingly.
D1/18/8	Defence Estates	MoD land is within the Urban Area Boundary and Mixed Use policy area. These designations are supported.	Noted.
7. DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY AND MASTER PLAN MAPS			
Development Strategy: Support			
D1/30/1	Fareham Borough	FBC welcomes the development strategy for the	Noted.

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
	Council	redevelopment of the Daedalus site which has benefits for both Boroughs over the next 10-15 years.	
D1/6/1	Lee Business Association Representative	Support the emphasis on aviation, marine related proposals, leisure, employment and habitat.	Noted.
D2/37/1	Local Resident	Support any development of the site if carried out with due respect to the existing business community and residents as stated in the SPD.	Noted.
D2/77/1	Local Resident	Hard to see how this proposed development will contribute to Gosport's economic growth as the workers are unlikely to live in Gosport or spend money in the Borough.	Whilst accepting that a site of this size will generate in-commuting it is clear that the site has the potential to provide a range of job opportunities in a number of different occupations to serve Borough residents. Businesses on the site will also buy products and services from existing and potential new businesses thereby helping to stimulate the local economy. The Daedalus site represents the best opportunity to improve the local economy- a do nothing approach will lead to a continue outflow of workers from the Borough.
D2/11/9	Local Resident	Total usage of the site is ok but need to ensure the area is for employment.	Noted.
Development Strategy: Impact on nature conservation features (other detailed comments in Considerations)			Nature Conservation section under Development
D1/19/2	Natural England	Concern about the regeneration proposals on nearby sites of national and international importance in particular 350 dwellings and a new marina. Additional impacts could also potentially arise from employment uses should these increase the use of the slipway or generate increased aircraft movement, and from the proposed increase in leisure and recreation use. Natural England would like these issues fully addressed in	The Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) of the Daedalus site includes an assessment of a number of impacts associated in addition to residential development including employment use with the potential increased use of the slipway and airfield. The proposed increase in leisure and recreation uses has also been considered. Consequently a number of amendments have been included in the SPD which incorporate the precautionary principle

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		the Core Strategy's HRA and SA/SEA to inform the preparation of the lower level HRA and SA/SEA for the Daedalus SPD.	where it has been shown that the impacts are uncertain at this stage. These have been set out in the HRA Report.
D1/19/3	Natural England	Currently the SPD does not provide sufficient assurances that adverse impacts will be avoided or clear commitment to enhance the natural environment and how these will be achieved.	Additional text in the Biodiversity Section includes: <i>* 'It is important to recognise that any development that would be likely to have a significant effect on a designated site, either alone or in combination with other plans and projects would not be in accordance with the Habitats Regulations 2010 or the development plan and would be refused.'</i>
D1/21/10	RSPB	Based on current details it will not be possible to demonstrate that the SPD will not have an adverse impact on the integrity of the Solent and Southampton Water SPA and Ramsar site.	<i>* The Daedalus SPD has been subject to assessment under the Habitats Regulations 2010 which has influenced the development options for the site. The Council recognises that additional growth in the Borough, in-combination with growth in neighbouring authorities could without appropriate management and mitigation, lead to adverse effects on European sites. In order to prevent such effects, the Borough Council will work with other authorities (including the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire) to develop and implement a strategic approach to protecting European sites from recreation pressures and other impacts of development. Where development at Daedalus is shown to have an impact on European sites, the developer will be required to consider and implement a range of mitigation measures which are outlined below and in the other relevant sections of this SPD.</i>

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
			<p>* <i>'The Borough Council where applicable to the Daedalus site will require developers to contribute towards mitigation measures identified in the Solent Disturbance and Mitigation Project [include footnote providing more detail of the study]</i></p> <p>Text in relation to residential development:</p> <p>* <i>'It will also be necessary to ensure that any additional dwellings will consider the environmental capacity of the area particularly in relation to potential impacts on internationally important habitats within the vicinity.'</i></p> <p>It is therefore considered that through the identification of mitigation measures and/or the need to take a precautionary approach where details are not known at this stage, the SPD can be found to have no adverse effects on the European sites.</p>
Objectives			
D1/30/2	Fareham Borough Council	FBC support key objectives including the creation of significant employment opportunities to reduce out-commuting from the Gosport Peninsula, maximising the benefit of the existing runways for aviation industries and benefitting from the direct links to the Solent via the slipway.	Noted.
D1/22/11 D1/25/3	Lee-on-the-Solent Residents' Association Homes and Communities Agency	Support key objectives.	Noted.
D1/19/5	Natural England	Both agencies are concerned that the key objectives do	Add new objective which relates to the protection of

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
D1/27/11	Environment Agency	<p>not include reference to the conservation and enhancement of the natural environment.</p> <p>Acknowledge reference to green infrastructure in 11th bullet point. EA considers it warrants a separate objective with further details (D1/27/11).</p> <p>NE would like to see clear objectives for the protection of designated sites of national and international importance as well as the delivery of gains for the natural environment (D1/19/5).</p> <p>Should be recognised that the creation and enhancement of natural greenspace may be necessary in mitigating the likely effects of new development, by diverting visitor pressure away from more sensitive designated areas. Suggested text is included in NE submission (D1/19/5).</p>	<p>international and national sites and give more prominence to green infrastructure.</p> <p>A new green infrastructure section has been included which includes the needs to divert visitor pressure away from more sensitive designated areas.</p>
D1/19/6	Natural England	<p>Certain objectives have significant implications for the natural environment including:</p> <p>3) increase in aircraft movements could have an increased disturbance effects on protected birds;</p> <p>4) increase in marine industries and recreation with direct links to the Solent could also increase disturbance;</p> <p>5) other mixed development such as regeneration of the seafront, leisure and community facilities and residential development could all increase the cumulative recreational and other pressures on designated sites.</p>	<p>These issues have been assessed in the Habitats Regulations Assessment with a number of changes made to the SPD as a result (see comment to D1/19/2 above).</p>
D1/23/4	Highways Agency	<p>Every effort should be made to mitigate the traffic impact of the development by managing down the demand for private car trips and encourage public transport usage.</p>	<p>The 7th bullet point makes it clear that the site should have good transport accessibility to make it attractive to new investment. This includes all forms of transport and thus is a suitable objective for the</p>

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
			development of the Daedalus site. The key measure to reduce the need to travel is reflected in the first bullet point relating to the creation of employment opportunities and reducing out-commuting. Measures such as managing down demand is detailed in the specific transport section of the SPD.
D1/28/7	Lee Flying Association	The SPD should declare a clear priority or preference for aviation businesses rather than mixed uses. Imperative for the airfield to survive against housing/commercial development pressures and that a critical mass of aviation businesses are attracted to Daedalus to share infrastructure costs.	The objective to encourage aviation is clear. However the SPD aims to provide a framework for the whole site within Gosport and consequently other uses are likely to be more appropriate for other parts of the site. The Council recognises that the aviation industry has particular requirements and specific measures to protect these are included in the SPD. The SPD is only a framework for making decisions and if an aviation-led consortium produced proposals that require less or no other uses these would be considered. The proposals for the FBC area also include a significant amount of land for aviation use.
D1/28/9	Lee Flying Association	In order to maximise the benefit of existing runways for aviation use (Objective 3). This in practice means: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no through road; • large hangars retained for aviation use; • runway access; • no encroachment of development on runway 17/35. 	The spine road aims to serve the users of the Daedalus site giving them access to the east and west and integrating parts of the site with the wider community. It will not be designed as a through route. The SPD acknowledges that the route of this road is not fixed and could be moved southwards if there was a requirement for more aviation uses to have access to the runway. The SPD would be too prescriptive if it earmarked the hangars solely for aviation use given the large amount of land and floorspace on the site (including within FBC).

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
			Greater access to the runway is set out as a key design consideration for the site. The route of the potential eastern access has been moved further southwards on the latest plans.
D2/45/10	Local Resident	What is Gosport Borough Council's key objective? It is not stated in the Summary Leaflet.	Primarily the creation of employment whilst safeguarding the site's heritage.
D2/45/24	Local Resident	Objectives should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an absolute numerical limit on the number of dwellings to be provided; • blanket prohibition on warehousing which produces very few jobs; • intended provision of infrastructure should take into account severe constraints in Government spending expected up to 2035. 	Considered too detailed as development strategy objectives. Such issues are considered elsewhere in the text.
Mixed Uses			
D1/25/3 D1/32/11	Homes and Communities Agency SEEDA	Support mix of uses as outlined in paragraph 4.4 and 4.5 and welcome the objective of creating a vibrant and diverse community which is active beyond the working day and creates a feeling of safety and sense of place.	Noted.
D1/22/7	Lee-on-the-Solent Residents' Association	When the SPD uses the term mixed use does it include flatted development above business developments?	The term mixed use is used in order not to be too prescriptive on the re-use of buildings in the historic area or new build adjacent to them. The Borough Council will consider a range of proposals including flatted development and business development within the quantum identified in the development strategy.
D2/1/4	Local Resident	Important to have a diversity of uses on the site.	Agree. The SPD encourages a mix of uses with an emphasis on employment-led regeneration.
D2/45/25	Local Resident	Para 4.5: Describing Daedalus as an employment-led mixed use site risks losing emphasis on employment	Certain parts of the site are suitable for residential and the creation of new homes will have a number

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		provision in the long term with residential use increasing in importance over time.	of benefits for the site. The term 'employment-led mixed use site' is a fair reflection of the Council's objectives. To state that Daedalus is solely an employment site would be misleading.
D1/32/12	SEEDA	Para 4.6: Remove 'most'. SPD should afford flexibility to the developer to consider a wider range of uses within the historic core.	Remove the word 'most'. Whilst residential should be focussed in the historic core it is acknowledged that there may be other parts of the site that are just as suitable for housing.
D2/45/26	Local Resident	Para 4.6-4.7: References to 'illustrative purposes', 'flexibility' and 'possible mixes of uses' emphasise that the results of public consultation can be increasingly ignored as time passes by. Public consultation will be limited to comments on individual planning applications not on the implementation of the initial agreed guidelines.	The SPD provides a framework for making decisions on future planning applications and has been shaped by the public consultation. Public comments received as part of these future planning applications will also be given due consideration by officers and ultimately by the elected Councillors.
D1/32/13	SEEDA	Plan 6 should be deleted. Whilst recognising that this is only an initial guide of development options SEEDA consider that the inclusion of Plan 6 still promotes a degree of prescription which is not necessary.	An initial guide to development options is considered a useful starting point for developers. It is made clear in Paragraphs 4.6 and 4.7 that the plan is for illustrative purposes and other options would be considered. The uses are not considered too prescriptive with scope for alternative options to be considered.
D1/28/9	Lee Flying Association	Plan 6: Amend the eastern purple block as this should not be developed as it would encroach on the north-south runway and obstruct valuable views from Broom Way. New access road should be through this area.	It is considered that this area is a suitable area for employment acting as a gateway to Daedalus. However the SPD makes it clear that evidence will be required to ensure that proposals do not have a detrimental impact on the function of the airfield and such information needs to be submitted with any future application. The road has been amended further south of the runway.
Employment uses:			
Support			
D1/13/1	Partnership of Urban	PUSH supports the identification of Daedalus as a	Noted.

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
	South Hampshire (PUSH)	strategic employment site. This is in accordance with PUSH's Employment Floorspace Policy Framework.	
D2/2/1	Local Resident	Agree Daedalus should be an industrial site.	Noted.
D2/60/2	Local Resident	Daedalus must be used to create jobs.	Noted.
Object			
D2/6/1	Local Resident	Too many business facilities.	Noted.
Impact of employment development on internationally important habitats			
D1/21/3	RSPB	Proposed employment development has the potential to significantly increase the workplace population which could put additional pressure on the European sites from recreational disturbance, and impacts associated with increased traffic, water abstraction, noise and light.	These impacts have been addressed by the HRA Report to accompany the Daedalus SPD and a number of amendments have been made to the SPD (see D1/19/2 above).
Encouraging investment			
D1/32/10	SEEDA	Para 4.1: SEEDA requests that reference to high technology is amended to widen the types of employment uses which could be accommodated on the site. SEEDA suggest 'a preference for marine, aviation and high technology related occupiers'.	Amend to identify wider range of employment types.
D2/20/6	Local Resident	What measures are to be taken to ensure the Daedalus site will be made attractive to prospective employers?	The SPD protects key assets such as the airfield and slipway which are the main strengths of the site which can help attract new investment. It also highlights that a developer will need to invest in infrastructure in order to make the site attractive for new businesses. The Borough Council will also continue to work with other organisations including SEEDA and future owners of the site to ensure investment can be secured to improve the infrastructure. This includes a bid for Regional Growth Funding.
D1/16/5	Hovercraft Museum	Strong and defendable policies need to be in place to resist the slow erosion of employment and leisure uses to	Agree.

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		residential and promote strategic access improvements to encourage business investment.	
Quantum of employment floorspace over the whole site			
D2/45/29	Local Resident	The amount of floorspace for the whole site should be much higher given that employment prospects in the Borough are getting worse.	The amount within Gosport includes a range of floorspace figures and is based on national guidance for plot ratios for the area most likely to be used for B1, B2 and B8 uses with the GBC area. Figures could be different depending on the type of eventual employment uses. The important element will be the potential employment densities. The employment floorspace figure in the FBC area is lower than the area of land suggests. This is because the potential impact on the strategic gap between settlements needs to be considered.
Quantum of employment floorspace in FBC area			
D1/32/15	SEEDA	In the FBC Core Strategy consultation SEEDA requested that the potential employment floorspace be expressed as a maximum gross floorspace i.e. 52,000sq.m gross floor floorspace within FBC area. This should be amended accordingly.	No change. The SPD uses the figures identified in FBC's Submission Core Strategy.
D2/45/28	Local Resident	The amount of employment floorspace within FBC is very small given the much greater proportion of the Daedalus site within Fareham. This increases the suspicion that widespread residential development within Fareham will occur.	FBC are not planning housing for their area. The proposals for employment are set out in their Core Strategy. The reason for lower employment floorspace figures is that this part of the site will accommodate low density development to reflect the character of the Strategic Gap and that the proposed employment will largely be hangar type development linked to the airfield.
Estimation of jobs on-site			
D1/32/14	SEEDA	Para 4.12: SPD should include source of job creation calculation. SEEDA considers that the Homes and	Include source which is an averaged out figure of small business units (32 m2 per worker) and general

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		Communities Agency Employment Densities Guide (2010) provides most up-to-date guidance.	industrial buildings (34 m2 per worker) (Arup 2001) as cited by the Government's 'Employment Land Reviews: Guidance Note (ODPM 2004). This is considered appropriate as it reflects the mix of potential employment buildings on the site and ensures consistency with the assumptions used in the Council's Employment Land Review. The Homes and Communities Agency Employment Densities Guide (2010) cited by SEEDA cites 36m2 per worker within a range of 18-60m2. The GBC assumption therefore is well within this range.
Extent of land shown as employment: MCA Land			
D1/2/3	Maritime and Coastguard Agency	Plan 6 and Masterplans (1 & 2) show areas of MCA land as employment use. The MCA have not approved the use of MCA land for any other purpose than MCA/DfT use.	The SPD provides a framework for the long term development of the site irrespective of ownership. The designation of the site for employment would allow a variety of employment uses to take place making the best use of its proximity to the airfield. This would not preclude the expansion of further MCA facilities on the site.
D2/14/5	Local Resident	Hope to see the Air Sea Recue Services retained.	Noted.
Employment use on the vacant MoD land not supported			
D1/18/3	Defence Estates	The employment land supply targets set out by PUSH and included in the Council's Employment Land Review indicate that there is no requirement to identify more land for manufacturing. A requirement is identified for office and warehouse/distribution uses. The Married Quarters site is not well located for warehouse and distribution uses given the potential	The principle of residential on this site has not been ruled out-it is just considered that the options for the site should be considered as part of the whole site to ensure it is planned comprehensively. However if a genuine need for Married Quarters can be demonstrated the Council will grant permission in principle in order that the site can benefit from its proximity with the adjoining completed Married Quarters. The SPD highlights that the southern part of the site which is bounded by existing residential is

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		<p>significant impact on the amenity of the existing Married Quarters.</p> <p>The site is unlikely to be viewed as a suitable location for significant office development with better sites located elsewhere in the Borough (Gosport Waterfront/Town Centre).</p> <p>The use of the Married Quarters land for employment uses is therefore not critical to either the Borough's employment land supply or the Council's vision for the site.</p> <p>The SPDs suggestion that part of the site could be developed for residential reinforces this conclusion.</p>	<p>more suited for residential uses.</p> <p>This site was originally considered as being most appropriate for employment in the 1997 Development Strategy. The Employment Land Review (ELR) (GBC 2010) and the emerging Core Strategy takes into account the PUSH minimum figure of 81,500 sq.m and that this is considered necessary to deliver an employment-led Strategy over the Plan period. These figures are minimum figures and therefore higher manufacturing floorspace figures may be appropriate including on sites such as Daedalus. After all Gosport has the lowest job density figure in SE England.</p> <p>The ELR identifies a shortfall in this figure (13,000sq.m) but identifies that further MoD releases such as Haslar Hospital, Blockhouse and HMS Sultan could provide this and more of the shortfall and would need to provide at least the same number of jobs as lost on these sites. However due to the uncertainty of either how these sites will be developed or if and when they will be released it is not possible to provide figures for these sites.</p> <p>The ELR also identifies other sources of employment floorspace including increasing employment figures on existing employment/mixed use allocation. This includes Daedalus and consequently the land used for Married Quarters (or part of it) could be used for additional employment.</p> <p>With regard to the issue regarding the type of</p>

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
			employment land (office, warehouse, light and general industry) it is important to note that the Borough Council in its emerging Strategy has not given specific figures for each type and therefore has not followed the PUSH figures. Instead the Borough Council considers that it is likely that a higher proportion of light and general industry will come forward than the PUSH figures suggest, and consequently there would be lower proportions of warehousing and office developed locally. The ELR acknowledges that notwithstanding the PUSH proportions it will be important in Gosport to ensure there is sufficient land for the Borough's high-tech manufacturing and marine sectors. This approach is consistent with Government Guidance in PPS4 which requires a pragmatic and flexible approach to the allocation of land for employment, not restrained by allocating land for specific employment uses.
Centres of excellence			
D2/45/30	Local Resident	Para 4.17- There is an urgency to develop the centres of excellence before developing industries look elsewhere and existing Gosport industries collapse as a result of MoD cutbacks.	Agree.
Aviation and marine businesses			
D2/73/1	Local Resident	Support for making light aviation, marine technology and high-tech manufacturing the central economic focus for the site.	Noted.
D2/12/2	Local Resident	There is too much emphasis on marine and aviation businesses. What businesses will want to locate here?	These are considered key assets of the site and local strengths. There have been a number of businesses in both sectors that have expressed an interest for a presence on the site.
D2/37/2	Local Resident	Concern how much emphasis is now being placed on the marine and aviation potential of the site, to the possible exclusion of almost all else	

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
D1/8/1	Fine Cars (Lee-on-the-Solent)	The stated desire for the marine and aviation industry is seriously flawed.	Due the sheer size of the site it is likely that Daedalus will be able to accommodate other employment uses as well as other uses such as leisure, community facilities and residential.
D2/24/3	Local Resident	What facilities are such industries likely to need and how are these needs to be satisfied?	The SPD provides scope for any aviation-related developer to be able to provide the facilities it needs. As demonstrated by SEEDA's aviation study the site has a good runway and sufficient land and buildings for aviation uses. It is likely that further infrastructure will be required.
Aviation: Support for airfield/aviation uses			
D1/6/3 D1/28/10 D2/5/2 D2/10/2 D2/25/6 D2/43/9 D2/49/1 D2/11/8 D2/58/1	Lee Business Association Representative Lee Flying Association Local Residents (7)	Fully support proposals that would secure airfield/runway/aviation activity.	Noted.
D2/29/1	Local Resident	The airfield at Daedalus has much to offer and an attractive option for general aviation enjoying good weather. It is a viable alternative to other airfields in the area for the small aircraft operator. There are a number of aviation-related businesses that could use the site. This is a golden opportunity to create a centre of aviation excellence	Noted.
D2/52/1	Local Resident	Airfield is a wonderful light aircraft facility. Only general aviation airfield on the south coast. Is important for current and future light aircraft and glider usage and	Agree.

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		special in terms of aviation heritage.	
D2/73/13	Local Resident	Important to retain MCA/Coastguard presence on the airfield. Support proposal for a new control centre.	Agree.
D2/73/3	Local Resident	Support presence of Britten-Norman on the site. The company could be used to publicise/incentivise opportunities for other companies to locate at Daedalus.	Noted.
D2/5/3	Local Resident	To remain viable the taxi-ways must be preserved together with off-runway airplane parking and access to hangars.	It is proposed that such features will be safeguarded.
D2/17/3 D2/49/2	Local Residents (2)	Aviation and associated infrastructure for small planes and helicopters should continue.	Agree.
D2/43/10 D2/49/3	Local Residents (2)	Glider activity should continue.	Noted.
D2/49/4	Local Resident	A flying school should be resumed on the site.	Noted.
Aviation: terminology			
D1/28/6	Lee Flying Association	Phase 'aviation businesses' or availability of the airfield for private and general aviation use (as mentioned in the Daedalus Planning Statement) should be used rather than 'aviation-related businesses' to avoid creating the impression that only aviation businesses not requiring an active airfield would be welcome to invest and locate at Daedalus.	Aviation-related businesses include businesses that require an active airfield and those that don't. The term encompasses a wider range of businesses.
Aviation: Management of the airfield			
D1/32/16	SEEDA	Para 4.15 ' <i>Negotiations are continuing between the MCA and SEEDA in respect of medium and long term arrangements for Daedalus.</i> '	Include SEEDA's suggested change as a footnote, Amend the paragraph in order that the text does not date quickly as negotiations are ongoing.
D1/32/17	SEEDA	Object to direct linkage made between improving the viability of an air-focussed regeneration site and a reduced need for residential uses on the site. Delete reference.	Retain reference to airfield viability but delete direct link to the residential element.
Aviation: Use of Hangars and associated space in Gosport part of the site			
D1/28/4 D2/52/4	Lee Flying Association Local Resident	Non-aviation businesses should not be encouraged to occupy premises which have runway/airside access	The SPD aims to provide a framework for the whole site within Gosport and consequently other uses are

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		<p>(D1/28/4).</p> <p>The Overlord and Dunning Hangars should be identified purely for aviation use. The access to airside should be re-opened and space made available between the current hangars and the Coastguard hangar for new airside aviation building in due course.</p> <p>Support para 4.14: concern that other statements in SPD to provide a variety of employment premises for a wide range of businesses dilutes or conflicts with proposals for aviation uses (D1/28/4).</p>	<p>likely to be more appropriate for other parts of the site. The Council recognises that the aviation industry has particular requirements and specific measures to protect these are included in the SPD. The SPD is only a framework for making decision and if an aviation-led consortium produced proposals that require less or no other uses these would be considered. The proposals for the FBC area also include a significant amount of land for aviation use. It is considered too prescriptive at this stage to safeguard the hangars for aviation use only. It will be necessary to consider detailed proposals and assess these against the principles of the SPD including the need to maximise the potential for aviation use. This would include the use of particular buildings and layout of the site in relation to the need to gain access to the airfield.</p>
Aviation: Arrangements regarding the north-south runway			
D1/28/1 D2/52/2	Lee Flying Association Local Resident	<p>Concern regarding encroachment of the north-south runway. The runway is a valuable asset in its own right and will maintain the viability of the airfield.</p> <p>Also help safeguard open space and sight lines that local people value (D1/28/1).</p>	<p>The route of the potential eastern access has been moved further southwards on the latest plans and is not within the taxiway area. The SPD aims to ensure that the operation of the runway is not affected by development and the appropriate information is required as part of any planning application.</p>
D1/28/2 D2/52/3	Lee Flying Association Local Resident	<p>The new proposed road proposed from Broom Way should be routed further south and not along the taxiway at south end. The taxiway should be retained and kept for aviation.</p>	<p>The new employment building at the entrance of the site south of the runway is aimed to provide a landmark gateway to the strategic employment site and it will be necessary to ensure such buildings do not impede the operation of the north-south runway.</p>
D1/28/3	Lee Flying Association	<p>Further building south of the north-south runway should not be permitted.</p>	<p>It is considered that this is the most suitable area for</p>

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
			more dense development in Hangars East in order to protect the wider strategic gap.
Aviation: Hangars West			
D2/73/9	Local Resident	Endorse proposals for aviation in this area.	Noted.
Aviation: Further research required			
D2/29/1 D2/37/5	Local Residents (2)	Before planning decisions are made there needs to be a professional appraisal of what is possible in terms of aviation (and marine use-D2/37/5)	Agree- SEEDA have recently commissioned research, 'Aviation Potential of Lee-on-the-Solent Airfield (Formerly HMS Daedalus)' (York Aviation 2011) which identifies the potential for aviation on the site. Similarly SEEDA's earlier Solent Waterfront Strategy identifies the potential for marine uses at Daedalus.
Aviation: Concerns regarding commercial attractiveness			
D1/8/3	Fine Cars (Lee-on-the-Solent)	Daedalus is unlikely to support significant aviation industries: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Servicing and maintenance of private aircraft normally takes place at their lease airfield and does not support many jobs; • Unlikely to be production on the site; • Commercial flying is more credible but wouldn't be supported by local population and has no support infrastructure. <p>A flying club/group may be a possibility.</p>	SEEDA's 'Aviation Potential of Lee-on-the-Solent Airfield (Formerly HMS Daedalus)' (York Aviation 2011) identifies scope to enhance the General Aviation market as well as the potential for ancillary growth in aviation-related businesses such as light aircraft maintenance and manufacture. There are also opportunities for growth in aerospace which include firms that would not need access to the runway but would benefit from close links with companies that do.
D2/37/4	Local Resident	The airfield has found its own niche by way of general aviation, the MCA facility and Britten-Norman's operation (airframe). Concerns regarding the commercial attractiveness of Daedalus for aviation use. <p>The size of the runway precludes the operation of large airframes and associated services (maintenance) which occur at larger airfields/airports. Aircraft component</p>	The evidence shows that not all aspects of the industry would be suited to the site due to established competition and facilities elsewhere. <p>Both SEEDA and the two Borough Councils have been approached by a number of businesses within the aviation sector expressing an interest in investing in the Daedalus site.</p>

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		industries require good road access rather than a runway.	
Aviation: Concerns regarding increased use			
D2/68/2	Local Resident	Proposed increase in the use of the airfield facilities will create noise and disruption and this requires more consideration.	Agree the issues relating to noise and disruption will need to be carefully considered as part of any application and the relevant avoidance and mitigation measures will need to be implemented.
Aviation: Impact on the internationally important sites			
D1/19/6 D1/21/4	Natural England RSPB	<p>Concern regarding the intensification of aviation on the internationally important habitats.</p> <p>No details provided in the SPD on the existing licensing conditions and whether there is scope for expanding the airfield use (D1/21/4).</p>	<p>Since the publication of the Daedalus SPD Consultation draft SEEDA have produced an aviation feasibility study (York Aviation 2011) which sets out details of the potential to expand aviation from its current levels (this may or may not be lower than when it was used as an MoD Base).</p> <p>The usage of the airfield itself is outside of the scope of the Daedalus SPD. There is the potential to increase aviation movements to at least the levels which occurred when it was an MoD base without the need for a further planning application. Even then it would be up to Fareham Borough Council as the local planning authority covering the airfield to determine at what level beyond this planning permission will be required.</p> <p>It is unclear at the SPD stage whether there will be any businesses located within Gosport that would contribute to additional flights and if so what the level and frequency of air movements would be. Much would depend on the type of businesses involved. Businesses located on the Gosport part of the site may require a site in close proximity to aviation businesses rather than using the runway</p>

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
			<p>themselves. However that said there may be some businesses that do require use of the runway. Consequently it is considered that assessment at this stage would not be meaningful and that proposals included in the Daedalus SPD would not necessarily lead to increased aviation movements.</p> <p>That said the Borough Council has taken a precautionary approach and included text which states 'It is important to recognise that any development that would be likely to have a significant effect on a designated site, either alone or in combination with other plans and projects would not be in accordance with the Habitats Regulations 2010 or the development plan and would be refused.'</p> <p>Additionally reference has been made to the need for an applicant to submit details relating to any potential use of the airfield in order that the information can be used to assess the environmental implications.</p>
Aviation: Future of Coastguard operations			
D1/31/5	Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	WT questions the future use of the airfield in the light of the Government's recent announcement concerning consolidating coastguard services.	Accept that there is some uncertainty regarding future MCA operations. The GBC SPD together with Fareham Borough Council's policies provides a framework for making future decisions for retaining aviation use of the site.
Marine sector			
Marine: Slipway			
D1/22/5	Lee-on-the-Solent Residents' Association	If the slipway is sold there should be some provision for its use by occupants on Daedalus for example marina industries, hovercraft and recreation uses.	Include under 'development considerations' the need to retain the slipway for marine-related activities linked to the Daedalus site.

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
D1/16/8	Hovercraft Museum	Strongest objection to any use that detrimentally affects the slipway. Its unrestricted retention is considered essential to enhance the attraction of Daedalus to marine-related businesses and activities.	Agree- A new paragraph has been included in the SPD that sets out the importance of retaining the slipway for businesses and other activities.
D2/3/1	Local Resident	Public access to the slipway should be maintained for launching vessels and water craft.	Agree.
D2/41/3	Local Resident	The slipway should be used to bring in heavy items and goods and to export goods. A pier or jetty could be built to accommodate small coastal freighters. This would help alleviate traffic congestion.	Include under 'development considerations' the need to retain the slipway for marine-related activities linked to the Daedalus site. Proposals for a pier and jetty would have implications on the internationally important site and are not being proposed as part of the Daedalus SPD.
D2/41/4	Local Resident	Traffic lights could be put in place at the slipway or a bridge over the road to the site.	Traffic lights may be required to allow use of the slipway from Daedalus. This issue has now been included in the SPD. A bridge is not proposed as the anticipated level of slipway usage would not warrant such a costly investment. There are also significant visual amenity and environmental factors to consider.
D1/22/6	Lee-on-the-Solent Residents' Association	In relation to the slipway the impact on the traffic flow along Marine Parade West needs to be taken into account.	This implication of the use of the slipway on traffic using Marine Parade is an issue that needs further consideration and has now been included in the SPD. Much will depend on the level of use and it will be necessary for future applications to set out details on anticipated slipway use.
D2/24/8	Local Resident	Any significant use of the slipway would seriously impair the movement of traffic on the busy Marine Parade and therefore may not be a real asset for the site or area.	
D2/5/3	Local Resident	Concern that the access to the sea from the runway area via the slipway and Seaplane Square appears to be overlooked. This is a unique feature and must be retained. The present 'wide access' via Theseus Road should not	A link between the northern hangars and the slipway is proposed through Seaplane Square and the triangular piece of land to the north. Further emphasis has been included in the Street Hierarchy part of the Transport and Accessibility Section.

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		be prejudiced by the proposed new buildings being sited too close to the route	
D1/8/3	Fine Cars (Lee-on-the-Solent)	Site is unlikely to be suitable for marine industries for a number of reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slipway would only be useful to small craft in fine conditions; • Site lacks facilities such as jetty, shelter for boat, travel lift, launch/recovery dock; • Whilst marine would be a wonderful facility it is unlikely to happen. 	SEEDA's Waterfront Strategy identifies the significant potential for marine-related businesses at the Daedalus site. These will need to be appropriate for the site and not have a detrimental impact on internationally important habitats in the vicinity and consequently marina and jetty proposals may not be appropriate.
D2/37/3	Local Resident	Sceptical about the commercial potential of a slipway. Without the addition of a marina at vast expense the slipway per se may not be the attraction to marine businesses that it seems is now being assumed.	
D1/11/5	Defence Heritage Support Group	It may be possible to construct a major port offshore with a new road and railway system.	This would be inappropriate for this site with likely significant environmental impacts.
D1/19/ D1/21/5	Natural England RSPB	Concern regarding the increased use of the slipway on the internationally important habitats which could lead to increased disturbance. Further information on the potential nature of these options is necessary in order to carry out a full assessment of their acceptability in this location. (D1/21/5).	It is not possible to provide further details on the anticipated level of use of the slipway as much depends on the proposals for the site. It is not clear whether this will be greater than the current use of the site for recreational purposes (including jet ski users). To address this issue text has been included in the SPD: <i>'It will be necessary to ensure the type and level of usage associated with marine activities generated by the site does not have any detrimental impact on the nature conservation features of internationally important sites within the vicinity. This needs to be demonstrated with detailed studies at the planning application stage to inform an appropriate</i>

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
			<i>assessment under the requirements of Habitats Regulations 2010. Proposals that will harm the features of the internationally important sites will not be permitted.'</i>
Other local businesses			
D1/8/4	Fine Cars (Lee-on-the-Solent)	The [1997] Planning Brief for Daedalus encouraged local business to move to Daedalus to allow expansion and sustainable employment. Fine Cars has been trying to locate to the site. Concerns that a New Car Showroom and allied facilities employing 25 people would not fit with the ambitions for marine and aviation.	<p>It is considered that many of the potential marine, aviation and high-tech businesses could indeed be local firms or at least support existing businesses given the strengths of these sectors in the Gosport economy.</p> <p>The SPD does allow for other local businesses on the site indeed paragraph 4.18 states that given the sheer size of the site there is scope to develop different segments of the business premises market including business start up and move-on accommodation.</p> <p>The appropriateness of a car showroom would need to be considered as part of a planning application as part of the regeneration of the whole site. Details such as scale and location within the site would need to be considered at this stage.</p>
D2/45/27	Local Resident	Para 4.8: Does not contain reference to existing Gosport businesses not within the preferred categories of marine, aviation and high technology industries.	The SPD does allow for other local businesses on the site indeed Paragraph 4.18 states that given the sheer size of the site there is scope to develop different segments of the business premises market including business start up and move-on accommodation.
D2/37/8	Local Resident	Reservations about the commercial attractiveness of the site for marine and aviation use may be necessary to accept a more general use, ultimately, whatever improves the site and ideally offers employment opportunities.	
D2/58/4	Local Resident	Need to encourage small business units on the site to provide local employment.	

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
D2/36/1 D2/65/4	Local Residents (2)	Local commercial businesses should be encouraged to expand and add local employment possibilities and thereby reducing out-bound traffic congestion.	
Other employment related uses			
D2/73/14	Local Resident	Driving Standard Agency Test Centre is a good idea.	Noted.
Skills/ Availability of suitable workforce			
D2/20/5	Local Resident	What measures are in place to ensure that businesses attracted to the site will be capable of providing employment for local residents with or without additional training?	Whilst a local authority can not force a private company to provide employment for local residents only, the SPD requires developers/employers on the Daedalus site to produce local training and employment plans which have been used elsewhere in South Hampshire to improve the employment and training opportunities for local residents at new development sites.
D2/20/10	Local Resident	Whilst attracting high tech industries is supported there is concern that these jobs will not provide opportunities for low qualified/ low skilled residents in the area (of which evidence suggests is a significant proportion of the workforce). Thus there is a need to provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • considerable training; • more low tech type employment. 	The site will have a range of job opportunities including lower skilled occupations. The Council will also work with local companies to improve local training opportunities.
D2/20/11	Local Resident	Whilst the SPD makes reference to work-based training, there are a number of actions required: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • training for future jobs in the high-tech sector should start as early as possible and be enhanced at Sixth Form; • understanding of the level of skills required by companies interested in moving to the site; • compare this with the current skill levels of Gosport residents; • develop a training strategy to provide Gosport residents with the best opportunities to take up 	Agree a number of actions are required on a Borough-wide basis to improve training opportunities. The Borough Council is working with local companies, education and training providers to improve opportunities. The SPD proposes that employers/developers prepare an Employment and Training Plan to improve local skills to meet the needs of businesses on the site.

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		employment on the site.	
D2/12/3	Local Resident	Doubt that there are the people available in the local area to train for the jobs proposed for the site. Most of the population is over 65. It also takes time to train young people and once trained their skills will be out-of-date.	The Borough already has strengths in the suggested industries including a skilled workforce in these industries. However it is acknowledged that further training is required particularly in relation to young people. The SPD proposes that employers/developers prepare an Employment and Training Plan to improve local skills to meet the needs of businesses on the site.
D2/14/4	Local Resident	There needs to be sufficient work for younger age group.	Agree-job creation is one of the key objectives of the redevelopment of Daedalus.
In-commuting congestion			
D2/2/2 D2/12/3	Local Residents (2)	Concern how many people would have the necessary skills to fulfil employment opportunities. Consequently workers from outside would use the roads creating even more congestion and misery for existing residents.	The SPD proposes that employers/developers prepare an Employment and Training Plan to improve local skills to meet the needs of businesses on the site. There will undoubtedly be in-commuting and any proposal will need to be accompanied by a traffic impact assessment with the relevant mitigation measures proposed.
Leisure/Tourism/Recreation			
D1/19/7	Natural England	NE considers that the SPD is indicating support for developing water sports with access to the Solent via the slipway. The cumulative recreational impacts on designated sites should be assessed in the HRA and SA/SEA.	These impacts have been assessed by the HRA with a number of precautionary measures included in the SPD as it is not clear at this stage what the nature of the proposals will be on the site and these will need to be addressed at project level.
D1/21/8	RSPB	Leisure uses such as an hotel and food and drink establishments alone and in-combination with the proposed residential development at Daedalus have the potential to place increased recreational pressure on the	In relation to the slipway the following text is proposed.

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		European sites. Concerned that the proposal to improve pedestrian and cycle facilities could further increase opportunities for recreational disturbance on the European sites.	<p><i>'It will be necessary to ensure the type and level of usage associated with marine activities generated by the site does not have any detrimental impact on the nature conservation features of internationally important sites within the vicinity. This needs to be demonstrated with detailed studies at the planning application stage to inform an appropriate assessment under the requirements of Habitats Regulations 2010. Proposals that will harm the features of the internationally important sites will not be permitted.'</i></p> <p>In addition a number of mitigation measures are included in relation to recreational disturbance including provision for alternative green infrastructure and cross-boundary working on management issues. There is also a commitment to implement relevant measures identified in the forthcoming Solent Disturbance and Mitigation stage.</p> <p>The measures to improve cycling and pedestrian access to Lee frontage and the Alver Valley have the potential to deflect pressure from more sensitive sites. As mentioned above there may be the need for cross-boundary working in relation to access at Hill Head which may arise from the Solent Disturbance and Recreation Study. Specific mention for improved cycle access westwards from Lee has been removed from the SPD as this is unlikely to be achieved as part of proposals at the Daedalus site.</p>
D2/34/1	Local Residents (3)	Daedalus represents a great opportunity for new	Agree.

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
D2/60/3 D2/65/7		leisure/recreation facilities for all- recognise that jobs are a priority.	
D2/37/6	Local Resident	Maybe necessary to find a new focus for the site-such as leisure as opposed to aviation and marine use.	The SPD will enable leisure options to come forward.
D2/6/3	Local Resident	Not enough leisure facilities.	The SPD is flexible regarding the provision of leisure facilities and if proposals from community groups or businesses come forward they would be considered alongside other proposals. The SPD recognises that the areas closest to the seafront are particularly suitable for leisure uses.
D2/23/1	Local Resident	Concerns whether hotels, conferencing facilities, restaurants and leisure uses will be delivered. Heard it before on other sites.	Acknowledge that there are challenges. The SPD provides a framework to enable these types of uses to come forward but ultimately there will need to be developer interest for these types of facilities if they are to be delivered.
Hotel use: Support			
D2/34/3 D2/77/7	Local Residents (2)	Hotel with conference centre/leisure facilities is supported. It would help promote the wider area	Agree a hotel to serve local business/tourism needs is important. The SPD does make reference of the potential for hotel uses on the site. Ultimately there will need to be developer interest for these types of facilities if they are to be delivered.
D2/9/6 D2/41/9	Local Residents (2)	A hotel would be a great advantage. The Wardroom would convert readily to a hotel. This would: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • re-use a historic building which is falling into disrepair (D2/41/9); • create employment (D2/41/9); • provide a facility in an attractive area which lacks such a facility at present (D2/41/9). 	
D2/25/1	Local Resident	A medium sized hotel is needed for the Lee area including a conference room for businesses and weddings etc. Would bring jobs to the area.	
D1/1/5	Advanced Marine Innovation Technology Subsea Ltd	The provision of adequate hotel accommodation at affordable prices is essential to support extensive business development. The SPD sidesteps this issue.	
D2/65/2	Local Resident	Has a hotel operator shown any interest? Traffic may be	

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		a deterrent.	
Hovercraft uses (museum and other activities)			
D1/16/6	Hovercraft Museum	<p>Great concern that the existing Hovercraft Museum is not mentioned in the emerging document other than a passing reference to a possible museum. This suggests SEEDA and the local authority do not recognise its existence nor are committed to its retention. Submitted letter provides detail regarding the significance of the museum in terms of exhibits and visitors.</p> <p>Limited tenure of the museum prohibits obtaining the necessary funding to protect and restore the exhibits. Investment is required in the hangars which could be secured by the Museum if it can be demonstrated it has a long term future on the site. The SPD doesn't provide this.</p> <p>The museum has the potential not only to attract investment (Heritage Lottery) it would generate tourism employment and training opportunities and assist with the regeneration of the Daedalus site.</p>	<p>The positive aspects of the Hovercraft Museum are acknowledged.</p> <p>The SPD will be revised accordingly to make specific reference to the retention of the Hovercraft Museum and the Search and Rescue Hovercraft facilities.</p>
D1/9/1	Hovercraft Society	The Hovercraft Society would like to ensure that the contribution of the UK military hovercraft scene is not overlooked. The site has a long history with the development of the hovercraft.	
D1/10/1	Association of Search & Rescue Hovercraft Gosport Branch(ASRHGB),	<p>The ASRH has the prime objective of using small hovercraft for search and rescue purposes on local tidal mudflats. Its hovercraft and equipment is accommodated in one of the Hovercraft Museum buildings.</p> <p>It appears unlikely from the SPD that the Hovercraft Museum will retain usage of the seaplane hangars, nor is</p>	

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		there an indication that alternative accommodation will be made available. ASRH would like a continuing presence on the site.	
D2/10/3 D2/15/2 D1/11/3 D2/24/6 D2/58/1 D2/60/1 D2/61/1 D2/65/10 D2/71/5 D2/72/5 D2/73/8	Local Residents (10) Defence Heritage Support Group	Hovercraft Museum must be retained. Disappointed there is no reference to the Hovercraft Museum.	
D2/30/1	Local Resident	The Hovercraft Museum needs to be mentioned by name. A secure 7 year tenancy is required to attract lottery funding. Museum's future is importance for Gosport's tourism industry and the nation's heritage.	
D2/60/1a D2/61/2	Local Residents (2)	Potential to be a major tourist attraction.	
D2/9/10	Local Resident	What will happen to the Hovercraft Museum is Seaplane Square?	
D1/16/10	Hovercraft Museum	Creative thinking could envisage the use of the SR.N4 hovercraft as a unique venue for a restaurant or entertainment.	This will need to be considered as part of detailed negotiations with future developers of the site.
D2/24/4	Local Resident	If the slipway is to be used the hovercraft cannot stay where they are.	The Seaplane Square will need to have management measures in place to ensure the space can be used flexibly by a range of users.
D2/24/5	Local Resident	If the museum is to survive it will require possibly two hangars.	Noted.
Heritage uses			
D2/15/3	Local Resident	The Hovercraft Museum could form a key part of the 'Seaplane Square heritage area' together with our Provincial Society historic Gosport and Fareham buses too and the Lee Flying Club.	Other aspects linked to the history of Daedalus will need to be accommodated on the site. Amend SPD accordingly.

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
D1/11/4	Defence Heritage Support Group	It would be nice to include a small display about Fleet Air Arm operations (as part of Hovercraft Museum or near the War Memorial).	
D2/65/11	Local Resident	Other museums could be encouraged to this historic area.	
Other suggested leisure uses			
D2/4/1	Local Resident	Motor racing circuit: fantastic opportunity for motor, kart and motorcycle racing which could generate relevant employment businesses.	Any proposal by a developer will be considered but it would be important not to conflict with the aviation potential for the site.
D2/9/8 D2/32/6 D2/34/1 D2/65/8	Local Residents (4)	Potential for leisure centre (sports hall gym)/public swimming pool. Holbrook is tatty and the use of Fareham results in northbound traffic (D2/9/8). Other facilities are some distance away (D2/32/6).	Holbrook will shortly be redeveloped with a new leisure centre/swimming pool facilities. There are no plans or resources for additional public facilities in the Borough. This does not preclude a private enterprise coming forward with a proposal for indoor sports facilities. Indeed certain buildings appear suitable for such facilities.
D2/33/1	Local Resident	The site could include a club for the 18-25's with bar, function room and live music/discos.	The SPD would allow for such a facility to be developed on the site. It would need to be in an appropriate building and ensure local amenities are not unduly affected.
D2/34/4 D2/65/9	Local Residents (2)	A cinema /theatre.	It is unlikely that a mainstream operator would operate in this location. The SPD would enable such a facility (maybe a small arthouse type/community-run venue) to be set up on the site if an entrepreneur or group considered there to be sufficient demand in the area.
Community facilities			
D2/19/1 D2/25/2	Local Residents (2)	Health centre could be provided on-site including: GP surgery and/or polyclinic to serve the needs of the elderly population (D2/19/1).	Agree there is scope for such facilities on the site. This is mentioned in the SPD.
D2/32/3	Local Resident	Daedalus may be an opportunity for an ambulance station/medical centre and possibly a fire station. Concerns regarding the overuse of QA Hospital since the	The NHS and ambulance service have been consulted on their infrastructure requirements in the Borough. No need has been expressed for an

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		closure of Haslar Hospital.	ambulance station. It is acknowledged that a new GP surgery is required within Lee and the SPD does make provision for such a use on the site.
D2/25/3	Local Resident	A large youth club/sports area could be provided.	Agree there is scope for such facilities on the site.
Retail uses			
D1/32/18	SEEDA	Para 4.23: Delete first sentence. Reference to small convenience store or specialist shops is too prescriptive.	GBC wishes to make it very clear that retail should be a very ancillary element to the Daedalus site and that Lee centre is close enough to the site to serve most of its needs. Any loosening of the current text has the potential to invite retail proposals that could cause harm to the centre. Whilst it is acknowledged that the PPS4 test mentioned in the text will be used, if the text was more permissive for retail a developer or planning inspector (on appeal) for instance could consider that the Council was encouraging a higher level of retail than intended. Indeed as a result of public consultation it is considered that the text could be made stronger to resist retail development.
D1/22/12	Lee-on-the-Solent Residents' Association	Support the need to protect Lee's High Street with it many individual shops.	Agree.

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
D1/6/5 D2/18/4 D2/11/10 D2/65/6 D2/71/6 D2/72/4	Lee Business Association Representative Local Residents (5)	Developers should not include any significant shops/supermarkets: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • this would be detrimental to the High Street (D2/18/4 & D2/65/6); • any large retail outlet coming to Lee would undermine the business interests of many uniquely independent small retailers. There is a need to protect local businesses (D1/6/5). 	<p>Agree. The Daedalus SPD makes it very clear that any retail on the Daedalus site would be limited. It suggests perhaps a small convenience store to serve the needs of the site or specialist retail (for example connected to the marine leisure sector).</p> <p>It also makes it clear that any proposed retail provision should not harm Lee Centre. Any proposals would need to meet the Government tests set out in its guidance PPS4: Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth including the requirements of an impact test. The Council's Adopted Local Plan Review (Policy R/S2) also aims to protect existing centres.</p> <p>The Borough Council is keen to ensure that Lee Centre remains a successful location for retail and associated businesses particularly with a good mix of independent businesses.</p>
D2/24/10	Local Resident	<p>The desire to maintain shopping facilities in Lee is strongly supported but facilities in the High Street are limited and can be easily swamped. Parking is limited and there is little space for shops to expand.</p> <p>More houses will mean more demand for more shops outside of the High Street which would then take business from the High Street and may cause its ultimate collapse.</p>	<p>Lee has good shopping facilities for its size and is currently very vibrant with high levels of occupancy. It is considered that there is sufficient parking within the vicinity of the centre (i.e. within 200 metres). New significant retail outside of the centre may detract from Lee High Street. Additional provision if required will be more appropriate on the edge of the existing centre. New housing is likely to support the existing centre as a proportion of household expenditure will be retained locally.</p>
D2/45/31	Local Resident	<p>Care will need to be taken that the existence of limited retail use will not itself be used as a justification for residential development.</p>	<p>Agree.</p>

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
D2/25/5	Local Resident	The Gosport area does not have many filling stations- a potential use on Daedalus	Any such proposals to come forward by a developer would be considered on its merits.
Residential uses: Support			
D1/25/5	Homes and Communities Agency	Support the inclusion of residential within the overall mix of uses. Mix of housing types and tenures is supported as is the aim of incorporating design and sustainability standards such as the Code for Sustainable Homes, Lifetime Homes and Secured By Design.	Noted.
D1/18/9	Defence Estates	The recognition of the importance of residential to the overall scheme is welcomed. The proposed location of residential, adjacent to existing housing is supported.	Noted.
Residential uses: Object-			
D2/2/3 D2/6/2 D2/24/8 D2/27/1 D2/62/4	Local Residents (5)	Too much residential proposed/No more housing.	The residential proposed is in accordance with the allocation set out in the Adopted Gosport Borough Local Plan Review in order to meet local housing needs.
D2/2/4 D2/24/9 D2/77/3	Local Residents (3)	New residential development will overwhelm existing roads and other infrastructure (doctors and other medical facilities, schools-D2/2/4 & D2/77/3) in combination with other developments in the area (including proposed development north of Fareham and Haslar). Where are the plans to provide more facilities? (D2/77/3)	The Borough Council will require appropriate contributions to deal with the impacts generated by the site.
Limits to residential development			
D1/22/14	Lee-on-the-Solent Residents' Association	Paras 4.25 and 5.82 should be made clear that 500 dwellings includes any in mixed development areas and included in the Married Quarters that have been built.	Para 4.25 has been amended to reflect the latest position regarding the Married Quarters. It will be made clear that the 500 allocation includes the existing Married Quarters and those proposed in the mixed use area. Para 5.82 relates specially to affordable housing which requires 40% of housing completions to be affordable.
D2/45/33	Local Residents (2)	The overall Local Plan Review allocation of 500 must not	It is the Council's intention that the 500 allocation

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
D2/11/1		be exceeded (preferably less-D2/52/2).	<p>identified in the Adopted Gosport Borough Local Plan Review will not be exceeded and that employment opportunities are maximised. This provision includes future Married Quarters if there is a demonstrated need as well as the conversion of historic buildings.</p> <p>However the Council considers that there may be exceptional circumstances where more housing is proposed and that this may be acceptable if it delivers the Council's key employment and heritage objectives for the site. Such residential development may be necessary to make the site viable for employment uses including the provision of necessary infrastructure. In such exceptional cases the developer will be required to robustly demonstrate that this is the case through an open book approach demonstrating the housing is necessary to make the site viable to deliver the overall objectives for the site.</p>
D2/23/2	Local Resident	There should be no more residential than that proposed in the SPD. Would be surprised if only 352 are built.	
D2/65/6	Local Resident	No more housing other than the MoD Married Quarters.	
D2/73/11	Local Resident	Opposed to large scale residential development except: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Married Quarters if there is still a need for these; May be scope for conversion of existing accommodation blocks into quality apartments 	
D2/60/4	Local Resident	If more houses are to be built please ensure that there is not too many to swamp and spoil the whole site. No more large housing estates.	
D1/22/16	Lee-on-the-Solent Residents' Association	Paragraph 4.28 should be deleted. This paragraph allows developers to contest the number of housing on the site. Extra workforce should come from Gosport area. There is adequate housing of all types for any extra workforce.	
D2/26/2	Local Resident	The reference to the consideration of a higher figure in exceptional circumstances is a loophole which seems to make the whole plan nonsensical.	
D2/45/4	Local Resident	The flexibility to consider a higher residential figure in order to help achieve the Council's key objective would allow the option of increasing residential even when maximisation of employment is not the justification for extra development.	
D2/45/5	Local Resident	The linkage of extra housing to maximise employment opportunities could lead to the subversion of already agreed upper housing limits for Gosport. What precautions will there be to prevent this happening?	
D2/45/15	Local Resident	Given the flat nature of the site there is an inherent danger of residential development being sought in the Fareham part of the site (4/5's of the site) against the wishes of	

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		Gosport Borough Council. Fareham has a recent record of agreeing large residential projects without adequate infrastructure.	located employment buildings associated with the airfield.
D2/45/32	Local Resident	Para 4.24: Considers that residential development will assist the financial viability of scheme-this emphasises the risk of residential development as time passes.	Noted.
D2/45/35	Local Resident	Para 4.28: Allowing higher figures in exceptional circumstances undermines the assurances about housing number limits in preceding paragraphs and could be used as justification to totally circumvent them.	The Council stresses the exceptional nature of housing figures and the need to clearly demonstrate the need for additional housing.
D1/18/12	Defence Estates	The possibility of developing more residential units on Daedalus than the allocated 352 units is noted.	Noted.
Residential uses: Impact on internationally and nationally important habitats			
D1/19/8 D1/27/12	Natural England Environment Agency	The potential higher/maximum number of residential units should be assumed for the purposes of HRA, applying the precautionary principle required by the Habitats Regulations.	The HRA for the Core Strategy builds-in any potential higher figures on brownfield sites such as Daedalus by assessing housing figures over the SE Plan figure of 2,500. A scenario of 4,000 dwellings has been tested although it is made very clear that this is not a target but is used to consider affects of growth higher than 2,500 dwellings. Such a scenario may be required to enable development of difficult brownfield sites with historic buildings and environmental constraints. Consequently the strategic impacts of growth in the peninsula have been identified in-combination with development in other areas and how these affect the European sites within south Hampshire. This information has been included in the HRA for the Daedalus SPD. However it should be made clear that in the case of Daedalus higher levels of housing (i.e. over 352 dwellings) will only be considered in exceptional circumstances which are set out. Therefore the

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
			Borough Council does not wish to identify a maximum figure of dwellings for the site as this is not the intention of the SPD and would therefore not be a meaningful assessment. Instead a guidance document such as the Daedalus SPD should highlight the issues that need to be considered if higher levels of residential development are proposed. Natural England's suggested amendment (D1/19/1) has therefore been included.
D1/19/9	Natural England	Section 4.27 should also refer to the environmental capacity and social benefits of the scheme.	Amend paragraph to mention that environmental capacity is also a consideration as well as economic viability. It is considered not necessary to specifically mention social benefits as this test would be more difficult to apply in this instance as it could be argued in all cases that housing will provide social benefits (directly by providing living accommodation or indirectly by making the site viable to allow the development of employment and other uses.)
D1/21/1	RSPB	<p>Proposed residential development is within 100m of internationally important sites with convenient access to those sites provided by the proposed pedestrian and cycle access at the western corner of the SPD. Concern that alone and in combination with other development in the wider area, the proposed residential development at Daedalus has the potential to place increased recreational pressure on these European sites.</p> <p>Concern that the timing of the SPD is in advance of the Solent Disturbance and Mitigation Project results and consequently it may not be possible to demonstrate that the proposed residential development will not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the European sites.</p>	<p>Following the HRA, the SPD has been amended to include text which is explicit about the pre-cautionary approach including the potential impact on recreational disturbance.</p> <p>It also includes text that mentions the need to include text regarding the findings of the Solent Disturbance and Mitigation Project where these are relevant to development at Daedalus. This could include provision of green infrastructure, improved links to green infrastructure and or improved management of green infrastructure. The need for a sub-regional and /or cross-boundary approach to this issue is acknowledged.</p>

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		<p>The results of the emerging SDMP must be fed into the SPD and the accompanying HRA to assess potential impacts and to inform a comprehensive mitigation strategy for the site.</p> <p>Any development that comes forward ahead of this research should be treated on a highly precautionary basis.</p>	
Residential Use: Married Quarters			
D1/18/1	Defence Estates	<p>Residential development would contribute to the overall vitality and sustainability of the site and should be seen as the most appropriate alternative use for the MoD owned land. Provision of Married Quarters would complement the existing area of Married Quarters.</p> <p>MoD fundamentally disagrees that the vacant MoD land could be used for employment purposes if it is ultimately declared surplus requirements by the MoD.</p>	<p>Agree that Married Quarters would complement existing Married Quarters. The SPD is positive to additional Married Quarters if there is a demonstrated need, particularly in the light of the Defence Review. The potential for the site for residential development is also acknowledged.</p> <p>The Council considers that part of the site may indeed be suitable for employment and that these options should be considered as part of the whole site if the land is declared surplus to MoD requirements.</p>
D1/18/10	Defence Estates	<p>Future requirements of Married Quarters are currently uncertain in the light of the recent Strategic Defence and Security Review. If the land is subsequently declared surplus to requirements, the MoD will seek to dispose of it. If not required by other Government departments, the land will be sold on the open market.</p> <p>If the land is disposed the MoD would support the use of the site for general residential purposes and would support the retention of the 352 allocation for the whole site.</p>	<p>The Council's requirement to show a genuine need is straight forward i.e. evidence to show that the MoD requires to build new housing in the Gosport area to serve MoD personnel.</p> <p>The reason why the Council is seeking Defence Estates to demonstrate need relates to the following. The 1997 Daedalus Development Strategy (approved both by the Borough Council and the Defence Estates Organisation) identified the land in question as the best location for employment use</p>

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
D1/18/11	Defence Estates	<p>MoD objects to the phrase 'genuine need' which implies that MoD may introduce needs that are not genuine. The SPD should specify exactly what the Council will require the MoD to provide to demonstrate that the site is required for Married Quarters purposes and should explain why this is an issue only for the Married Quarters site (as opposed to the sites to accommodate the other 200 dwellings allocated to Daedalus).</p> <p>If the alternative use of the site for residential purposes is supported, the requirement for MoD to provide evidence of need for the use of its land for Married Quarters should be removed from the SPD.</p>	<p>given its proximity to Broom Way. However when the original outline permission was granted for 300 dwellings an exception was made to meet a local need for Married Quarters.</p> <p>Now the permission for the second phase has lapsed there is now an opportunity to review the situation and consider the vacant MoD site as part of the whole Daedalus site. This represents good planning and allows opportunities to be explored which will help deliver a vibrant and viable employment-led site. The Council would likely have taken this position in relation to any other lapsed permission on the site.</p>
D2/63/1	Local Resident	Disappointed that the Council has refused the second phase of the Married Quarters site. Disagree that the MoD plans disrupt the overall planning of the Daedalus site. Piecemeal development would be quite possible within zoned areas.	
D2/73/12	Local Resident	Accept MoD housing if there is a need. Though the planned declines in the number of service personnel makes it difficult to justify additional service housing.	
D2/9/5	Local Resident	Is the provision of MoD housing to be affected by the 2010 Defence Review? If the housing is not required as a result will the number and mix of the houses be the same?	
D2/17/5	Local Resident	Pleased the 2 nd phase of MoD housing has been delayed as this would affect our peace and quiet.	
Residential: Location on site			
D1/32/19	SEEDA	The SPD is too prescriptive on the location of the residential development.	The SPD (paras 4.6 and 4.7) makes it clear that the potential location of uses is for illustrative purposes. The plans help to explain the development principles set out in the SPD. The Council will consider alternative proposals, consequently the Plan is not

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
			considered too prescriptive.
D1/22/13	Lee-on-the-Solent Residents' Association	Appreciate the way housing provides a buffer between the employment areas on the site to blend new development with the existing residential areas.	Noted.
Residential uses: Affordable housing-Support			
D1/25/7	Homes and Communities Agency	Provision to seek 40% affordable housing is supported.	Noted.
D2/3/5	Local Resident	Affordable housing should be incorporated into the site as per R/H5 –Need to define areas and units.	Noted- the affordable housing will operate in accordance with the Local Plan Review policy.
Residential uses: Affordable housing-Clarification			
D2/45/36	Local Resident	Para 4.29: Will the 40% affordable housing of new residential development apply?	Yes it will- add cross reference to the Development Considerations section.
D2/6/3	Local Resident	Affordable housing not defined. Should be for first-time buyers	Affordable housing could include provision for first-time buyers. The provision will be in accordance with the Borough-wide policy set out in the Local Plan Review.
D1/22/15	Lee-on-the-Solent Residents' Association	Clarification: Has the MoD contributed towards affordable housing? It is assumed and needs to be clarified that there will only be 40% of what housing is left to build.	The affordable housing will only be required on what housing is left to be built. In relation to the completed Married Quarters, there is a legal agreement in place which ensures that if this housing is released to the private market 40% will be required for affordable housing.
Residential uses: Mixed housing			
D2/32/4	Local Resident	What is meant by mixed housing? Aware of problems of having amalgamated council and private housing	Noted.
Residential uses: Retirement village			
D2/37/7	Local Resident	Maybe necessary to find a new focus for the site-such as a retirement home as opposed to aviation and marine use.	The SPD does not rule out such provision.
Marina -as the SPD is not proposing a Marina revised text on the marina issue is being moved from the Development Strategy section to the Development Consideration section in order to provide guidance if developers were considering such a proposal. It is not being promoted as part of the Daedalus site			
D1/19/11	Natural England	Para 4.30 states there is a potential for a marina. However it is not clear what the potential environmental	The draft findings of the Core Strategy HRA have concluded that there are significant environmental

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		<p>are.</p> <p>Unless there is clear evidence to demonstrate the impacts can be overcome, so as to avoid adverse effects on the integrity of designated sites, reference to a marina as a possible development option could potentially be misleading. Sections 4.31 and 5.42 also refer to assessment of any marina development at the project level. If a marina is being promoted at Core Strategy and SPD level this issue should be assessed in the HRA and SA/SEA at the strategic level.</p>	<p>issues in developing a marina.</p> <p>In the light of comments received to the consultation version of the SPD the text has been made clearer in that the SPD does not propose a marina nor is any marina proposed within the site covered by the SPD. Instead the SPD makes it clear that guidance is included in the SPD due to previous interest/suggestions for a marina by various parties which considered that this could complement development at Daedalus. The SPD instead provides guidance to such interested parties to advise that there are considerable environmental and other constraints and that significant further work and assessment is required to ensure that proposals would not have a detrimental impact on the European sites.</p>
D1/27/13	Environment Agency	<p>As stated in its response to the Core Strategy the EA would unlikely be able to support the option of a marina. In addition any potential impacts direct or indirect arising from the marina development would need to be appropriately assessed at a strategic level.</p>	<p>For further clarity the section on the marina has been moved from the 'Development Strategy section' to the 'Development Consideration section' thus making it clear that the marina does not form part of the development strategy for the site.</p>
D1/21/6	RSPB	<p>In the absence of a detailed appraisal of the marina proposal it may not be possible to demonstrate that the proposed SPD will not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the important European sites. Recommend that either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SPD clearly states that a marina development would not be supported in this location; or • The marina is screened in and subject to a full Appropriate Assessment in accordance with the Habitats Regulations. 	<p>The SPD section on the marina includes text which specifically states that a marina development would be refused if it is shown to have a detrimental impact on the European sites.</p>
D1/31/4	Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	<p>The WT objects to the inclusion of the statement '<i>There may be the potential for the development of a marina in the Solent close to the Daedalus site, adjacent the slipway...</i>' and '<i>It is considered that such a proposal would complement the development strategy for Daedalus</i>'.</p>	

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		WT consider that there are significant ecological issues relating to the proposals that will not be readily overcome. It will be critical to look at these before the SPD is adopted. Any mention of the marina should be left out of the SPD.	
D1/27/14	Environment Agency	Flood Defence consent from the EA may be required for any marina proposals. This should be included in para 4.32	Footnote added.
D1/22/17	Lee-on-the-Solent Residents' Association	Any benefits of a marina would need to balance the adverse visual and environmental impact a marina would have on Lee seafront with its safe bathing and spectacular views. Movement of boats from Daedalus to the marina would have an impact on the traffic flow of the B3333.	Agree such implications will need to be carefully assessed.
D2/45/37	Local Resident	Lee-on-the-Solent foreshore is not suitable for marina development for a number of reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It faces south-westerly winds and storms; • Sea-bed too shallow and would require dredging (aggravating storm damage from waves); • Site too close to major shipping routes. 	The SPD does not include a proposal for a marina. It just flags up the issues that need to be considered if a developer were to bring forward a proposal.
D2/43/1	Local Resident	Object to marina. Note that there is no plan for a marina and one is not shown in the plan. More reassurance is required that a marina will not be developed. It would destroy the character of Lee.	
D2/76/3	Local Resident	If a marina was viable it would have been built many years ago.	
D1/16/9	Hovercraft Museum	Possibility of a marina adjacent the slipway is a concern-could have an impact on the unrestricted access to the slipway.	
		There are significant ecological, tidal and wind	

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		considerations and the extensive works required to mitigate those constraints suggest it is unlikely to be feasible.	
D2/3/4	Local Resident	The Solent is already full. More marinas are not required.	
D2/9/9	Local Resident	Will the marina proposal be re-activated?	
D2/65/3	Local Resident	Marina sounds wonderful but have experts been consulted? Doubt whether it is feasible.	
D2/34/2	Local Resident	A marina would be a good job creation development.	Noted.
8. DEVELOPMENT CONSIDERATIONS			
D1/19/10	Natural England	<p>SPD makes a number of references to HRA at the project level including: Para 5.40-biodiversity, 5.60 air pollution, 5.61 contaminated land, 5.71 waste water treatment.</p> <p>However the Habitat Regulations require that there is reasonable certainty at a policy level that development allocations are deliverable without adverse effects on the integrity of designated sites. SPD must be subject to robust assessment and could include the need for policy caveats where there are residual uncertainties depending on how a policy is implemented.</p>	The SPD has been subject to an Habitats Regulation Assessment and as a result the SPD includes a number of policy caveats where there are residual uncertainties depending on how the SPD is implemented.
D1/19/12 D1/27/15	Natural England Environment Agency	<p>Both agencies would support reference to Green Infrastructure including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • links to PUSH GI Projects; • links to Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (D1/19/12); • an illustrative map as a strategic guide for developers where GI could be incorporated throughout the site; • links off-site such as the Alver Valley (D1/27/15); • Ensure design of existing and new work places leads to attractive green environments for business wishing to locate in the sub-region. GI would help achieve this (D1/27/15). 	A new green infrastructure section has been included in the SPD which makes the links to PUSH GI projects and the forthcoming findings of the Solent Disturbance and Mitigation Strategy. The SPD makes reference to improving linkages with the Alver Valley.

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"> Water quality benefits (D1/27/15) 	
Design and built heritage			
D1/32/20	SEEDA	Para 5.3: Reference should be made to the tests in PPS5 in respect of the protection of heritage assets.	Any application will need to have regard to all PPS's there is no specific need to single out PPS5 in these paragraphs.
D1/32/21	SEEDA	Para 5.4: Reference to national policy tests should be updated to reflect the provisions of PPS5.	
D1/32/22	SEEDA	<p>Para 5.5: Amend to read:</p> <p>The design of the proposals should be sensitive to its setting, and Planning applications <u>which are considered to impact on a designated heritage asset</u> should be accompanied by <u>a</u> detailed visual impact assessments, the detail of which should be agreed with GBC.</p>	The text should remain unchanged as the proposed amendment is too limited in its scope and does not reference the setting of the Conservation Area or the broader setting of all heritage assets.
D1/32/24	SEEDA	<p>Para 5.8 should recognise that due to the size of the Waterfront site development will come forward in phases. Suggested amendment:</p> <p>It is important that the re-use of these buildings take place <u>at the appropriate phases</u> at an early stage of the site's development.</p>	It should remain a priority to bring forward their restoration at an early stage and the text should therefore remain unchanged.
D1/32/23	SEEDA	Plan 7 Buildings immediately to the south of Dunning and Swann Hangars are shown as worthy of record. SEEDA does not share this view and should be removed from this category.	The CMP prepared for SEEDA identifies these buildings and sets out the basic level of recording necessary for them. It is considered best practice to identify levels of recording for all buildings of heritage value on the site whether they are to be retained or not. The buildings identified would be regarded as heritage assets worthy of the basic level of recording where their demolition is proposed.
D1/16/1	Hovercraft Museum	Encouraging to note a positive attitude to retaining historic buildings specifically the proposed listing of the J Class Hangars and Winch House.	Noted.
D2/60/5	Local Resident	Nice buildings on the site should be incorporated and embraced wholeheartedly in any future plans.	Agree.

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
D2/73/6	Local Resident	Priority should be given to the Listed Buildings in the Waterfront area and around Barracks Square.	Agree.
D2/6/5	Local Resident	Not enough Conservation.	It is considered that the SPD includes significant reference to built heritage. The biodiversity and green infrastructure section also places significant weight on nature conservation.
D2/45/38	Local Resident	Given the public expenditure constraints who will undertake the comprehensive repair and refurbishment of the listed buildings?	Private developers/Landowner.
D1/26/2	Hampshire County Council	Amend paragraph 5.12 in relation to what is required as part of an archaeological assessment and mitigation strategy (text supplied in HCC submission).	Amend text accordingly.
Open space/green infrastructure			
D1/27/3	Environment Agency	SPD does not embrace Green Infrastructure (GI) or the benefits that GI can bring to a community such as recreation, sustainable travel and provision of new and enhanced biodiversity areas.	Whilst many of these elements were previously included in the SPD, in order to provide greater prominence on this issue a new section has been added to the SPD which includes the on and off-site infrastructure requirements and opportunities relating to the Daedalus site with the relevant cross-references.
D2/17/2 D2/27/4	Local Residents (2)	As much green space should be preserved (and created D2/27/4)	These opportunities are set out in the new Green Infrastructure section.
D2/14/3	Local Resident	There needs to be enough open space for leisure and opportunities for younger age groups for leisure.	
D2/77/6	Local Resident	Need to create a huge green park between Lee and Stubbington.	
D2/41/11	Local Resident	No mention is made to use part of the site for agriculture.	This may be relevant for the north east part of the site within FBC area.
D2/73/10	Local Resident	Greater emphasis should be given to food production for a sustainable future. The planned allotments [in Hangars West in FBC] should be used for intensive market gardening.	This may be relevant for the north east part of the site within the FBC area for agriculture. The FBC Core Strategy has allocated land for allotments on the western side of Daedalus.

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
D2/74/1	Local Resident	Concerned that the Draft SPD does not include an extension of the Lee-on-the-Solent allotment site. Ideal opportunity to provide additional plots to the south of the proposed new access road.	This area is considered suitable for employment and will represent a gateway business area on Broom Way giving the site greater prominence.
Sustainable Construction			
D1/18/13 D1/19/13 D1/25/6 D1/27/16	Defence Estates Natural England Homes and Communities Agency Environment Agency	The requirement for sustainable construction is supported.	Noted.
D1/33/3	Portsmouth Water	Para 5.15 refers to the PUSH Sustainability Framework and the possibility that Daedalus could be an exemplar site. The recent Havant Borough Council Core Strategy Inspector's Report sets out reasons why higher levels of Code for Sustainable Homes (CfSH) may be unsound. Portsmouth Water would urge GBC to adopt cost effective policies which developers and customers will find acceptable.	The detailed references to the CfSH and the BREAM standards have been removed from the SPD. Instead provision is made to ensure the SPD links to the relevant policy of the Core Strategy, once it has been adopted.
D1/33/2	Portsmouth Water	Para 5.16: Levels 5 and 6 of the CfSH can only be achieved with rain water harvesting or grey water re-use. This standard is not cost effective or sustainable and does not reflect the 'Updated Draft Water Resources Management Plan'. Table 2 should be altered to remove references to level 6 of the Code and to defer compliance with level 4 until 2016. This will allow time for developers and customers to adapt to the higher water efficiency standards.	
Energy efficiency and renewable energy			
D1/19/14	Natural England	Generally support proposed efficiencies in energy.	Noted.
D2/3/3	Local Resident	Energy efficiency, solar heating/generation should be a requirement (not an aim).	The SPD outlines the potential for energy efficiency and renewable energy. This gives developers the flexibility to improve efficiency and/or generate
D2/41/7	Local Resident	Take the opportunity for the site to be self-sustaining in	

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		power. Lee tends to be windy in the winter and sunny in the summer hence the site should take advantage of Government subsidies to build solar arrays and a wind turbine together with power storage facilities (giant lithium battery) when power can not be generated.	renewable power/heating in order to meet the relevant Building Regulations and the relevant Code for Sustainable Homes or BREEAM standard. Consequently there is a requirement to deliver energy efficiency/renewable energy but in accordance with the relevant standards. Further work is required by developers to ascertain the feasibility and viability of renewable energy on the site.
D2/45/39	Local Resident	Para 5.16: The 'open book' process of scrutinising sustainable construction should involve the Regulatory Board and other GBC Boards.	The results of this process would be reported to the relevant Board.
D1/18/14	Defence Estates	The requirements regarding energy efficiency and renewable energy for the Married Quarters site should be clarified.	The Married Quarters site should be considered as part of the rest of the Daedalus site and therefore opportunities to consider the appropriate renewable energy schemes should be considered either as part of a whole site scheme or just the vacant MoD land by itself if Defence Estates were only interested in pursuing development on this site in isolation.
D1/27/17	Environment Agency	Any testing or development of a ground source heat pump system must consider the potential for contamination. The EA would wish to be consulted on the development of any such scheme including the placement of any infrastructure required for use. Web link given and further details supplied.	Amend text accordingly.
Use of water resources			
D1/19/15	Natural England	Generally support proposed efficiencies in water consumption.	Noted.
D1/33/4	Portsmouth Water	Para 5.27 should not specify how the Code levels are achieved and it should not refer to rainwater harvesting or greywater recycling for domestic properties. Rain water harvesting may be cost effective for commercial uses such	The detailed references to the CfSH and BREEAM standards have been removed from the SPD. Instead provision has been made in an earlier paragraph to ensure the SPD links to the relevant

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		as vehicle washing.	policy of the Core Strategy, once it has been adopted. It appears to be acceptable to refer to rainwater harvesting as a potential option particularly as the requirement of the higher code level is no longer included in the text.
Flood risk			
D1/27/5	Environment Agency	Welcome reference of the potential impact development may have on surface water drainage and flood risk. Infrastructure will be required to manage the risk.	Noted.
D1/27/18	Environment Agency	Para 5.30: These are the minimum requirements for an outline planning application depending upon the particular matters for consideration.	Add footnote to this regard.
D1/20/1	Havant, Portsmouth and Gosport Coastal Defence Partnership	Part of the slipway is in Floodzone 2.	The slipway shown within the Daedalus site boundary is not shown on the latest EA Plans as being within Flood Zone 2. It is proposed to retain the slipway as a slipway and not for other forms of development.
D1/27/19	Environment Agency	Welcome the inclusion of SuDS and the identification of potential difficulties where contamination is present. SuDS can also contribute to GI.	Noted.
D1/20/3	Havant, Portsmouth and Gosport Coastal Defence Partnership	Should be a reference to the effects of sub-surface water movement and the total effects on the nearby River Alver	Text added on groundwater quality.
D1/18/15	Defence Estates	The Council's requirement with regard to the Flood Risk Assessment should be clarified. Is a strategic FRA being required for the whole of the Daedalus site, including the MoD owned-land? Is so who is to undertake it?	The whole of the Daedalus site is over 1ha and therefore in accordance with PPS25. A Flood Risk Assessment is required to accompany any planning application which would be carried out by the developer. Similarly if the MoD land comes forward separately

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
			<p>as the site is over 1ha a Flood Risk Assessment would be required.</p> <p>In relation to a strategic flood risk assessment of major sites. Stage 1 has been prepared by the PUSH authorities and a more detailed one has been undertaken as part of the emerging Core Strategy. At a strategic level the study is broader in nature and this demonstrates that Daedalus is an appropriate site to include in the LDF as a development site given its low risk of tidal or fluvial flooding.</p>
D1/1/7	Advanced Marine Innovation Technology Subsea Ltd	Greatest longer term risk is ignored.	The SPD requires developers to submit a Flood Risk Assessment with a planning application to deal with any identified flood risk issues including surface water drainage.
D2/45/40	Local Resident	Para 5.28: Poor site drainage raises the possibility that the airfield is unsuitable for development. Who provides the anticipated storm water drainage infrastructure?	It is proposed that the airfield will remain as an operational runway. The private developer would pay for the necessary improvements as with any other development site.
Coastal management			
D1/20/2	Havant, Portsmouth and Gosport Coastal Defence Partnership	Any changes to the coastline as a result of the proposals could have a significant effect on coastal processes and the changes would need to be assessed and post construction effects noted in the long term monitoring.	This is mentioned under development considerations for the marina.
Waste and recycling			
D1/27/20	Environment Agency	After the construction phase the on-going activities associated with housing or business will generate waste and this also needs to be considered. Critical appropriate facilities for the storage and collection of recyclable materials with guidance and info provided by GBC on recycling and separate collection of waste of both householders and business.	Agree. This is set out under paragraph 5.35. Amend to refer to consultation with GBC relating to local requirements.

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
Noted.	Natural England	Generally support proposed minimisation of waste and waste recycling.	Noted.
D2/45/41	Local Resident	Para 5.33: No construction and demolition waste should be dumped or buried at Daedalus given the fears for other pollution within the Daedalus site.	Agree. There are no proposals in the Hampshire Waste Local Plan to include Daedalus as a landfill site. No proposals are outlined in the SPD.
D2/27/5	Local Resident	Wasteful and environmentally damaging demolition of buildings to make way for higher density development should be avoided.	Agree-
D1/27/21	Environment Agency	Encourage the development of new recovery technologies as part of an integrated solution to achieving the highest levels of recycling and recovery and where possible these should include the distribution of heat and power. A waste management park could provide a wide range of facilities, employment opportunities and be an incentive for business. It can deliver on the goal of communities taking responsibility for their own waste.	Acknowledge that such facilities will deliver both employment and environmental benefits. The SPD enables such facilities to be considered within the framework of the Council's wider employment objectives. Potential for CHP is mentioned elsewhere in the SPD.
D1/22/18	Lee-on-the-Solent Residents' Association	If the recycling facility is to be large and for County use it is necessary to take account of the impact on local roads and if it generates dust, smoke or attracts scavenging birds it will have an impact on the airfield and any hi-tech employment as well as the amenities of local residents. Any consideration for an on-site recycling facility should be retained purely for the use of occupiers of the Daedalus site only.	Acknowledge that any such facility would have traffic and other environmental considerations. These would need to be addressed by a Traffic Impact Assessment and an Environmental Impact Assessment as part of any planning application. Facilities that would impact on the airfield would not be acceptable. The site is not currently identified by HCC as a recycling site but the Borough Council considers it important to provide guidance if such a facility is proposed over the potential longer term. Important that any facility should not detract from the Council's overall objective for significant employment including encouraging hi-tech industries to the site. It is also

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
			acknowledged that such facilities can provide local jobs as well as meet the Borough's own waste requirements.
Nature Conservation: Overall protection and enhancement			
D1/27/2	Environment Agency	SPD does not sufficiently consider the issues of protection and enhancement of nature conservation on site despite it being mentioned as key development consideration in the SPD and is a key policy in the emerging Core Strategy.	The SPD includes measures to protect and enhance nature conservation both on and off-site. It also requires an ecological assessment to accompany a planning application (para 8.4) A green infrastructure section has been added to be more explicit about the potential for green infrastructure both on and off the site. Paragraph 5.45 has been amended to include further opportunities.
Nature Conservation: Internationally important habitats			
D1/19/17	Natural England	Para 5.36 states that the final Core Strategy HRA will set out appropriate mitigation measures for internationally important habitats. However NE recommends that the SPD will need a robust assessment for HRA drawing on the findings of the Core Strategy HRA.	The HRA, in the light of comments received from Natural England identifies a number of additional measures/text wording which have been incorporated into the SPD.
D1/19/18	Natural England	Para 5.38: Refers to recreational access toward the south and east being promoted for particular types of activities. Again recommend that the HRA should assess these impacts and identify the types of activities which will avoid any adverse impacts on designated sites.	Encouraging recreation along Lee seafront eastwards of Daedalus would deflect pressure further west towards Hill Head (which is part of the SPA). Similarly improved links to the Alver Valley would also provide recreational opportunities in less sensitive areas. Reference is made in the text to consider the findings of the Solent Disturbance and Mitigation Project.
D1/19/19	Natural England	Para 5.39 states measures within the Core Strategy will ensure that the Daedalus site will not have an adverse effect on European sites. Although general mitigation measures are referred to, this will require quantified evidence and mitigation, in order to demonstrate that adverse effects will be avoided.	It is considered that the HRA conducted for the SPD is appropriate for this level of planning document. It is not until the project level i.e. application stage that there will be some indication of the types of use and how these could impact on the European sites. It is at this stage when quantified evidence and

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
			mitigation will be required.
D1/27/4	Environment Agency	Welcome reference of the potential impact development may have on water quality in relation to biodiversity considerations.	Noted.
D1/27/22	Environment Agency	Reassuring that the emerging HRA relating to the potential option for the marina has been used to inform the SPD.	Noted.
D1/33/5	Portsmouth Water	Para 5.39 refers to abstraction from sensitive river habitats. This does not reflect the current licence situation and the work that has been done to protect habitats. Water efficiency is an important tool to balance supply and demand but standards need to be affordable and pragmatic.	<p>Agree and remove reference from the paragraph.</p> <p>The impact of abstraction was identified as a potential impact at the Screening stage of the HRA. The emerging HRA for the Core Strategy (which has been used for the Daedalus HRA) has found that the demand for water in the South Hampshire area can be met without any detrimental impacts on the European sites.</p> <p>However it has been necessary to include a precautionary approach in the SPD as growth in Gosport Borough (including Daedalus) could potentially exceed the growth set out in the SE Plan (which was used as the basis for the relevant evidence studies). This growth would take place in exceptional circumstances in order to help enable the regeneration of difficult sites. That said this is likely to be more than offset by reductions in proposed housing elsewhere in the sub-region following the proposed revocation of the SE Plan</p>

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
			(such as in Fareham BC and Portsmouth CC areas). The Council however continues to include provisions for the Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM standards for commercial buildings to ensure buildings are built to incorporate recognised sustainable standards, including water efficiency measures. The relevant standard will be examined as part of the proposals for the Core Strategy. The SPD makes it clear that these standards will only apply if adopted as part of the Core Strategy and then the viability of such measures would still be considered.
Nature Conservation: Protected species on-site			
D1/19/20	Natural England	In relation to bats refer to Natural England's standing advice on protected species. Development proposals would need to meet these tests in order for any necessary licence to be obtained.	Refer to Natural England's Standing Advice.
D1/32/25	SEEDA	Para 5.43: Use phrase 'have been recorded within' rather than 'are known to be present'.	Amend accordingly.
D1/32/26	SEEDA	Question whether Great Crested Newts have been found on the site.	Amend. Potential newt habitat identified. The Ecological Report adds that the lack of records for Great Crested Newt does not prove their absence. Further surveys required.
D2/7/1	Local Resident	Need to have regard to Sky Larks. Will there be a bird survey?	A planning application will need to be accompanied with the appropriate ecological reports including protected species such as badgers. This requirement is made clear in the SPD.
D2/9/7	Local Resident	Retention of open space is important. Much wildlife is now present on Daedalus (badgers, deer, birds). Re-development must be as green as possible in connection	An ecological assessment accompanying future planning applications will need to include the appropriate mitigation measures including the

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		with the habitat creation plan to the north-east and centre of the site.	retention of open space. Further details have been added to the SPD in relation to potential opportunities both in terms of the green infrastructure network (new green infrastructure section) and enhancing habitats (biodiversity section).
D2/17/4	Local Resident	Strips of land around the edge of Daedalus should be left wild for the protection of wildlife (badgers, birds etc).	
D2/23/3	Local Resident	Wildlife will be affected by the new proposals-this should be kept to a minimum. This is an attractive area with skylarks, owls and butterflies.	
D2/53/1 D2/64/1 D2/67/1	Local Residents (3)	Concern regarding the impact of development on badger habitats on the Daedalus site including a sett. Space required for foraging.	
Nature Conservation: Measures to enhance biodiversity on-site			
D1/19/20 D1/27/23	Natural England Environment Agency	Support para 5.45. Suggest following references: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • need for green infrastructure linkage with networks outside of the site. • Sustainable drainage systems ((D1/27/23). 	Amend text accordingly.
D1/6/2	Lee Business Association Representative	Support emphasis on habitat.	Noted.
D2/50/1	Local Resident	Trees should be preserved on parts of the site including the trees on the southern border of the MoD Married Quarters site. Need full time guards to protect trees from clearance.	Agree important trees need to be retained on the site. The ecological and townscape assessments to accompany forthcoming planning applications will identify important trees to be retained. The Borough Council will be able to protect identified trees through condition and/or a Tree Preservation Order if that level of protection where appropriate. The importance to preserve important natural features has also been added as a design principle in Para 7.7.
Nature Conservation: Invasive plant species			
D1/27/24	Environment Agency	Support that the document sets out steps to eradicate invasive plants from the site.	Noted.

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
Nature Conservation: Habitats within FBC			
D2/73/4	Local Resident	Support proposal for biodiversity and habitat creation in the area north of Hangars East [in FBC area]. This could include market gardening including reserved allotments for young people including for educational purposes.	Noted-Proposals will need to be considered by FBC.
D2/73/5	Local Resident	Existing woodland adjacent Hangars East on Broom Way should be considered an extension of the Alver Valley Country Park and managed accordingly with improved footpath and bridleway access. The Strategic Gap function of the woods and fields on either side of Broom Way needs safeguarding.	Agree this area should be considered as part of a wider green infrastructure network linking Stokes Bay/Browndown, the Alver Valley with the open part of Daedalus with the countryside area in the Strategic Gap. The wooded area itself is currently unavailable to be used for public purposes. The new green infrastructure section refers to these matters.
D2/45/42	Local Resident	No mention is made of development within the Fareham part of the site.	The whole site plan developed in conjunction with Daedalus shows that the airfield site will be retained and areas within Fareham will be managed for biodiversity.
Amenity Issues			
D2/42/2	Local Resident	If Richmond Road is within the masterplan or adjacent to it what are the plans for compensation for residents owning properties in Richmond Road blighted by the plan?	Richmond Road is not within the area covered by the Daedalus SPD but is adjacent to the area covered. Detailed proposals will be considered as part of a planning application and residents will have an opportunity to comment on detailed matters of concern.
Lighting			
D1/19/22	Natural England	Recommend Para 5.50 should take into account the need to maintain dark areas which may be important for bat roosting or foraging.	It is acknowledged that light pollution is an important consideration and that there is a need to protect dark areas particularly within the strategic gap which is primarily in the FBC area. Policies for this area aim to safeguard its character. Reference made to

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
			this consideration.
Noise pollution			
D2/24/2	Local Resident	Daedalus adjoins established housing and any industry would therefore need to be clean, relatively quiet and not require frequent movement of heavy vehicles.	These issues will need to be fully considered as part of an Environmental Impact Assessment to accompany a detailed planning application. The SPD makes it clear that measures need to be put in place to reduce the impact of noise on surrounding properties.
D2/40/3	Local Resident	Noise is already an issue for local residents and would increase if new housing is built.	
D2/45/43	Local Resident	Primary purpose of the development is employment-led. There will be commercial pressures for minimal enforcement of noise legislation. To allow occupants of existing and future residential development to influence how legislation is enforced will create a perpetual contradiction for GBC to sort out. Increased residential development will increase the potential for noise complaints.	
Air pollution			
D1/32/27	SEEDA	Para 5.59: For operational purposes phase impacts, the need for both detailed air quality dispersion modelling in relation to should be carried out to determine the potential impact on local air quality from traffic flows and commercial activities and for odour assessment should be established using current industry guidelines.' and potentially dispersion modelling should also be carried out for relevant commercial developments, including waste facilities, to determine mitigation/abatement measures to be incorporated.	Considered that there is no need to change from the original text.
D2/45/44	Local Resident	What happens if the proposed development will have adverse environmental consequences that cannot be overcome? Does the whole development stop?	The Borough Council would need an understanding of what the adverse environmental impacts were, what mitigation measures were proposed, would they be effective, and if not what other proposals were feasible. This would need to be informed by

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
			an Environmental Impact Assessment with advice from the relevant experts and statutory agencies. The Borough Council will refuse applications where there are significant adverse environmental implications.
Contaminated Land			
D1/27/25	Environment Agency	Points in Contaminated Land Section are welcomed.	Noted.
D1/27/26	Environment Agency	The section should include reference to the potential benefits from the identification and remediation (where necessary) of contamination for the environment including streams, underground water and coastal water.	The section in the SPD is considered sufficiently detailed with references to the relevant documents and agencies for further information.
D1/27/27	Environment Agency	Proposals could implement remedial techniques that would ensure a sustainable development which minimises off-site removal of contaminated soils; the site could be an exemplar for sustainable remediation technologies.	
D1/27/28	Environment Agency	Comments in Para 5.65 relating to surface water drainage should also consider and reflect points stated in Para 5.30. SuDS in addition to flood attenuation with protection and enhancement of controlled waters can provide opportunities. The document could be more aspirational in its approach.	The section in the SPD is considered sufficiently detailed with references to the relevant documents and agencies for further information.
D1/32/28	SEEDA	Reference to the application stage needs to be clarified. SEEDA does not anticipate that the level of required further survey data set out in Para 5.63 would be necessary as part of an outline planning application, but could be secured by way of a suitable planning condition.	No change. Development Control advises that further studies will be required at the application stage. Other elements can be agreed through condition depending on the findings of the studies.
D2/45/45	Local Resident	What happens if excessive contamination is found on site? Does the whole development stop and who pays for remedial measures given the constraints on MoD finances, forthcoming demise of SEEDA and public sector finance constraints?	The Borough Council will need to consider the findings of the relevant contamination studies with further advice from the Environment Agency. The developer will be required to pay for the relevant mitigation measures.
D2/45/46	Local Resident	No reference is made to the complications posed by the	If this is a significant issue with regard to potential

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		Bracklesham Beds locally. Any remedial strategy will need to take account of the tendency of sea water to travel inland from lee foreshore along the Bracklesham Beds.	contamination, such as having a role in source-pathway-receptor relationships this would need to be detailed in the relevant contamination reports.
Utilities			
D1/14/1	Southern Water	Supports section on utilities.	Noted.
D1/27/6	Environment Agency	Welcome reference of the potential impact development may have upon utilities.	Noted.
D1/1/3	Advanced Marine Innovation Technology Subsea Ltd	The provision of utilities to serve the site is not adequately addressed.	The Daedalus SPD provides a framework for making decisions. It aims to highlight the key issues associated with infrastructure provision so that developers are aware of both the potential investment requirements and where further information is required. This information has been provided by the relevant utility companies and other work undertaken by SEEDA.
Water supply, treatment and sewerage			
D1/27/8	Environment Agency	The protection and enhancement of water quality has not been made explicitly clear. The Water Framework Directive and the Shellfish Waters Directive are particularly relevant to the site. No new development should cause a deterioration in water quality and where possible lead to enhancements. This is backed by Saved Policy R/ENV2 of the Local Plan Review.	Add a section under Sustainable Construction: Use and Protection of Water Resources regarding the need to protect water quality.
D1/33/1	Portsmouth Water	May be sensible to consider a new spine supply to commercial and housing developments along the proposed main road through the site.	Amend SPD to make reference to this.
D1/27/7	Environment Agency	Welcome reference of the environmental and treatment capacity issues at Peel Common Waste Water Treatment works, the links to water efficiency and the requirement to liaise with Southern Water to ensure that these issues are	Noted.

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		considered at an early stage.	
D1/14/1	Southern Water	Supports section on water supply, treatment and sewerage. Para 5.71 correctly highlights the potential environmental constraints at Peel Common. Representation includes further clarification.	Noted. Text included in Southern Water's representation has been added to the SPD.
D2/45/47	Local Resident	Investigations into the capacity of nearby Peel Common Wastewater Treatment Works should be completed and remedial works arising therefrom be completed before any development within Daedalus takes place.	See Southern Water's comments above.
D1/14/3	Southern Water	With regard to the local sewerage system (the underground pipes and associated pumping stations) there is insufficient capacity in the system to accommodate the proposed development. Such enhancements should be paid for by the development. This needs to be recognised in the SPD. Southern Water proposes a paragraph similar to paragraph 5.70 regarding this issue.	Noted. Include Southern Water's comments in the SPD.
Specific Employment and Commercial Development Considerations			
D1/22/19	Lee-on-the-Solent Residents' Association	Concern that skill and training requirements will be placing demands on potential newcomers. The site has many disadvantages and we need to encourage rather than deter business investing in Daedalus.	This is an important issue and it is envisaged the Borough Council will work closely with developers and potential employers to ensure that the requirements are not onerous and benefit both the company and the local workforce.
D2/45/48	Local Resident	Given the state of public finances, developer contributions are going to have to be relied upon to a greater degree. Will this undermine GBC as LPA?	No the LPA will continue to determine applications in relation to national and local policy.
D1/19/20	Natural England	Para 5.78 should set that developer contributions will be required to conserve and enhance the natural environment including the provision or enhancement of multi-functional green infrastructure and other mitigation	In order to deliver other sustainability benefits such as local employment to reduce poverty, out commuting and associated congestion, air pollution and carbon emissions. The Council needs to be

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		measures,	careful not to deter businesses by onerous developer contribution requirements. Other environmental considerations are already included in Paragraph 5.78 but an amendment can be made to refer to Habitat Regulation considerations.
D1/32/29	SEEDA	Para 5.79: SEEDA agrees that development should aim to maximise employment opportunities. However explicitly identifying that large scale warehousing should be limited could conflict with the aim to attract aviation and marine-led employment. Potential occupiers could require warehouse accommodation. Delete first sentence.	Accept that warehousing could form part of marine and aviation business. Retain the safeguards against low employment uses dominating the site.
D1/22/20	Lee-on-the-Solent Residents' Association	Support paragraph 5.79. Low generating uses such as warehousing would be disastrous creating fewer jobs, major HGV movements adding significantly to road congestion and environmental degradation.	Agree. However in the light of SEEDA's representation there may be scope for some warehousing in connection with certain employment uses. See above.
Specific Aviation Considerations			
D1/30/3	Fareham Borough Council	Para 5.81 is supported.	Noted.
D1/3/1	Civil Aviation Authority	On the basis that no structure is expected to be higher than 100ft (30.48m) there would be no en-route navigation issue.	Noted.
D1/3/2	Civil Aviation Authority	It is acknowledged that the development's location in relation to the Lee-on-the-Solent aerodrome/runway is such that there is clearly the potential for development to have aerodrome safeguarding implications and that the safeguarding of the aerodrome needs to be a prime consideration. In the absence of the detail in the SPD regarding proposed structures the CAA have provided a guide providing an overview of the types of development that the CAA may have interest in [included in full on file]. According to the CAA guide, the CAA and/or aerodrome	Noted. Include CAA advice. The site will not include any tall buildings. However the requirement for consultation on wind turbines and telecommunication masts could be added to the SPD for the avoidance of doubt. The MCA have been consulted regarding the proposals for the site and will be consulted regarding future planning applications.

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		<p>operator will need to be consulted on proposals for tall buildings (over 90metres in height), wind turbines and telecommunications installation.</p> <p>Safeguarding responsibility rests in all cases with the relevant aerodrome licensee/operator and it is essential that the Council establishes the associated viewpoint of the operator (i.e. the MCA).</p>	
D1/28/11	Lee Flying Association	<p>Para 5.81: Support but concerned that the proposed development at the end of the north-south runway would reduce the attractiveness of the site to aviation business.</p> <p>Proposed road at end of Ross House is within the minimum lateral safety zone applied to runway areas. Significant safety issues which would arise from placing a junction in this location. Road would reduce attractiveness of the airfield for aviation and result in reducing the length of the runway.</p>	<p>The proposed indicated road at the eastern end of the site has been realigned southwards so as not to use part of the taxiways for the north-south access. Any forthcoming applicant will be required to submit information to demonstrate that their proposals will not unduly affect the operations of the airfield, for example by constructing buildings that would affect the runway.</p> <p>In relation to the western access it is considered that a new road would not have any impact on the current unlicensed nature of the airfield. If it were proposed in the future to license the airfield it would be necessary to reduce the length of the runway, which would still be fully operational. This change would be due to the presence of Ross House and consequently the introduction of a new road in this location would make no difference to operations of the airfield. This evidence is contained in the Airfield and Safeguarding Study (Mott MacDonald Feb 2011).</p>
D2/40/4	Local Resident	Further airport use outside of the working day should be avoided-noise issues.	Acknowledged that future planning application for airfield operation will need to be accompanied by an Environmental Impact Assessment and considered

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
			accordingly including noise impacts.
D2/41/6	Local Resident	The utilities on the site need upgrading	Acknowledged. Include further details as a result of SEEDA's aviation study.
Specific residential development considerations:			
Mix of dwellings sizes and types			
D1/18/16	Defence Estates	The density of MoD housing is largely defined by the need to meet specified standards for elements such as garden lengths and room dimensions. The Married Quarters application showed a density of 30 dwellings per hectare. There is little scope for increasing the density.	Noted. 30 dwellings per hectare is considered acceptable.
D2/45/49	Local Resident	Provision for one of the oldest age profiles in Hampshire directly contradicts employment creation aims.	The site is a strategic employment site and will not only provide jobs for Lee residents but elsewhere in the Borough which will help reduce out-commuting from the Peninsula.
Home working			
D1/18/17	Defence Estates	The size and number of rooms for Married Quarters is also provided at Mod approved scale and there is no scope for providing additional features that might encourage home working.	Noted. Para 5.89 only recognises the potential and does not require such facilities. Importantly it clearly highlights that any such properties count towards the outstanding 352 housing allocation and are not additional to it.
D1/1/6	Advanced Marine Innovation Technology Subsea Ltd	The number of real jobs that can be supported by home working is extremely limited.	Agree. The reference is made to home working in the SPD to provide guidance to developers that home working on the site is a possibility but this will count towards the outstanding housing allocation and will not be a 'loophole' to provide additional housing on the site.
D2/20/7	Local Resident	Could home working also reduce in-commuting?	Noted.
D2/45/50	Local Resident	Total site allocation must not be exceeded.	Any home working provision would count towards this provision.
Infrastructure and Supporting Services including developer contributions			
D1/19/20 D1/27/29	Natural England Environment Agency	Para 5.90 (and 5.98–D1/19/20) should state that developer contributions will be required to conserve and	Amend accordingly.

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		enhance the natural environment including the provision or enhancement of multi-functional green infrastructure and other mitigation measures.	
D1/29/2	Sport England	Paras 5.90, 5.93-5.98: SE would like to highlight a number of SE tools that may assist in calculating demand generated by the development. A potential developer contribution figure towards sports facilities is suggested (details supplied).	This will be appropriate as part of the Council's forthcoming CIL work.
D1/18/18	Defence Estates	The MoD accepts the need to mitigate the impacts on surrounding infrastructure and to increase where necessary. However Officer Married Quarters often have smaller household sizes than comparable civilian development. In addition a significant number of officers choose to educate their children at boarding schools to reduce unsettling experiences of moving house and school. Both these factors mean a standard formula approach may not be appropriate in calculating the need for additional educational provision. Similarly the need for open space, indoor leisure etc might also be reduced compared to similar civilian development.	The Council considers that it needs to assess the requirements in a similar way as other households, particularly as there is the potential that these houses will be released to the open market. If special circumstances are clearly demonstrated at the time of a planning application for Married Quarters these will be considered and treated as an exception. No need to include a blanket exception in the SPD itself.
D2/27/2 D2/48/1	Local Residents (2)	Infrastructure improvements (doctors and schools-D2/48/1) should be put in place before any new development takes place in Gosport generally.	Whilst this is the ideal situation it is unlikely this can happen in reality as the funds are released at trigger points at certain stages of development. Only in acute shortages could this be potentially negotiated as part of a legal agreement. None of the service providers have identified that this is the case in Lee. Provisions are in place for developers to provide contributions for education facilities and indeed other development in Lee have been used to improve local school facilities (Policies R/DP3 and R/CF6 of the Adopted Local Plan Review). Contributions can also be made for medical facilities
D2/2/5	Local Resident	If new infrastructure was put in place before residential development took place it may then be acceptable.	
D2/9/4	Local Resident	Lee schools and medical centre are already at capacity. Any residential development should consider this.	
D2/19/2	Local Resident	Additional housing will inevitably increase demand on medical facilities (hospital). These take years to achieve.	

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
			(under Policy R/DP3) if it is appropriate under the tests of Circular 5/05.
D2/19/3	Local Resident	[Impact on] education already covered in plan.	Noted.
D2/32/5	Local Resident	What consideration has been given to further school facilities as some local children are unable to attend local schools due to overcrowding?	The Council takes advice from Hampshire County Council as the local education authority and provisions are in place to take developer contributions
D1/22/21	Lee-on-the-Solent Residents' Association	Para 5.97: The Manor Way field should be dealt with as a separate issues and its development not prejudiced by anything in the SPD.	Agree that Manor Way field should be treated as a separate issue in accordance with the provisions of the Local Plan Review. The provision for allotments in association with the site is dealt with in more generic terms in the green infrastructure section. The potential for allotments in relation to Daedalus has been suggested as a footnote.
D1/3230	SEEDA	SEEDA requests GBC to reconsider whether allotments could potentially be required. FBC are promoting allotments within Hangars West. SEEDA consider these could be used by the new residents of Daedalus.	There is a significant shortage of allotments within Lee-on-the Solent and therefore the Borough Council considers it necessary to consider this form of open space as part of its open space requirements.
Other development considerations: Indoor and outdoor sports			
D1/29/1	Sport England	Indoor and outdoor sports should be included as a development consideration. There should be early dialogue with SE in relation to sports facilities. Need should be based on local assessments. SE advocates the local standards set out in Table 4 of the Open Space Monitoring Report (2010) be used to provide appropriate levels of open space and sports facilities for the Daedalus area.	Relevant Open Space standards are included in the SPD with reference to the appropriate policy in the Local Plan Review. The SPD enables indoor sports to be provided on the site. Standards for such facilities will need to be considered as part of the forthcoming Site Allocations and Delivery DPD and not appropriate for the SPD.
Other development considerations: Safeguarding zones			
D1/5/1	Defence Estates Safeguarding	The site falls outside of any Ministry of Defence statutorily safeguarded zones and consequently the MoD has no	Noted

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		safeguarding objections to the development.	
Other development considerations: Geology			
D2/45/22	Local Resident	Complications posed by the site's geology are not mentioned in the document. The Bracklesham Beds which underlie the surface gravels inland from Lee foreshore have caused damp to properties along Lee seafront and are likely to do so inland. There should be a reference to this complication for development on the airfield and particularly for residential development.	Noted. The issues raised by this geological issue would need to be mentioned and addressed through the relevant technical reports that accompany the planning applications (e.g. flood risk and contaminated land). Other issues relating to damp would need to be addressed as part of the building regulations.
9. TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY STRATEGY			
Existing conditions			
D1/26/3	Hampshire County Council	Para 6.16 should be reworded to clarify what the outline list of transport intervention refers to and whether it is actually a reference to a Transport Contributions Policy list.	Amend text to specifically mention the Strategic Access to Gosport Study (StAG).
D2/57/1	Local Resident	SPD acknowledges the difficulties and issues relating to poor infrastructure on the Gosport peninsula.	Noted.
D1/22/22	Lee-on-the-Solent Residents' Association	SPD identifies the issues but does not offer any confidence that GBC, FBC or HCC are able to resolve them or can provide a suitable overarching approach.	The development of Daedalus as an employment-led site which offers significant opportunities to reduce out-commuting is the main contribution the site can make to reduce congestion on the Peninsula. Specific transport measures identified in the SPD are more localised and aim to deal with specific identified problems that would be generated or exacerbated by development at Daedalus. The Peninsula's strategic transport issues are considered in other reports by HCC which are informing the emerging Core Strategy.
D1/22/24	Lee-on-the-Solent Residents' Association	Provision of employment on Daedalus (though essential) should not be seen as the solution to traffic conditions.	
D1/22/25	Lee-on-the-Solent Residents' Association	Disagree that the Borough has relatively good access to the motorway. And that in-commuters experience few delays in am and pm peaks.	It is considered that off-peak Gosport has relatively good access to the motorway network compared with many other areas of the Country. For example an HCC Study in 2007 showed that it takes just

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		There is very little off-peak, with a number of factors (rain, term times, company work patterns) reducing quiet periods.	under 11 minutes off-peak to travel between Fort Brockhurst Roundabout to Junction 11. This Study also confirms relatively short journey times for in-commuters. Whilst this particular measure is not directly applicable to Daedalus it does emphasise the Peninsula's relatively good off-peak connections. It is acknowledged however that traffic incidents on key routes can quickly affect these times. The statement aims to highlight to developers that there are positive aspects of locating on the Peninsula.
D2/45/52	Local Resident	Para 6.16 ignores the likely absence of funding until at least 2035.	<p>Funding for schemes will need to be secured from a variety of sources including the private sector. It is acknowledged that significant public funding will be very limited. There is funding identified in the LTP for 2013/14 for improvements to Newgate Lane. Developers of Daedalus are likely to fund for improvements at Peel Common and Stubbington roundabouts. It is likely that developer contributions and additional LTP funding will arise before 2035 to progress further improvements on Newgate Lane.</p> <p>It is considered that a 'do-nothing' approach at Daedalus would make the commuting situation worse on the Peninsula with a continued loss of MoD employment. The Daedalus site will bring new investment and jobs to the Peninsula.</p>
Impact on local road network			
D1/23/7	Highways Agency	The HA is concerned that the Daedalus site when fully occupied (in Fareham and Gosport) has the potential to have an adverse impact on the safe operation of the Strategic Road Network due to its location, scale and proximity. The M27 junctions 9 and 11 are currently	The existing road network serving Junctions 9 and 11 is already at capacity in peak hours and is unable to deliver additional traffic to the junctions. Increasing the opportunities of local people to work within the Gosport Peninsula and thereby reducing

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		experiencing congestion particularly during peak periods. Consequently the HA would have concerns if any additional traffic were to be added to any of these junctions without careful consideration of mitigation measures. The HA have no plans for capacity enhancements on the M27.	the need to travel on the M27 is the best form of mitigation. Furthermore the current BRT measures and future extensions will provide a non-car alternative for users of the A32 corridor.
D2/1/1 D2/8/1 D2/9/1 D2/46/1 D2/47/2 D2/49/5 D1/17/2 D2/64/2 D2/66/1 D2/67/1 D2/68/1 D2/71/3 D/72/2 D2/74/2 D2/77/2 D2/22/1 D2/41/2	Local Residents (13) Contrabyte Systems Limited	Problems relating to the surrounding road network would be exacerbated by the proposed Daedalus development.	Whilst it is acknowledged that local traffic issues will need to be mitigated it is considered that Daedalus has the best potential to improve the strategic transport issues over the medium-long term by providing significant numbers of new jobs for local residents. A 'do-nothing' approach will exacerbate the out-commuting situation as there will likely be the continued loss of jobs from the Peninsula including those within the defence sector.
D2/47/1 D2/57/2 D2/59/4 D2/62/5 D2/71/1 D2/72/1 D2/76/2	Local Residents (7)	Development should not take place until there is the necessary road infrastructure.	Measures are included in the SPD to alleviate local transport problems. These will need to be assessed further once the Borough Council receives detailed planning proposals and the accompanying Traffic Impact Assessment.
D1/17/1 D2/74/3	Contrabyte Systems Limited Local Resident	SPD lacks sufficient road transport infrastructure.	
D2/17/1	Local Resident	Development should not increase road congestion out of Lee	Whilst smaller local transport measures will be completed in conjunction with particular phases of development, other larger schemes (for example Newgate Lane) will take longer. The Daedalus scheme will pay a contribution towards larger schemes and delivery of the relevant infrastructure will be dependent on HCC securing the funding. Improvements to Newgate Lane South are programmed in 2013/2014 and will be implemented with LTP funding. Improvements to Newgate Lane

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
			<p>North and the Speedfields Roundabouts will be dependent on HCC securing the funding. Developments at Daedalus may contribute towards this scheme.</p> <p>It is anticipated works to Stubbington and Peel Common roundabouts will be completed in conjunction with particular phases of the developments.</p>
D2/59/5 D2/65/1 D2/71/2 D2/72/3	Local Residents (4)	Lack of road infrastructure improvements will be a deterrent to inward investment and puts in doubt plan proposals.	Road infrastructure could be a deterrent to new investment. Consequently the SPD requires improved transport measures. The SPD also acknowledges that the site has some very unique assets which will attract specialist businesses notwithstanding the road network.
D2/12/4 D2/46/3 D1/16/3 D2/77/5	Local Residents (3) Hovercraft Museum	The significant local road congestion (A27/A32 Junction, Newgate Lane, unsuitable local roads for existing HGV traffic, poor public transport services D2/12/4, D2/77/5) and lack of investment will deter business investment.	
D2/43/3	Local Resident	The successful functioning of Daedalus will depend on strategic accessibility.	Agree.
D2/43/5	Local Resident	Congestion could potentially be reduced if the site provides local jobs for local people. The planning framework should consider this.	Agree.
D2/44/3	Local Resident	Fareham Borough Council and Gosport Borough Council must work with Hampshire County Council to find the simplest and cheapest solution to enable traffic from Gosport to access the motorway.	Agree. The StAG Study was undertaken by HCC to identify the most viable measures.
D2/45/54	Local Resident	Guarantees of remedial works considered necessary by transport planners and the public and the funding of these schemes must be available before the final SPD is agreed.	Mitigation measures will be agreed with developers through a legal agreement as part of an approved planning consent.
Transport objectives and key principles			
D1/26/4	Hampshire County	Objectives should be amended to include an additional	Suggested wording is not an objective. Include

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
	Council	bullet point regarding the overall transport strategy. Text is supplied in HCC submission.	revised wording in Para 6.18 instead.
D1/23/10	Highways Agency	HA fully support measures that will reduce the dependence on the private car and reduce the need to travel by offering sustainable alternatives. It should be made clear that new transport infrastructure will only be considered as a last resort.	Provision of local employment is the prime measure for reducing car travel. The site is well-served by the existing cycle track network but the SPD acknowledges scope for improvements on Marine Parade. The BRT scheme will promote bus use on parts of the Peninsula but the scope for improving commercially viable bus travel directly to/from Daedalus is limited. It is essential to improve Newgate Lane to provide suitable access for HGVs and attract investors.
D1/26/5	Hampshire County Council	Para 6.22 should be amended to make it clear that the main access routes to the Gosport peninsula (via the A32, B3385 Newgate Lane and the B3334 Rowner Road, Gosport Road and Titchfield Road corridor) will be subject to additional traffic from the development. Mitigation measures may be required to these routes to ensure that the development's traffic does not cause demonstrable harm. The attractiveness of these routes will be key to attracting new businesses to the Daedalus site.	Mention that the main access routes to the Gosport peninsula will be subject to additional traffic from the development and that specific mitigation measures will be required.
D1/32/31	SEEDA	Para 6.20: Text should recognise that further detailed dialogue will be required before any definitive commitments on a bus strategy can be made.	Amend text to acknowledge that further discussions are required.
Transport assessments and contributions			
D1/26/6	Hampshire County Council	Para 6.23 should be amended to link the findings of the TA with the overall transport strategy for the area. Text supplied as part of HCC's submission.	Amend accordingly.
D1/26/7	Hampshire County Council	HCC supports the principle of seeking developer contributions. However Para 6.24 should be amended to note that works may be required by the developer. Text supplied as part of HCC's submission.	Amend accordingly.

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
D1/26/8	Hampshire County Council	Para 6.25 should be amended to better reflect the requirements of the development. Text supplied as part of HCC's submission.	GBC consider necessary to retain reference to an Implementation Plan in order to deliver transport mitigation measures in a coherent and timely manner.
D1/23/5	Highways Agency	Note that a transport assessment will be required. From the SPD it would appear that this work will be done by the developer(s). It is vital that a single comprehensive TA will be undertaken for the whole site.	Agree.
D1/23/6	Highways Agency	The HA recommends that prior to adoption, the districts work closely to establish that there is a reasonable prospect of delivering any potential interventions in transport terms. It should be made clear that new infrastructure is only considered as a last resort after identifying alternative sustainable options such as demand management and traffic management.	The Councils have identified potential interventions including measures to reduce travel and offer opportunities to travel by methods other than the car. However it is also clear that some improvements to the highway network are required to alleviate impacts of the development and to be able to attract investment to the site, which will in turn bring jobs and potentially reduce the need to travel out of the Peninsula for work.
D1/23/8	Highways Agency	Important that Councils work together to coordinate infrastructure planning to serve the site including phasing arrangements within the context of the South Hampshire Sub Region. The Sub-Regional Transport Model being developed by TfSH could provide a starting point to identify that there is a reasonable prospect of the delivery of potential interventions and thus providing a credible evidence base to support the SPD.	As stated in the SPD GBC and FBC are working together with HCC to coordinate infrastructure planning within the sub region. It is agreed that the SRTM is potentially a useful tool to assist in assessing the traffic distribution arising from the development as well as the effectiveness of potential interventions. However the model's future use as a tool for detailed transport assessment should remain at the discretion of the developer.
D1/22/26	Lee-on-the-Solent Residents' Association	With the option of more than one developer this could lead to a piecemeal approach to transport, traffic and communication which could become difficult to coordinate. There should be a single integrated and overarching	Agree that this is an issue. It is considered that Paragraphs 8.9-8.13 in the Implementation Section of the SPD address the issue of phasing and the need for comprehensive planning.

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		masterplan. Each developer would provide their proposals and contribution, each being considered against the plan of improvement and consideration of the overall benefits and facilities being improved.	
Provision of off-site infrastructure			
D1/26/9	Hampshire County Council	Para 6.27 should be amended to provide more detail on off-site infrastructure. Text supplied as part of HCC's submission.	Amend to provide more detail on off-site infrastructure.
D1/23/11	Highways Agency	In order to obtain planning permission it will be necessary to demonstrate that the development related traffic can be successfully accommodated in capacity and safety terms. It is requested that further analysis into potential SRN impacts and any necessary mitigation measures should be considered.	Agree. Developers are required to provide an appropriate transport assessment as part of a planning application. This requirement is included in the SPD.
D1/32/32	SEEDA	Para 6.28: add text relating to Circular 05/05 (text supplied).	Include as a footnote.
D1/22/23	Lee-on-the-Solent Residents' Association	SPD recommends minor road improvements but the fundamental issue that needs to be resolved is Fareham Quay and access to the motorway. There needs to be a comprehensive viable and appropriate plan to resolve these major issues and for them to be implemented in a timely manner to support the Daedalus development.	These strategic issues will need to be addressed by HCC strategies as well as the local highway authority. Schemes identified in HCC's StAG report will support initiatives at Daedalus. It is not possible to improve the Quay Street roundabout beyond the proposals to be implemented in association with the Tesco development.
D2/5/1	Local Resident	Pleased to see the document recognises the need for improved road links. These will need to be completed with priority to encourage developers to come forward. These will need to be funded before future developers are engaged.	Developers will be providing costs towards schemes in a phased approach.
D2/11/2	Local Resident	The proposed access arrangements appear to be satisfactory (with one exception see D2/11/3 below)..	Noted.
D2/9/2	Local Resident	Development must include road improvements for at least 3 miles in all directions.	A TA which will accompany future planning applications at Daedalus will identify what detailed

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
			mitigation measures are required and the scope shall be agreed with the highway authorities. The SPD identifies a number of schemes that could be required.
D2/46/2	Local Resident	A relief road is required.	The Western Access Road is identified in HCC's StAG Report as a potential scheme but is not deliverable without substantial Government funding which is unlikely to be available in the short-medium term. A TA which will accompany future planning applications at Daedalus will identify what detailed mitigation measures are required.
D2/45/55	Local Resident	The distress of Compulsory Purchase Orders for off-site transport purposes must be avoided if local opposition to the proposals are to be minimised.	It is not anticipated that CPO's will be required.
D2/45/55	Local Resident	The state of public finances is likely to prevent all or some of the schemes identified in paragraph 6.28 from taking place. Is the Daedalus scheme still viable without these?	<p>It is considered that Daedalus has the potential to alleviate the strategic transport problems over the medium-long term by providing significant new jobs which are available to local residents. A 'do-nothing' approach will exacerbate the out-commuting situation as there will likely be the continued loss of jobs from the Peninsula including those within the defence sector.</p> <p>As rightly mentioned the squeeze on public funding and private finance will limit opportunities for infrastructure development. It will be necessary to ensure that the Daedalus scheme is viable to attract significant employment and that a balance is struck to ensure any significantly adverse transport impacts are mitigated. Measures are included in the SPD to alleviate local transport problems. These will need to be assessed further once the Borough Council</p>

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
			receives detailed planning proposals and the accompanying Traffic Impact Assessment. Whilst smaller local transport measures will be completed in conjunction with particular phases of development, other larger schemes (for example Newgate Lane) will take longer. The Daedalus scheme will pay a contribution towards larger schemes and delivery of the relevant infrastructure will be dependent on HCC securing the funding.
D2/59/3	Local Resident	Additional traffic lights at Peel Common and Stubbington Roundabouts is pathetic without addressing the Newgate Lane/Fareham Creek bottlenecks	Accept improvements are required and it is envisaged that developer contributions will help to improve Newgate Lane. Funding is included in LTP3 for 2013/14. Strategic issues will need to be addressed by HCC strategies as the local highway authority. Schemes identified in HCC's StAG report will support initiatives at Daedalus. It is not possible to improve the Quay Street roundabout beyond the proposals to be implemented in association with the Tesco development.
Newgate Lane			
D2/44/1 D2/62/6	Local Residents (2)	Newgate Lane needs to be improved as specified in the SPD.	Agree funding for improvements to Newgate Lane will need to be a priority and will potentially alleviate traffic issues generated by Daedalus (subject to the findings of a detailed TA Report to support a planning proposal) as well as make the site more attractive for investment. There is funding identified in the LTP for 2013/14 for improvements to Newgate Lane which is included in
D2/43/6	Local Resident	Newgate Lane needs to be improved to provide better road links to the M27 particularly for freight movements.	
D2/27/1	Local Resident	Need to improve Newgate Lane and A32 before any development takes place.	
D2/1/2	Local Resident	Improvements required to the two mini-roundabouts in Newgate Lane adjacent ASDA.	
D1/6/4	Lee Business	There is an urgent need to widen Newgate Lane with	

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
	Association Representative	improvements to Speedfield Roundabout. This would benefit local traffic and benefit the Daedalus site.	the SPD.
D2/32/2 D2/60/5	Local Residents (2)	Newgate Lane needs to be widened to accommodate the number of vehicles already using this route.	
D1/11/1	Defence Heritage Support Group	Need to make major improvements to Newgate Lane to support such a large project. Priority should be given to obtaining Government approval for such a scheme.	
D1/17/3	Contrabyte Systems Limited	Whilst the Newgate Lane Improvement Corridor is mentioned on p38 there is no information on what this improvement will be. Consideration needs to be given to a dual carriageway.	
D2/57/3	Local Resident	Proposed cycle lanes to Newgate Lane is welcomed.	Noted.
D2/57/4	Local Resident	A dedicated bus lane is required to run the length of Newgate Lane which links the Daedalus development with the BRT.	This scheme has not been proposed by HCC.
Stubbington Roundabouts			
D2/44/6	Local Resident	Signalisation of roundabouts in Stubbington is not necessary and should only be carried out as a final measure in the future if required. During the day these roundabouts cause few problems and all available funds should be spent on Newgate Lane and the A32.	Initial transport studies have indicated these works will be necessary to accommodate development at Daedalus to improve capacity and safety. Further detailed assessments will be required within the TA to accompany future planning applications which will verify the need or not.
Peel Common Roundabout and Broom Way			
D2/57/5	Local Resident	Need for improvements along Broom Way to the Peel Common Roundabout including a new bus lane from the Daedalus access to Peel Common Roundabout. Existing cycleway would also need to be accommodated	This is not considered necessary given the relatively low frequency of bus services using this road.
Peak Lane			
D2/55/7	Local Resident	Need to improve infrastructure in Peak Lane (in FBC area).	This is not considered necessary within the scope of this development.

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
Stubbington lane/Titchfield Road			
D2/62/7	Local Resident	Stubbington Lane and Titchfield Road need to be upgraded before development takes place.	This is not achievable or affordable within the scope of the development.
Stubbington Bypass/Western Bypass			
D2/39/1 D2/44/2	Local Residents (2)	<p>There needs to be a new road in and out of Lee which links to the M27 if Daedalus is to be successful.</p> <p>There is already an unacceptable volume of traffic in Newgate Lane during rush hours (getting longer).</p> <p>Likely that those employed at the site will come from other destinations not just Gosport and Stubbington (even now majority of cars arriving at Argus Gate come via Peel Common roundabout direction) (D2/39/1).</p> <p>Likelihood of any Government funding for the foreseeable future is unlikely (D2/39/1).</p>	<p>The Western Access Road is identified in HCC's StAG Report as a potential scheme but is not deliverable without substantial Government funding which is unlikely to be available in the short-medium term. A TA which will accompany future planning applications at Daedalus will identify what detailed mitigation measures are required.</p> <p>It is agreed new road investment is required. Newgate Lane is identified as a capital project for 2013/14 in the LTP. Developers will be required to fund schemes to accommodate their development including Stubbington and Peel Common roundabouts.</p> <p>New employment opportunities have the potential to reduce out-commuting and it is likely that most jobs on the site will be taken by Gosport Borough residents (based on evidence from 2001 Census). There will also be in-bound commuting for which there appears to be sufficient road capacity. A TA will need to consider this further.</p>
Other suggested transport improvements			
D2/12/5	Local Resident	Introduce local road trains.	HCC have no plans to introduce road trains
D2/13/1	Local Resident	The site needs better foot and cycle access to the site especially on the north, west and east side.	Agree. A range of measures have been included in the Daedalus SPD.
Internal road layout			

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
D1/30/7	Fareham Borough Council	FBC requests that the future internal highway will be designed and signed to discourage its use as a through route and that this objective is added to the final version of the SPD.	The SPD does not promote the internal highway network as a through-route and there is not expected to be a significant number of movements. The ability to make local movements between Lee and Stubbington will be advantageous to residents and businesses and is not expected to be detrimental in planning or highway terms for Fareham residents. Neither are through movements likely to be of a scale harmful to the function of the site. However the matter can be further investigated within the TA.
D1/28/13	Lee Flying Association	An east-west road is not required. Support the idea that the road alignment of the internal road may need to be further south than indicated on Plan 9.	The road is not being promoted as an east-west through road. Instead it allows an east and west access for users and residents of the Daedalus site. It is acknowledged that the plans in the SPD are only indicative and the road could be moved southwards particularly if there were requirements to require more of the land in the Daedalus Waterfront area for aviation use (i.e. requiring airside access).
Access points			
D1/22/3	Lee-on-the-Solent Residents' Association	A number of residents have expressed concerns with regard to heavy vehicles driving through narrow roads in Lee.	Signing and the design of the site will aim to ensure that heavy vehicles use the most appropriate access. These arrangements are set out in the SPD by directing most traffic to the primary access at Broom Way with a secondary access off Marine Parade to take other vehicles and thereby avoid using more minor local access roads.
D2/55/2	Local Resident	Any development will increase traffic and damage to surrounding streets as well as safety considerations.	
D2/75/3	Local Resident	Use of local access roads such as Drake Road and Milvil Road would need to include adequate protection against speed, traffic volume and weight. This should include 20mph speed restrictions, weight limits and even a ban on light commercial vehicles during non-working hours.	

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
D2/36/2	Local Resident	Entrances to the site should not be through Lee (Court Road, Milvil Road etc) but restricted to the outskirts (i.e. traffic light junction on Manor Way and Marine Parade West).	Traffic calming and traffic managements can be considered where a need has been demonstrated.
D2/51/1	Local Resident	Need to ensure access points to the site do not encourage vehicles to use local residential roads. Such entrances (e.g. Nottingham Place) should be for pedestrians and cyclists only. However if only used for pedestrians it will be necessary to think about parking restrictions on roads around the site as workers would park on local roads and walk into the site.	It is not anticipated that light traffic flows are likely to occur between Daedalus and the existing parts of Lee via these minor access roads. Most of the traffic including the heavier vehicles will use the primary and secondary access points through sign and design measures. Roads such as Nottingham Place and Milvil Road are only likely to be used by local people. It is important that the site has a number of minor local access points to integrate the proposed residential and community uses with the rest of the Lee community. Many of the minor access points are in effect reinstating former access points to the site. The more minor access points there are the less traffic flow will be placed on any single local access point, with the primary and secondary access points taking the bulk of traffic including the non-neighbourhood traffic.
D2/43/8	Local Resident	Suitable traffic management and traffic calming is required so that traffic is kept to designated routes to deter rat-running.	
D2/45/57	Local Resident	Paragraphs 6.33-6.60 make no references to road widening outside the Daedalus site and related reductions of gardens fronting highways (or CPOs).	No such schemes are proposed.
Eastern access point			
D1/26/11	Hampshire County Council	Para 6.35 should also accommodate pedestrians.	Amend accordingly.
D1/32/33	SEEDA	Add 'the timing of delivery for the new access point will be linked to the phases of development and having regard to the capacity of the existing access arrangements.	Agree but amend 'capacity and suitability'.
D2/55/5	Local Resident	All access to the site should be restricted to Broom Way	It is not appropriate to have one access point on a

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		and Rowner Lane.	site of this scale. Broom Way will be the primary access with a hierarchy of other access points. A lorry routing strategy will direct such vehicles to Broom Way and the site will be designed to encourage access to the main access points.
D2/28/4	Local Resident	Everything needs to be done to encourage access via eastern access point not secondary access point (see D2/28/1 below).	
D2/44/5	Local Resident	The route via Stubbington on Gosport Road and Titchfield Road should be accessed from Peel Common roundabout and drivers discouraged using seafront route.	
D1/18/19	Defence Estates	The new access road running along the northern edge of the Married Quarters site should be designed and aligned to minimise any impact on the amenity of residents in terms of noise and fumes. Need to mention this in the text.	DE was aware of the Council's overall strategy for Daedalus as an employment-led regeneration site when they positioned the Married Quarters adjacent the existing road, which will remain as the spine road for the site. Amenity impacts will be considered as part of forthcoming planning applications.
D2/32/1	Local Resident	Concerned by the additional traffic using the new junction with Cherque Way. The noise and volume of traffic using Cherque Way will also increase.	The developer will be required through a TA to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the highway authority that the new junction has adequate capacity. An Environmental Statement to accompany a planning application will consider noise concerns.
D2/77/4	Local Resident	Any new access onto Manor Way or Broom Way will add extra danger to an already very busy road.	The junctions will be designed to the appropriate road safety standards
Western access point: just north of Ross House option (and footway/cycleway to the south)			
D1/2/4	Maritime and Coastguard Agency	There are a number of occasions where access roads have been drawn into MCA's land. MCA have not formally commented on any proposal for access roads that cross MCA land.	The SPD provides a framework for the long term development of the site irrespective of land ownership. The SPD includes a number of options and considers that the route just north of Ross House which uses MCA land as the best option. If for whatever reason (including ownership) this option can not be implemented the developer will need to consider alternative options as outlined in the SPD. The MCA have been involved in discussions/consultations on this proposal for a

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
			number of months.
D1/28/12	Lee Flying Association	<p>The proposed access would have significant safety issues which would arise from placing a road and junction in the immediate vicinity of aircraft arrivals and departures. Would reduce attractiveness of the airfield to aviation requiring the airfield be licensed or reducing the declared runway Take-Off and Landing Distances.</p> <p>Instead a separate access could serve the Ward Room area as well as Brambles Way and Albion/Vengeance Way to Broom Way</p>	<p>SEEDA have commissioned a study which demonstrates that the access option just north of Ross House will not unduly affect the operation of the runway.</p> <p>A site of this size with a number of distinct areas and functions needs a number of access points. It is considered that the suggested access points are more suitable for local access rather than the requirements for employers on the site. The Ross House access is important in providing a direct and convenient means of access to employment areas.</p>
D1/28/5 D2/52/5	Lee Flying Association Local Resident	The possibility of building additional buildings with airside access (see D1/28/5 and D2/52/4) would have a bearing on the proposed road adjacent Ross House. This does not need to be a public thoroughfare. Access to the employment part only needs to be from Broom Way as at present.	The SPD makes clear that the main road in the site can be moved southwards to accommodate aviation uses in hangars further from the airfield. The main 'spine road' will not be promoted as a east-west access but will be able to be used by the public as it will allow all users of the Daedalus site to access the site from the east and west.
D2/44/4	Local Resident	Access alongside Ross House into Stubbington Road will cause a considerable increase in traffic using Moody Road/Crofton Lane/Cuckoo Lane as a rat run to avoid roundabouts and signal controls. Create additional danger in residential/school area. Residential roads showing damage caused by heavier vehicles.	<p>A TA to accompany a planning application will consider anticipated traffic movements in the area depending on the quantum and type of development proposed. From this assessment the appropriate mitigation measures will need to be secured.</p> <p>The provision of local employment reduces the need to leave the Borough through Stubbington. It is considered that the position of access points on Marine Parade will have no bearing on the levels of use of Moody Road as a short cut.</p>
D2/35/1	Local Resident	Cannot see how the new road can be fitted safely	Investigations by SEEDA have demonstrated that it

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		<p>between the runway and Ross House. It will encroach on MCA land within the blue fence which no doubt was established for safety reasons. It also crosses land within FBC.</p> <p>Such a road could affect the continued operation of the runway in particular the length of runway required.</p>	<p>is possible that a road can be safely accommodated between Ross House and the runway. A report commissioned by SEEDA demonstrates that a road in this location would not affect the operation of the runway.</p>
D2/28/1 D2/35/1	Local Residents (2)	<p>New access road serving the employment area would increase volume and weight of traffic using Stubbington Lane. Issues include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other accesses exist (D2/35/1); • Difficult to get onto Stubbington Lane from Seamead due to volume and speed of traffic and limited visibility (D2/28/1); • Dangerous to cyclists (D2/28/1). 	<p>The development will change the distribution of traffic on the road network. It will decrease out-commuting but increase in-commuting. The TA will determine the net changes in volume.</p> <p>Broom Way will be designed and signed as the primary access directing traffic from Stubbington Lane. There will be a hierarchy of accesses but a secondary access is required off Stubbington Lane/Marine Parade to take traffic that is not suited for the small local access points.</p> <p>Traffic controlled signals at the new junction will reduce traffic speeds and potentially assist traffic exiting Seamead.</p> <p>Appropriate measures will be included for cyclists.</p>
D2/40/1	Local Resident	New road access at the western end of seafront is stupid even with traffic lights as it is on a bend on an unlit road.	The junction will be built to appropriate safety standards.
D1/12/1 D2/16/1 D2/38/1 D2/69/1 D2/70/1	Director, Ross House Solentview Limited Local Residents (4)	Opposed to any roads or other access streets being built either north or south of Ross House.	It is considered important to have a secondary access to serve the employment areas.
D1/12/1	Director, Ross House Solentview Limited	New access would be intrusive and impact on quality of life.	The access to the north of Ross House will have a lesser impact than the access south of Ross House (as originally proposed by SEEDA). It is further

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
			away from the apartments, not between buildings (thereby avoiding a canyonning effect), and has the potential to improve access for Ross House residents onto Stubbington lane via traffic-controlled signals. It is accepted negotiations will be required between the landowners and developers to secure this benefit.
D2/16/3	Local Resident	Proposed road would have very restricted visibility from Lee-on-the-Solent albeit clear towards Stubbington. As a resident of Ross House it can be tricky joining the road. An increase in the volume of traffic would be an accident waiting to happen.	A traffic-signalled junction has the potential to improve access and slow traffic. There is scope for residents of Ross House to be able to join the new access road and access Stubbington lane via the new traffic lights.
D2/56/4	Local Resident	With the new access how would Ross House residents be able to get in and out of the property? Would there be traffic lights or a roundabout so residents can get out?	
D2/75/1	Local Resident	New access would have a severe impact upon a narrow piece of relatively unspoilt sea-front between the Gosport and Fareham areas.	The road junction is close to a built-up area and would not have a significant impact upon the wider gap.
D2/38/3	Local Resident	Concerns new road and stationary traffic at the new junction would increase pollution levels to the detriment of elderly and infirm residents.	The issue of air pollution will need to be assessed as part of an Environmental Statement to accompany a forthcoming planning application. This issue has been highlighted in the air pollution section of the SPD.
D2/70/2	Local Resident	Concern that new access would be too close to the bend and traffic wouldn't be able to access Stubbington Lane as main road is too busy.	Proposed traffic lights would remedy these issues.
D2/70/3	Local Resident	Unclear who the new road would serve. It wouldn't serve commuters unless they work in Hill Head or the beach.	The road would serve the users of the Daedalus site.
D2/38/4	Local Resident	Balconies would be overlooked by vehicles or pedestrians	Detailed measures to reduce any particular significant amenity impacts can be considered at the planning application stage.
D2/16/4	Local Residents (2)	With the proposed road on one side of Ross House and a	It is proposed to no longer show the southern route

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
D2/56/3		proposed pedestrian/cycle access on the other side, Ross House would be somewhat of an island.	as a pedestrian/cycle access. However it is unlikely that the cycle/pedestrian route would create a feeling of severance which would likely be the case if a road was proposed here (as originally proposed by SEEDA).
D2/38/6	Local Resident	Resale value of flats would depreciate as a result of access points.	Not a planning issue.
D2/16/7	Local Resident	SPD acknowledges that there will be an increase in lorry movements and that the road network around Stubbington is not suitable especially Titchfield Road. However does GBC acknowledge that a lot of lorries would take the shorted route if there was an access off Stubbington Lane/Marine Parade West?	Signage will encourage lorries to use the primary access off Broom Way. It is acknowledged that light traffic and a certain number of local lorries may continue down Stubbington Lane and hence the need for an access off Marine Parade/Stubbington Lane.
D2/28/2	Local Resident	A roundabout at Ross House with offset approach from north to slow down vehicles.	Roundabout not viable due to limited availability of land but the proposed set of traffic lights would slow down vehicles.
D2/38/5 D2/56/1 D2/69/2	Local Residents (3)	Concern that pedestrian/cycle access to the south of Ross House would increase possibility of criminal and anti-social behaviour and loss of security. The privacy and peace would disappear (D2/38/5) What security measures would be put in place? Any street lighting would shine into bedrooms (D2/56/1).	It is proposed to no longer show the pedestrian/cycle access to the south of Ross House.
Western access point: Drake Road			
D1/12/2 D2/16/2 D2/38/2 D2/40/2	Director, Ross House Solentview Limited Local Residents (3)	Improvements to Drake Road would be the better option than new access adjacent Ross House (as it has clear visibility in both directions-D2/16/2).	Drake Road is identified in the SPD as a potential access point as part of the hierarchy of accesses. This is considered a local access point and that a larger access point is still required just north of Ross House. A number of access points will improve permeability.
Other access points: Milvil Road and/or Queen's Gate			
D2/17/5 D2/31/1	Local Residents (6)	Concern about opening up Queen's Gate/Manor Way/Milvil Road for vehicle access. This would increase	It is proposed that an access could be created at the northern end of Milvil Road. This would be used as a

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
D2/54/1 D2/55/1 D2/62/3 D2/63/2		<p>traffic and be used as a rat run through a residential area.</p> <p>If this goes ahead residents should get compensation ((D2/54/1 & D2/62/2).</p> <p>Need to purchase extra sound proofing double glazing or install sleeping policeman and speed cameras in the appropriate areas (D2/54/1). Need for boundary walls or fencing to be provided commensurate with the security that has been experienced at Daedalus for the last 50 years.</p>	<p>local access linking parts of the Daedalus site with Lee centre and other areas in the local neighbourhood. The access would be designed for local movements.</p> <p>Movements from outside of Lee would find more convenient routes of access through the main entrances.</p> <p>Milvil Road and Manor Way form part of the public highway and the capacity to take additional traffic will need to be assessed as part of a TA to accompany a planning application once the proposed location, scale and type of development proposed are known. The appropriate mitigation measures will be considered at this stage as with any planning application.</p>
D2/11/5	Local Resident	The accesses at the north end of Milvil Road and Manor Way 'Queen's Gate' should be pedestrian/cycle accesses.	It is proposed to have a pedestrian/cycle way at the north end of Milvil Road together with a potential road access (see comments above).
D2/55/4	Local Resident	Even if Milvil Road and Norwich Place were pedestrian only then the parking problems with contractors private cars and vans would deny local residents of parking.	Commuters/contractors will use the more convenient access points such as Broom Way. The Daedalus site will have ample parking negating the need for users to park off-site.
Nottingham Place			
D1/22/4	Lee-on-the-Solent Residents' Association	Residents have expressed concerns of heavy vehicles using roads such as Nottingham Place.	<p>More convenient access points are available to serve employment areas. May be used for vehicles for local servicing.</p> <p>Access points such as Nottingham Place will be designed as local access points as part of a hierarchy with more convenient access points</p>
D2/51/2 D2/62/2	Local Residents (2)	<p>No vehicular access to the new development via Nottingham Place/Court Road. Inappropriate for commercial traffic to use a residential area.</p> <p>Problem of rat-running (D2/51/2).</p>	

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
			(Broom Way/Stubbington Way) taking most of the traffic including heavier vehicles.
Bayntum Drive (via Chark Lane)			
D1/18/6	Defence Estates	Access to the Married Quarters should be from Bayntum Drive (i.e. existing road) which was designed to accommodate the remaining 152 dwellings. Vehicular access onto the new proposed spine road would not be necessary particularly if Milvil Road was utilised this would separate residential and employment traffic.	This option is now shown in addition to links to the main spine road, Character Area 6 and Milvil Road. This leaves future developers to consider a number of options.
Link between vacant MoD land and Character Area 6			
D1/18/20	Defence Estates	The proposed link between the proposed Married Quarters and Character Area 6 is supported. This would enable clear separation of residential and employment traffic.	Noted.
Alternative access options to consider			
D2/16/6	Local Resident	New main access road should be developed off Gosport Road, within the FBC area. This would not disturb any residential areas. Whereas other options would be extremely close not only to Ross House but other properties along Marine Parade. Accept that there may be issues with the runway (but so is the Ross House option) If this is the case it is unlikely that the whole runway is required and on the rare occasions the full length is required it may be possible to restrict traffic at the required time. It would still be possible to manage the area for wildlife.	A new road of this length would not be feasible nor consistent with the approach of providing a permeable development with convenient access integrated into Lee-on-the-Solent.
D2/11/3 D2/55/6	Local Residents (2)	There could be better access directly off the Peel Common Roundabout (or near-by).	A new road of this length would not be feasible nor consistent with the approach of providing a permeable development with convenient access integrated into Lee-on-the-Solent.
D2/75/2	Local Resident	Instead of access north of Ross House a new road should	This option would have an impact on the

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		be considered that curves south westerly and meets with Hermes Road and taken to Richmond Road close to the War Memorial, which could be a 'crown' on a new traffic island.	Conservation Area and the setting of a listed building.
Runway use and road use			
D2/9/3	Local Resident	As the runway will be increasingly used will there be a need for extra traffic lights near Sea Lane, as in the past when Daedalus was operational?	Currently there are no plans to include a set of signals linked to the use of the runway. It is understood that current and anticipated levels and type of aviation use will not require signals at this location. These matters will be kept under review.
Lorry routeing			
D1/26/10	Hampshire County Council	Para 6.34 should be reworded to provide greater clarity on the proposed lorry routeing. Suggested text supplied in HCC submission.	Add 'the developer will be required to fund signing of this lorry route'. Other suggestions not required necessary as already covered in SPD albeit not in as much detail. However this is considered appropriate for the SPD.
D1/23/12	Highway Agency	The potential M27 impacts associated with additional development-related lorry movements should be considered within the Daedalus TA. If the development has a material adverse impact on the SRN a package of mitigation measures will need to be proposed and assessed in accordance with DfT's circular 02/2007 and Guidance on Transport Assessment (2007).	Noted.
D1/30/5	Fareham Borough Council	FBC welcome the need to provide a lorry routeing signage strategy to direct heavy goods vehicles to Newgate Lane, from where access can be gained to the development site via Broom Way. Paras 6.37 and 6.38 refer to articulated vehicles only. FBC request the signage does not distinguish between the types of lorries, though recognising the need for the secondary access to be designed to accommodate	Agree. The signing itself will not distinguish between the types of good vehicles (the SPD text mentions articulated vehicles specifically in order to identify the motivation for the requirement). The details of the signing will need to be agreed by the Highway Authority with FBC and GBC at the planning application stage. It is anticipated that all goods vehicles will be encouraged to use Newgate

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		service type vehicles and cars.	Lane for strategic access and therefore using the Broom Way Access.
D2/55/3	Local Resident	Already heavy traffic including coaches and HGVs use Richmond Road, Milvil Road and Court Road to by-pass Lee Centre and for access to the site via Broom Way. This has caused near accidents at the junction of Milvil Road and Court Road by virtue of the junction being blind.	The SPD access strategy suggests several points of access on Marine Parade, particularly a secondary access just north of Ross House which negates the need for access through residential areas of Lee.
D1/1/8	Advanced Marine Innovation Technology Subsea Ltd	Para 6.34 ignores the issue of sat navs.	It is important to have a lorry routeing strategy in place. However the Council recognises that sat nav may direct traffic along other routes, hence the need for a secondary access to accommodate such vehicles and avoid the vehicles using less appropriate roads within Lee-on-the-Solent.
Construction traffic			
D2/12/1	Local Resident	SPD does not include details regarding the transport of materials to the site during construction, removal of materials from the site during construction (including contaminated wastes) and the associated impact on infrastructure.	Construction management plans including arrangements for construction vehicles will be considered as part of the planning application stage.
Parking strategy			
D1/1/9	Advanced Marine Innovation Technology Subsea Ltd	Paragraph 6.48 ignores the reality of parking.	On the contrary the SPD requires developers to provide sufficient parking for business and residential needs. These details will be assessed at the planning application stage together with provisions to encourage alternative modes of transport.
Bus			
D1/30/7	Fareham Borough Council	Recognise the importance of ensuring improved conditions and connections for public transport to help reduce traffic levels.	Noted.
D2/43/4	Local Resident	More consideration should be given to public transport including the use of mini-buses.	SPD highlights the need for developers to consult with transport providers at an early stage to promote

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		Buses running through the site should also be considered.	better public transport connections to Daedalus. Sufficient guidance is included in the travel plan this, where appropriate could include the use of workplace mini-buses.
D2/45/53	Local Resident	Paras 6.20/6.29: Bus services are unlikely to become more frequent given the shrinking HCC finances. Thus there is unlikely to be bus services serving the irregular hours (including nights) required by many industries.	Agreed. Services will need to be commercially viable in the long run.
Bus Rapid Transit (BRT): Relevance to Daedalus and effectiveness of the BRT in principle			
D1/23/9	Highways Agency	The two Borough Councils should work closely together to ensure/demonstrate that the proposals for the BRT scheme are robust, credible and deliverable. To determine deliverability of any options in relation to the SRN early engagements with the HA will be necessary.	First stage of the scheme is already underway.
D1/17/4	Contrabyte Systems Limited	Heavy reliance on bus system is not the answer- a £20 million white elephant.	It is not considered that the SPD places heavy reliance on the BRT. However the BRT represents an opportunity for bus providers to reconsider routes on the Gosport peninsula which could potentially serve Daedalus and the Lee area including better links to Fareham and its railway station and enabling workers in Bridgemary and Rowner to access Daedalus via revised bus routes (e.g. Lee-on-the-Solent- Rowner - BRT corridor - Bridgemary and Fareham and vice versa).
D2/57/6	Local Resident	Whilst supportive of the BRT there is no need to reference it in the document unless there is much more of a physical link between it and any proposed infrastructure improvements for Daedalus.	
D2/45/51	Local Resident	Para 6.12: Due top state of public finances unlikely further stages of the BRT will be constructed (to Fareham Railway station or Gosport Town Centre).	
D2/20/8	Local Resident	Are buses serving the Daedalus site using the BRT?	It is acknowledged that there will be funding difficulties for further phases of the scheme at the present time.
Pedestrian/cycle access			
D1/30/8	Fareham Borough Council	Recognise the importance of ensuring improved conditions and connections for pedestrians and cyclists to help reduce traffic levels.	Noted.

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
D1/19/25	Natural England	Welcome the promotion of walking and cycling. However paragraphs 6.14, 6.53, 6.55 and 7.4 refer to the potential for increased coastal links with Hill Head and the beach and Marine Parade. This may potentially increase levels of access to sensitive coastal areas and the environmental impacts so will need to be considered as part of the SPD assessment.	Proposals at Daedalus will specifically relate to Marine Parade not to links further west. The Marine Parade proposal will improve connections eastwards with the rest of the cycle network in Gosport and will help increase cycle usage in the urban area and reduce the need to travel by car. The consultation draft of the SPD is not seeking westward improvements to Hill Head, it only highlights the potential. Consequently there is no need to mention this in the finalised version in the text and therefore assessment of a link to Hill Head is not required as part of the Daedalus SPD.
D2/3/2	Local Resident	Cycle paths and footpaths should be separated from each other not shared or only demarcated by painted lines.	Shared use is proven to work satisfactorily.
D2/44/7	Local Resident	SPD refers to encouragement of walking and cycling but only in relation to Gosport. Consideration should be given to the Stubbington and Hill Head areas although peak time traffic makes it dangerous.	SPD highlights links to Stubbington between Broom Way and Gosport Road as well as other opportunities to connect with parts of Fareham.
D2/28/3	Local Resident	Why are no cycle tracks planned to link with any in the FBC area?	
D2/18/3	Local Resident	Agree that cycle path should be installed along Marine Parade.	Agree.
Water-based transport			
D2/41/5	Local Resident	The site could be a stopping point for a Solent ferry service serving Portsmouth, Gosport and Southampton. This would assist with the transport problem	There are no plans on part of the ferry companies to deliver such a service.
Travel Plan			
D1/26/12	Hampshire County Council	Para 6.59 should be amended to better reflect the requirements for developers to deliver a full travel plan for each individual site within the Daedalus area.	Delete 'subsidiary'.
D1/23/13	Highways Agency	The Travel Plan should be closely linked to the TA and reflect the objectives and requirements set out in PPG13	Noted. already have reference to Department for Transport.

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		and the DfT document using the planning system to secure travel plans' The travel plan should be in place prior to the site opening. The full HA response sets out some criteria for a successful travel plan.	
10.DESIGN			
Design principles			
D1/27/30	Environment Agency	Suggest GI network is included in 2 nd bullet point. A strong grid can form the basis for sustainable travel routes.	Strong linkages with areas outside of communities outside Daedalus so sustainable travel such as cycling and walking is already mention in bullet point 2. This would include links with green infrastructure. The new green infrastructure also makes reference to these connections.
D2/30/2	Local Resident	Architectural integrity is of foremost importance in the design of any new houses and other buildings.	Agree. The appearance of buildings particularly in the historic core will be very important to preserve the character of the site. This is covered by Paragraphs 5.2, 5.4 and 5.5 and by Section 7.
D2/20/9	Local Resident	What is meant by the term 'living street' (Para 6.45)? A mix of residential and commercial uses on the same street can be an unpleasant experience (excessive daytime traffic, insufficient residents to bring about community cohesion, daytime parking in front of residents houses by workers).	The phrase 'living streets' is perhaps superfluous to this sentence. In most cases the employment and residential areas are on separate streets. It is proposed that the residential areas will knit together with existing residential areas in Lee. It is only in the historic core where there is a mix of uses. The detailed elements of a future planning application will be considered with regard to issues such as traffic, compatibility of uses and parking).
D1/18/21	Defence Estates	Residential development along the eastern boundary of the site is supported.	Noted.
Site frontage onto Marine Parade			
D2/73/6	Local Resident	The Waterfront area and around Barracks Square: Should be opened to the public and seen as an extension to	Agree. Add as a design principle.

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		Marine Parade. Potential for cultural and musical events, plus exhibition space.	
D2/25/4	Local Resident	The Seafront area around Marine Parade/Richmond Road could have a more attractive frontage.	There is certainly scope to enhance the Conservation Area setting having regard to the sensitive historic structures and their setting. This is addressed in the Character Area sections and will be a key part of any future discussions.
D2/24/7	Local Resident	A developer may wish to put flats along the frontage overlooking the Solent. This would be inappropriate and create additional traffic.	The limited opportunities for new development on the Waterfront are identified in the SPD. The context of the Conservation Area, the setting of the heritage assets, and the context of the Marine Parade Area of Special Character will limit the height and scale of any development in the area concerned.
Character Areas			
D1/32/34	SEEDA	Plan 10 Character Areas are not fully consistent with the land use and design aspirations for the Waterfront area and does not reflect detailed design and heritage discussions held between SEEDA and GBC officers. Should be changed to boundaries shown in supplied plan.	The SEEDA Character Areas have not been formally agreed. The Character Areas do not significantly differ but those in the SPD take account of further careful on-site analysis of the character of the site, its built form, and historic layout. The only possible review might be to consider a slight amendment to the boundary between areas 5 and 6 which could comfortably overlap.
Character Area 1: Wardroom/Westcliffe House Area			
D2/41/7	Local Resident	The Ward Room and other historic buildings on site are rapidly falling in to disrepair. Consideration should be given to fast track the development of these	Agreed. Future phasing plans should prioritise the repair and restoration of these buildings at an early stage as noted in para 5.8 (Design and Built Heritage).
D1/22/27	Lee-on-the-Solent Residents' Association	Support variety of uses for the Wardroom but phrase 'institutional use' is inappropriate.	Institutional use refers to the term used within the Use Classes Order. Examples are given in the text.
D2/48/2	Local Resident	The Ward Room should be opened up to visitors.	The key priority is to preserve and enhance the condition of the building to ensure its long-term future. Whilst it will be good to open the building to

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
			public use much will depend on its eventual use.
D1/32/37	SEEDA	Westcliffe House may not be suitable for residential accommodation (according to initial design feasibility work)	The Council does not want to be overly prescriptive and limit this type of use. Specialist developers may be able to find such a use for the building.
Character Area 2: Seaplane Square			
D1/32/38	SEEDA	SEEDA understands only three buildings have been put forward for listing not four	The three J Type Seaplane Hangars and an associated Winch House were proposed for listing.
D1/16/6	Hovercraft Museum	Listed buildings (as highlighted in the Local Plan Review and SPD) recognise that the most appropriate use for a historic building is for the purpose for which they were built. Clearly the hovercraft museum reflects that objective. The hangars, slipway and Winch House and their relationship to one another and the overall Conservation Area is of recognised importance.	Agree. Make specific reference to the Hovercraft Museum.
D1/16/7	Hovercraft Museum	Concern is expressed on any sub-division of Seaplane Square and the introduction of inappropriate uses including any significant area of car parking. To demonstrate the hovercraft a safe area is required, an activity likely to be prejudiced by any sub-division of this area, whether physically or by ownership.	Make specific reference to retaining the Hovercraft Museum within the site. Flexibility in the use of Seaplane Square will be important. Subdivision of the space should be avoided. Some areas would be required for parking at certain times, and provision for access for service deliveries and pedestrians would also be important. A parking strategy and management plan would be required as part of an application. There will be the need to balance the interests of the Hovercraft Museum with that of other commercial and public interests.
D2/58/3 D2/61/3	Local Residents (2)	Hovercraft Museum should retain their occupancy of Seaplane Square. The site benefits from <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • slipway access; • history of the site for testing hovercrafts; • public realm of Seaplane Square could be utilised for hovercraft related events; • potential links with other museums in the area (e.g. Explosion). 	
D2/52/7	Local Resident	Seaplane Square is a mess. The Hovercraft Museum will need large amounts of money to upgrade. It is an important historical record.	

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
D2/15/1	Local Resident	Encouraged that the area described as Seaplane Square is intended to be a heritage area and the former WW1 seaplane hangars are to be retained.	Noted.
D2/15/4	Local Resident	There should be genuine heritage on the site (see D2/15/3 regarding heritage uses in Development Strategy section) not just housing, a café with alfresco seating, a car park and universal classis street furniture.	Noted. Amendments highlighted elsewhere will enable other heritage proposals at Daedalus. Proposals could be considered as part of a future planning application.
D1/24/1	The Provincial Society	Agree that buildings around Seaplane Square are of historical and architectural importance.	
D1/24/2	The Provincial Society	Provincial Society would like to enhance the heritage of Seaplane Square by offering: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • display of heritage vehicles with associated educational facilities; and • heritage vehicles for free use on a few days each year to support local events. 	
D1/22/28	Lee-on-the-Solent Residents' Association	The Hovercraft Museum will need to be removed from Seaplane Square to provide 'this vibrant front door'. Is there a site for the Hovercraft Museum elsewhere on the site	
D1/22/28	Lee-on-the-Solent Residents' Association	Do not support listing of J Type Seaplane Hangars which are ugly and out of character on the seafront?	The Council considers that there is the potential to retain a hovercraft museum at Seaplane Square or elsewhere on the site. Either way it is recognised that its use of space will need to be reconsidered and other commercial/leisure uses will also need to be considered. These elements have been strengthened in the amended version of the SPD.
Character Area 3: Barracks Square			
D1/32/36	SEEDA	Barracks Square is defined too tightly- should be expanded to Hermes Road to west, Vengeance Road to the east and Implacable Road to the north	The national historic significance of these structures was noted by English Heritage in a thematic review. English Heritage put forward the proposal to list the buildings. Buildings are recommended for listing on architectural or historic grounds and their aesthetic appearance is not a factor.
Barracks Square is an inward looking space focused on the central parade ground. The three roads referred to are quite detached from the square and			

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
			form parts of stronger linear spaces (Hermes Road also facing the large open area to its west).
D2/73/15	Local Resident	It would be good if Barracks Square could be planted as an ornamental garden.	The landscaping of this Square would be considered as part of a detailed planning application and the importance of creating an attractive soft landscaped space is noted.
Character Area 4: Implacable Road and Hermes Road			
D1/32/39	SEEDA	Amend character area boundary to reflect comments relating to Barracks Square (D1/32/36).	Implacable Road has a strong linear character detached from Barracks Square. Hermes Road similarly addressed the space to its west and turns its back on Barracks Square.
D1/28/14	Lee Flying Association	Amend to allow the movement of aircraft to make it possible for aircraft (wingspan/16m) to be exhibited at Seaplane Square, access the slipway (amphibious aircraft operations) and access the seafront for static display at community events.	Noted. The flexible use of Seaplane Square and the slipway is important. This is mentioned in the text. A route from Hangars North through Character Area 4 is mentioned in the text although no specific width has been suggested. The detailed width will need to be considered as part of a planning application.
Character Area 5: Vengeance Road Area			
D1/32/40	SEEDA	Amend character area boundary to reflect comments relating to Barracks Square (D1/32/36). The Eagle Club would therefore be in a different character area.	Vengeance Road has a strong linear character quite separate and distinct from Barracks Square.
D2/21/1	Local Resident	Concerns that proposals to convert the historic building identified on the plan [Frobisher Block] will affect the privacy of the residents in an adjacent property.	The building is of historic interest rather than a Listed Building. The original building was built in the 1930's and was used as a barrack block and consequently has had a history of being used as a form of residential use. Proposals to convert this building for modern residential use will need to accord with the policies of the Adopted Gosport Local Plan Review (2006) which aims to safeguard the privacy of existing residents.

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
Character Area 6: Norwich Place Character Area 6			
D1/18/22	Defence Estates	The use of Area 6 for predominately residential purposes is supported as a suitable neighbour for Married quarters/residential use of the MoD owned land.	Noted.
Character Area 7: Western edge			
D1/32/41	SEEDA	Amend character area boundary to reflect comments relating to Northern Hangars (D1/32/35).	The character area represents the need to delineate a sensitive 'fringe' area alongside the residential area to the south and its present character differs from the wide open space to the north.
D1/32/42	SEEDA	If extended east there is scope for additional open space to be provided to act as a buffer between residential and employment areas.	
D1/12/4	Director, Ross House Solentview Limited	Landscaping of garden is a good idea provided it is for the sole and exclusive use of Ross House residents. Otherwise that would impact greatly on the security and privacy of our development.	The detailed aspects of any park including the amenities of residents would need to be considered at a detailed planning application stage. In principle the retention of an open space in this location would help to protect the mature landscaping in this area which was once part of the garden of the original Ross House.
D2/56/2 D2/69/3	Local Residents (2)	Concerned regarding open space to the rear of Ross House in respect of security and noise issues. What security measures would be included? Would it be closed in the evening? Would it be looked after by the Borough Council? (D2/56/2)	
Character Area 8: Northern hangars			
D1/32/35	SEEDA	Character area extends too far west, Para 7.4 makes provision for residential development on western part of the site to provide a buffer. This character area is shown as employment.	This character area forms part of a wide open space north of the core of the built development to the south. Its present character is therefore quite distinct from the area to the south. The proposed character area will not preclude appropriate employment led development in this area. The residential development referred to in para 7.4 includes that proposed in Character Area 7. The boundary of Character Area 7 has been moved north-eastwards to allow residential development on

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
			the other side of the road to create a street frontage.
D1/32/43	SEEDA	A preferred energy strategy is yet to be determined and therefore it is premature to identify that a CHP would be provided; or that it would be in this location. Delete this bullet point.	This was originally shown in the SEEDA Masterplan and would appear a good location for such a use. The CHP is a suggested land use. Other locations on the site would be considered if shown to be more appropriate.
D1/32/44	SEEDA	Initial feasibility work suggests that parking may be possible here.	Noted the SPD does not preclude this use and would need to be considered as part of a wider car parking strategy for the whole site.
D1/18/23	Defence Estates	Support the need to protect the amenity of nearby residential properties through the development of smaller units. However with regard to the location of the small units no mention is made of the eastern boundary adjacent to the MoD land nor along the northern edge of the MoD owned land. Text in SPD should reflect this.	The northern boundary of the site is adjacent the airfield and may not be appropriate for smaller premises. Noise considerations will be assessed with each application (in a similar way the Driving School was considered which resulted in the use of bunding to reduce noise impacts). The undeveloped MoD land is now included as a new character area (9) in which the interface between employment and residential uses has been considered.
11. IMPLEMENTATION			
Implementation: Submission of planning applications			
D1/30/4	Fareham Borough Council	FBC request that any outline application is supported by an aviation study which demonstrates that the siting of new development and infrastructure will not undermine the future operation of the airfield.	Agree-amend accordingly. This is included in the specific aviation considerations section.
D1/19/26	Natural England	Para 8.2: An outline application should also include the need for an avoidance and mitigation strategy, green infrastructure provision and biodiversity enhancement.	Amend to include these measures.
D1/27/31	Environment Agency	Para 8.2: Recommend include 'surface and drainage infrastructure' as a key study. This will be informed by the flood risk assessment	Amend according.

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
D1/19/27	Natural England	Para 8.6: Consideration should also be given to the Habitat Regulation Assessment.	Amend accordingly.
Implementation: Phasing			
D1/19/28	Natural England	Para 8.8: Phasing programme should include green infrastructure and other mitigation measures.	Last bullet point mentions that infrastructure will be phased in accordance with an agreed trigger list; this includes green infrastructure.
D1/22/30	Lee-on-the-Solent Residents' Association	Agree with plans to have a phasing programme and that top priority should be given for employment creation and the early use of Listed Buildings.	Noted.
Implementation: Developer contributions/ Section 106 Requirements			
D1/19/29	Natural England	Para 8.13 should include the provision of multi-functional green infrastructure linking with the wider GI network and the need to secure long-term management.	Add reference to green infrastructure and ongoing management.
D1/28/8	Lee Flying Association	Non-aviation businesses should be required to contribute to aviation infrastructure costs even if none are required by that business.	It may be unreasonable to require non-aviation businesses to pay for aviation related infrastructure and could deter potential investment.
D1/22/31	Lee-on-the-Solent Residents' Association	Support contributions towards education facilities and the need for additional provision to be made in Lee-on-the-Solent.	Noted.
Implementation: Other funding mechanisms			
D2/41/10	Local Resident	What about EU money to develop the site. Gosport is a high unemployment area.	Current/future owners will need to consider several sources of funding. The Borough Council's Economic Prosperity section will be able to advise companies further on this issue. The most applicable at present is the Government's Regional Growth Fund.
Implementation: Viability/Enabling Development			
D2/45/58	Local Resident	Para 8.17: Any excess over the remaining allocation of 352 units is likely to be highly controversial.	Acknowledged. Consequently the Borough Council will only consider permitting proposals over the allocation if there is a clear and demonstrable case. This will need to be based on evidence that this is necessary to deliver the Council's key aims of

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
			employment creation on the site.
Implementation: On-going maintenance			
D2/27/32	Environment Agency	Recommend that surface water drainage is included.	Amend accordingly.
Implementation: Development of the site in general (organisational/ownership arrangements,			
D2/59/1	Local Resident	Concern regarding the mess of the Daedalus project- too many organisations, no cohesion and no single authority with the power to make things happen.	Noted.
D2/59/2	Local Resident	Gosport and Fareham Borough Councils should be focussing their efforts on what will replace SEEDA.	
D1/22/2	Lee-on-the-Solent Residents' Association	Helpful if the SPD could explain what happens when SEEDA ceases to exist and what the financial situation will be.	This is still unclear. The SPD aims to provide a planning framework irrespective of who eventually owns the site.
D2/24/1	Local Resident	Document contains a number of aspirations but it is not clear how these are to be achieved. No point proceeding with this document until the Council has a clear idea of how these aspirations are to be achieved. Once the companies and organisation who wish to come to this site have been identified and confirmed it will be possible to provide a detailed brief for the Council. Otherwise an industrial estate will be built with the hope of letting units. This is unacceptable and unlikely to deliver the employment required.	The SPD is a framework to consider future planning applications and is not a proposal in its own right. It is up to a developer to come forward with proposals and these will be considered against the elements detailed in the SPD. It is likely that a number of proposals will come forward particularly once the site is marketed and a consortium of interested parties comes forward.
D2/41/12	Local Resident	Developer must develop the utilities and infrastructure first before other works.	This will be undertaken in a phased manner on sites as large as this to meet the needs of the site at each stage. It will be necessary for some initial infrastructure to be provided in order to make the site attractive for companies locating on the site.
D2/20/12	Local Resident	Concerned that GBC has not yet received SEEDA's list of companies that had expressed an interest in moving to the site	Noted.
D2/20/12	Local Resident	Consideration should be given to the provision of financial incentives to encourage companies to move to the site	The Budget announced that the Government would create 21 new Enterprise Zones, within local

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		and employ Gosport residents, for example a reduction in business rates based upon the percentage of Gosport residents they employ.	enterprise partnerships, with simplified planning rules, super-fast broadband and tax breaks for businesses. The Solent Local Enterprise Partnership applied to the Government to become an Enterprise Zone and in August 2011 this status was confirmed
D2/45/2	Local Resident	As highlighted at the public meeting there is frustration from commercial companies who wish to be located on Daedalus. Procedures should be introduced for commercial requests to be determined during the consultation period up to the final agreement of all relevant policies to avoid a further year's delay. Commerce cannot be held back while months and years pass by for policy finalisation.	<p>The Borough Council has also been frustrated by the delay on this site and this has not been brought about due to policy considerations rather the complex ownership, contractual obligations and long term management arrangements relating to the former and current owners of the site. Moving towards an agreement on these outstanding issues has been necessary to assist with ensuring that an employment-led site is viable.</p> <p>It is important to note that the SPD is only a planning framework to help guide future developers on forthcoming applications as well as flagging-up key issues that need to be considered in more detail.</p> <p>It is wholly inappropriate to determine commercial requests on the site whilst consulting the general public on a framework. Instead it is much more appropriate for these commercial enterprises to provide constructive comments on how the SPD could be changed to deliver the Council's objectives for the site.</p> <p>The most appropriate way for commercial enterprises to register their interest is by providing their details to the landowners/developers as part of any future marketing exercise. This would give them</p>

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
			an opportunity to form part of a consortium and help shape a planning proposal. The Council could then consider the proposal as part of a whole scheme rather than on a piecemeal basis.
D2/18/2	Local Resident	There is a need to get on with it-the site has laid dormant for too long.	Noted.
D1/23/14	Highways Agency	HA are keen to engage in pre-application discussions with the site developer and GBC.	Noted.
12: APPENDICES			
D1/27/33	Environment Agency	Appendix 3: May wish to include PUSH Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA)	Add to list.
D1/27/34	Environment Agency	Appendix 4 Provides the latest position on PPG20 (text supplied).	Refer to Paragraph 3.9 which is still applicable at present.
13: OTHER COMMENTS REGARDING SPD			
Other comments: Government legislation			
D2/45/8	Local Resident	Will the SPD be overtaken by new Government Guidelines which can appear unexpectedly quicker than the local preparation of detailed local guidance.	Agree that this can be an issue. However in relation to the Government's latest changes to the planning system in relation to Localism, it is understood that there will still be a need to prepare a development plan and this can be supported by an SPD where necessary. The key issues on the site are likely to remain and it is considered that the SPD provides sufficient flexibility within a defined framework to deal with changing circumstances.
Other comments: Structure of the document			
D1/1/1	Advanced Marine Innovation Technology Subsea Ltd	Layout of the document is poor and the sub sectioning reveals a lack of clarity in the considerations.	Noted.
SPD Process			
D1/22/32	Lee-on-the-Solent	Useful to understand how SPD passes to the EiP.	The SPD does not form part of the statutory

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
	Residents' Association		development and is guidance and therefore an EiP is not required. The Council will adopt the SPD once it has considered all the representations received and proposed changes.
14: HABITATS REGULATION ASSESSMENT DRAFT SCREENING REPORT			
General comment			
D1/7/1	The Coal Authority	No specific comments at this stage.	Noted.
D1/27/35	Environment Agency	Support approach to the document and pleased with its overall content.	Noted.
D1/31/1	Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	Welcome the submission of the HRA Screening Report.	Noted.
D1/33/5	Portsmouth Water	The HRA Screening Statement should be altered to reflect the current licensing and supply situation. Comments about 'over abstraction' and the impact on river systems need to be reconsidered and the document should refer to Portsmouth Water's 'Updated Draft Water Resources Management Plan' (July 2010). The benefits of the Havant Thicket Winter Storage Reservoir should also be included. Detailed text supplied.	HRA has been amended to reflect the latest version of the Draft Water Resources Management Plan (as per Portsmouth Water's website as at 1 st June 2011).
Relevant European sites			
D1/9/30 D1/27/36	Natural England Environment Agency	Agree that all the relevant European Sites relevant to the site have been identified.	Noted.
Methodology			
D1/19/34	Natural England	HRA prepared by David Tyldesley and Associates (2006). Whilst this is acceptable revised internal guidance was produced in Feb 2009 and may assist in the preparation the SPD HRA. Guidance has not been signed off by DCLG and so may be subject to change	NE sent a copy to GBC following its meeting with officers during the consultation period. Officers have had regard to this guidance when preparing the HRA Report.
D1/19/33	Natural England	Natural England also formed from parts of the Rural Development Service and Countryside Agency.	Noted.
Ecological descriptions, qualifying features conservation objectives, vulnerabilities and opportunities			
D1/9/31	Natural England	Ecological descriptions, qualifying features, conservation	Noted.

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		objectives, vulnerabilities and opportunities all presented.	
D1/27/37	Environment Agency	Agree potential vulnerabilities have been identified.	Noted.
D1/27/38	Environment Agency	Agree with list of relevant plans and projects as identified in Annex A.	Noted.
Effects of the Plan			
D1/19/32 D1/21/2	Natural England RSPB	Following impacts should also be considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • noise; • light pollution; • vibration; (D1/21/2) • construction effects (D1/21/2). 	These issues have been included in the HRA Report.
D1/19/35a	Natural England	The impact categories which have been attributed to the individual components of Policy CS9 are unclear in a number of cases and require further justification (see D1/19/35b – D1/19/35e below). The screening section therefore requires additional text to support the screening matrix and to explain the basis on which any individual sites are being screened out.	See specific comments below.
D1/19/35b		3a: employment floorspace has been given Category 5 (steers development away from European sites) but have impacts such as air quality (through increased traffic), water abstraction and waste water discharge.	Employment floorspace has been re-categorised as an '8' in relation to the following impacts (as identified in Table 4.23 of the Gosport Core Strategy HRA Screening Report (Sept 2009). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air pollution (which could affect the Southampton and Solent SPA and Ramsar Site). It is not considered that other sites will be affected by air pollution as it is considered that employment development on this site will help reduce out-commuting and thereby traffic and pollution overall. Accept that an impact of additional traffic using Stubbington Lane close to the Hill Head part of the

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
			<p>Solent and Southampton Water SPA may need to be considered at a Project level.</p> <p>* Water abstraction which could affect River Itchen SAC, Solent Maritime SAC, Chichester Harbours SPA and Ramsar, Portsmouth Harbour SPA and Ramsar and the Southampton and Solent SPA and Ramsar Site.</p> <p>* Waste Water Pollution which could affect Portsmouth Harbour SPA and Ramsar and the Southampton and Solent SPA and Ramsar Site</p> <p>These potential impacts have been included in the HRA Report.</p>
D1/19/35c		<p>3b: Leisure and recreation and proposed scheme for a new marina have been scored 5 except for the Solent and Southampton Water SPA/Ramsar site but may have in-combination effects such as increased water abstraction and waste water discharge.</p>	<p>Leisure and recreation has been re-categorised as an '8' in relation to the following impacts (as identified in Table 4.23 of the Gosport Core Strategy HRA Screening Report (Sept 2009):</p> <p>* Water abstraction which could affect the River Itchen SAC, Solent Maritime SAC, Chichester Harbours SPA and Ramsar, Portsmouth Harbour SPA and Ramsar and the Southampton and Solent SPA and Ramsar Site.</p> <p>* Waste Water Pollution which could affect Portsmouth Harbour SPA and Ramsar and the Southampton and Solent SPA and Ramsar Site.</p> <p>These potential impacts have been included in the HRA Report.</p> <p>The marina has been screened-out as it does not</p>

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
			form part of the anticipated uses for the Daedalus site as set out in the SPD.
D1/19/35d		4: employment uses and safeguarding access to the Solent via the slipway has been scored 5 but an additional employment allocation could increase the use of the slipway which would have disturbance implications for the Solent and Southampton Water SPA/Ramsar.	This has been re-categorised as an '8' as increased use of the slipway which would have disturbance implications for the Solent and Southampton Water SPA/Ramsar site. This potential impact has been included in the HRA Report.
D1/19/35e		5 enhanced visitor attractions including potential for water sports and 6 food and drinks premises have been scored 5 but will increase visitors and potentially add to the recreational disturbance of the SPA in combination with the other proposed development.	Enhanced visitor attractions which could include water sports has been re-categorised as an 8. As this use could have disturbance implications for the Solent and Southampton Water SPA/Ramsar. This potential impact has been included in the HRA Report.
D1/19/35f		10, 11 and 12 which all refer to improving access including to the waterfront have been scored 1 (policy not leading to development). However the planning and design of access facilities is an important contributory factor in assessing whether there will be increased levels of disturbance by increasing the waterfront accessibility.	Enhanced access has been re-categorised as an 8. As this could have disturbance implications for the Solent and Southampton Water SPA/Ramsar. This potential impact has been included in the HRA Report.
D1/19/36	Natural England	Table 5: NE advise that the HRA should consider the potential impacts of air pollution due to increased traffic from the development on all roads which pass within 200m of a designated site, where there is likely to be a significant increase in traffic as a result of the development (further technical guidance supplied). Natural England advise that it is necessary for the Borough Council to have reasonable certainty through quantification of the effects at the Core Strategy and SPD	Noted. This potential impact has been considered in the HRA Report.

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		level that adverse effects on integrity will be avoided/ Also air quality impacts should be assessed at an early stage in order to inform the Core Strategy and SPD documents.	
D1/19/37	Natural England	Table 5: Reference should also be made to the additional leisure facilities proposed which may contribute to recreational disturbance (in addition to residential development and marina)	Noted the potential disturbance impact of additional leisure facilities has been considered in the HRA Report.
Para 2.3D1/27/38	Environment Agency	Table 5: Flood risk has been considered in term of potential effects on European site from Daedalus Core Strategy policy.	Noted.
D1/27/40	Environment Agency	Para 4.21: Recommend the requirements of the Water Framework Directive are given consideration in order to ensure no further deterioration to any water-body, be it groundwater, transitional/coastal, rivers or lakes within the GBC area.	This has been considered when considering the waste water pollution issue.
D1/19/38	Natural England	<p>Para 4.24: Records that a marina is not included in the draft SPD and has therefore been screened out of the HRA process. However NE considers that if the marina is being promoted within the Core Strategy policy and the SPD as an option which may be complementary to proposed employment development the issue should be assessed in the HRA and SA/SEA at a strategic level.</p> <p>If a marina development is not being promoted it may be appropriate to consider a modification of the policy which excludes reference to it or alternatively to make it clear that any development that would be likely to have a significant effect on a designated site, either alone or in combination with other plans and projects would not be in accordance with the development plan and would not have the benefit of a presumption of approval under Section 38 of the Planning and Compulsory purchase Act</p>	<p>A marina will not be included in the latest draft version of the Core Strategy. It has been removed from the Development Strategy part of the document. Mention of a marina is now only included in the development considerations section to provide guidance to developer in the eventuality that a marina development is proposed. The following text has also been added on the advice of Natural England:</p> <p>'any development that would be likely to have a significant effect on a designated site, either alone or in combination with other plans and projects would not be in accordance with the development plan.'</p>

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		2004 at the planning application stage.	
D1/27/43	Environment Agency	Reassuring the HRA has been used to make key changes between the Core Strategy policy and the draft SPD. As identified there are a number of potential environmental vulnerabilities associated with the marina option. EA is happy for the effects to be screened out if the option is not being promoted in the SPD.	
D1/21/6	RSPB	Given the clear support for a marina in Para 4.30 of the SPD the RSPB is very concerned that the marina has been screened out of the HRA Screening Statement. It is RSPB's reading of the SPD that a marina is not precluded from the scope of the SPD and is seen to complement proposals at Daedalus. It can therefore not be screened out.	
D1/21/9	RSPB	Welcome conclusion that the SPD will require an Appropriate Assessment under the Habitats Regulations, however based on current details it will not be possible to demonstrate that the SPD will not have an adverse impact on the integrity of the Solent and Southampton Water SPA and Ramsar site. Urge Council to ensure points are thoroughly assessed and further research including the forthcoming results of the Solent Disturbance and Recreation Project are used to inform a full and robust assessment of potential impacts.	The HRA Report includes further assessment and makes reference to further research such as the Solent Disturbance and Recreation Project.
Screening Statement			
D1/27/41	Environment Agency	Agree with Screening Statement. In terms of waste water it needs to be demonstrated that the proposed development can be accommodated within current discharge consent limits. This will be in relation to both main discharge and storm abstraction.	Noted.
D1/27/42	Environment Agency	In terms of water abstraction, it will need to be demonstrated that the current Habitats Directive compliant	Noted.

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		licenses and licences which are in the process of becoming compliant, will not be exceeded as a result of the development.	
D1/31/2	Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	Agree with the findings that an Appropriate Assessment will be required in order to ascertain whether or not proposals will lead to significant adverse effects on the site integrity either alone or in combination. Without this the SPD would not be legally compliant with the Conservation of Species and Habitat Regulations 2010.	Noted.
D1/31/3	Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	The SPD will need to be adjusted to take into account any required avoidance/mitigation measures arising from the HRA.	Noted.
15: CONSULTATION ARRANGEMENTS			
Consultation: General points			
D2/41/1	Local Resident	It appears not much has happened in the last few years with the owner SEEDA and the many public consultations it has held-surely the powers that be know the feelings of Lee residents by now. Have young people been asked for their views?	Noted. Groundwork has involved young people in its consultation for SEEDA.
D2/45/9	Local Resident	What guarantees do we have public comments will be taken into account and not just those compatible with Government, developers' or planners' preferences.	Comments have been considered and a report will be presented to Councillors identifying the key issues arising from the consultation. Detailed comments will also be made available for Councillors to view.
D2/60/6	Local Resident	Please listen to the people of the area and take their concerns on board in the future planning of this very important site.	
Consultation: Public meeting			
D2/45/1	Local Resident	At the outset of the meeting the public were asked to bear in mind that the meeting was being held in a church. This could be construed as moral pressure on the public to avoid making certain comments. Public buildings should	Noted.

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		be used in future.	
D2/37/9	Local Resident	The Chairman's frequently stated view that the body of the meeting should be asking questions, rather than making comments, to be totally inappropriate. The public should be able to state their views to officials. Considered the random nature of taking comments and the clear effort to ignore/silence one individual to be an embarrassment.	Members of the public were free to ask questions and make comments. The random nature of comments reflected the content and the order that members of the public made them. The Council wanted to provide a loose structure for the public meeting and allow the public to set the agenda. Not aware of anyone being silenced or not given time to speak.
D2/65/4	Local Resident	Treatment of local businessman was poor. Understand his frustration and he should have been asked to come long to the Council Offices for further discussion.	Local businessman was invited to talk to the Council about his particular issues.
D2/76/4	Local Resident	The way the panel tried to manipulate the questions was beneath contempt.	Do not accept that questions were being manipulated. All those that indicated that they wished to speak were given time to air their questions and views. Those that did not feel comfortable to speak could make representations on the comments form, speak to officers after the meeting, visit them at exhibitions or contact them at the Town Hall. Indeed many residents have done.
D2/42/1	Local Resident	The loop system was not working at the public meeting as far as I heard. A total waste of time.	Apologise if there were technical difficulties. The Council made every effort to ensure that these were available on the evening including employing a sound engineer who regularly covers events at St Faiths.