

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
Royal Clarence Yard and the Retained Area			
219/20	Cllr Bateman	Agree with principles identified	Support welcomed
294/26	Gosport Society	<p>Ensure proposals for Royal Clarence Yard are finally considered as a whole, not in two or more parts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - With the release of the retained land, it should be possible to ensure that the majority of this area is accessible (particularly the heritage assets) and that the Yard can be read and appreciated as a whole. - Together with the Royal William Yard in Plymouth, RCY is one of the only two former Royal Naval Yards and should be celebrated and promoted as such. 	Agree. Amend SPD to emphasise this point more strongly.
<i>Improving access to whole RCY area</i>			
57/28	Local resident	Lacks access for the general public (57/28)	Proposals in the SPD aim to improve access by

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
83/21, 100/18, 108/11, 109/16, 113/1, 133/16, 116/12, 124/15, 203/18, 219/9, 239/10, 294/53	Local residents Cllr Raffaelli, Cllr Bateman, Gosport Society	<p>Improved access to RCY along the waterfront is required Improved access will encourage more people to visit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would promote further development of the yard which is a tremendous asset. (124/15) - From Falkland Gardens (219/9)/ from ferry 83/21, 239/10) - Would reduce walking times to the Ferry (113/1) - Route the Millennium Promenade through RCY at the first possible opportunity, visitor miss RCY at the moment (350/29) - Improve access by foot, bike and car (100/18) - Make RCY part of dockyard walkway(139/6) - Council needs to work with landowners and developers to ensure that the original vision is realised and the route as close to the waterside as possible (preferably neither along Mumby Road and Weevil Lane. (294/52). - The segment that currently runs the whole length of Weevil Lane could be re-routed without further delay through the developed part of RCY. This would have a beneficial impact on the businesses located in Cooperage Green and along the RCY Waterfront (294/52). 	<p>foot, cycle and car in various ways.</p> <p>The principle of routing the Millennium Promenade close to the waterfront as opportunities arise is already established in the GBLP and within this SPD. The England Coastal Path could also be routed through the site. Amend RCY accordingly. Such a proposal would assist businesses at RCY.</p> <p>Proposals could be implemented as part of proposals to improve parking and signing at RCY; as part of the proposed public realm action plan; or as part of the longer term proposals relating to the Retained Area.</p>
289/15	Local resident	Need a stronger link between RCY and the main Town centre	
6/9, 132/9, 210/5, 272/15, 336/52, 350/29	Meon Ramblers, Lee Residents Association	<p>Support public access through the site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Using Oil Pipeline as an access is a good idea as the route is through the Ramparts(6/9) - Any scope of getting an access nearer the water and OAPA Jetty (understand that this is related to land being released)(6/9) - The Oil pipeline agency is planning to retain access to their site making a route across their land difficult. (132/9). 	Support welcomed. It is recognised that certain sections such as those relating to the OAPA land may not be forthcoming in the short-term but it is important to highlight this as a future proposal when an opportunity arises in the future.

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"> - Potential for a mini-arch over the MoD pipeline (similar to wooden bridges used on the Thames Path near Staines) (210/5) 	
29/20, 139/6	Local residents	Consider water transport <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - water bus service with links to Fareham, Port Solent and Portsmouth to encourage footfall (29/20) - provide ferry access to the historic dockyard (139/6) 	A water passenger service did run from this site for a time but lacked patronage and therefore ceased operation. The Council would support any revised attempt for such operations. A service currently operates between museum sites around the Harbour and if there were sufficient attractions at the RCY site such a service may consider it worthwhile to stop here. Amend the SPD to highlight the opportunity.
291/19	Local resident	Area not served by buses	Lack of bus access is acknowledged. There was a period where a bus service was subsidised to the RCY site, however due to low patronage the operation ceased. The lack of public transport is acknowledged as currently users need to walk from town centre bus stops. Other options such as a land train have been suggested as part of the SPD to link sites along the waterfront better. The consideration of this will be included in the SPD under Theme E relating to improving accessibility.
289/15	Local resident	Improve access with the town centre with a free express bus service?(289/15)	
366/6	Local resident	Support for a land train to Royal Clarence Yard and to Explosion (366/6).	The consideration of this will be included in the SPD under Theme E relating to improving accessibility.
99/9, 108/13, 112/32	Local residents	Open up/strengthen the Millennium Bridge /Forton Lifting Bridge for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - road bridge for cars (99/9) - Buses (108/13, 112/32) - Other vehicles (112/32) 	The structure was not designed or constructed with such traffic in mind, and does not have the necessary structural strength for vehicle containment. The bridge was designed to carry pedestrians and cyclists, occasional emergency vehicles and a specific form of road train. The deck width was largely determined for the shared use of pedestrians and cyclists, with 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>balustrade designed with regard to the look of the structure and the desire to maintain a view for pedestrians, not vehicle containment. the wearing surface is not suited to regular use by heavy vehicles and that the surface water drainage discharges water straight into the sea - this arrangement may be unacceptable to the Environment Agency for traffic use where fuel and oil spillage is possible.</p>
<p>Royal Clarence Yard</p>			
<p><i>Overarching comments about the site</i></p>			
<p>4/20, 5/15, 68/30, 72/10, 272/15, , 343/13, 362/18</p>	<p>Local residents, Gosport Marine Scene, Lee Residents Association</p>	<p>Positive aspects cited about RCY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a very attractive site overlooking the marina(4/20, 5/15) • Could be the jewel for Gosport (72/10) • Expansion of small marine businesses in the office and light industrial units is encouraging(68/30) • It's an amazing location, more needs to be done to encourage people to go there. (272/15) • Great asset to Gosport. It's a shame lot of people don't know about it. Maybe now that the Submarine Museum and Explosion are part of the Historic Dockyard it will become better known (343/13) • Clarence Marina has the potential to become an upmarket part of the town. (272/15) 	<p>Agree this is a fantastic site and location. Amend the SPD to emphasise this further.</p>
<p>36/10,45/8, 80/14, 102/17</p>	<p>Local residents</p>	<p>The character and buildings should be maintained</p>	<p>Agree the SPD very much aims to do this.</p>

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
23/5, 28/15, 65/14, 72/5, 83/19, 203/18, 206/1, 246/12, 248/22	Local residents	<p>The site is uncompleted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Needs finishing (28/15, 65/14, 72/5, 83/19, 203/18, 206/1) - Area is still a building site (23/5) - Royal Clarence Yard empty (246/12) <p>Shop units vacant because parking for shoppers not been included this area could be a vibrant area for day and evening events (248/22)</p>	<p>There are only two parcels of land to be completed. One of these is almost completed and the other site has just started being built-out.</p> <p>With regard to the waterfront it is acknowledged that the site has a number of current difficulties. The SPD puts forwards suggestions on how some of these issues can be addressed. It is important to recognise that this will need the determination and support of the developer, businesses and local residents together with the Council if this is to succeed. A partnership approach is very much needed.</p> <p>Further details are covered later in this section.</p>
258/26	Local resident	Concern about poor commercial judgement of Council due to unfilled retail units which cast doubt on the success of future ventures plus lack of starter homes (258/26)	The site is not a Council development but has been developed by a private developer. Affordable housing has been secured on the site.
79/7	Local resident	Shame it has not been a success	There are many elements of RCY that are successful including the conversions of a nationally significant complex of buildings in an attractive way to provide a mix of new homes and employment areas with marina (Cooperage, North Meadow). In many ways the attractiveness of the site contributes to the frustration that the waterfront has not been commercially vibrant as it had been hoped with a limited number of businesses taking these units. However it is recognised that the waterfront still has huge potential and the SPD includes some suggestions to work in a positive way to address some of the issues highlighted (detailed later in this section of the report). The Council is in dialogue with the developer to improve certain elements of the site including public parking
	Local resident	Concern that developers did not deliver what was promised and is this going to be the future of planning and development in Gosport.	

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
			provision and wayfinding.
107/58	Local resident	RCY debacle should have been a wake up call to the Council. They must be held accountable by the residents and pro-actively find ways to make this work as a priority. It is too easy to blame the developers and Government planning. It was the Council the people elected to not let such things happen. Imposing as yet unknown financial penalties on developers does not get what was needed to benefit the people	The SPD proposes actions which aim to alleviate issues at this site.
107/60	Local resident	Publish how much Berkeley Homes paid as a fine for not building what they had contracted to do, and how this amount was derived and agreed	The Council is not aware of any fine.
143/12	Local resident	The area is nice and has some nice pubs now so a little would go a long way.	Agree some further improvements could assist this area greatly. Some suggestions are included in the SPD.
63/23,	Local resident	No more buildings required- site already completed	No additional houses or buildings are proposed – other than on the small area at the northern end of the site that was originally granted planning permission.
197/16, 216/9, 376/7	Local residents	Leave alone - Royal Clarence Yard, Weevil Lane St Georges should be left as it is. It is a historic site (376/7)	The Council's proposals are instead relating to public realm improvements and considering access and other improvements. In order to bring some vitality and viability to the commercial uses there needs to be a consideration by the Council, the developer, local residents, on-site businesses and the wider community on how the area can increase its footfall and become more attractive to commercial investors and Gosport residents as well as other visitors including those using the marinas. Hence the suggestions in the SPD.
237/19	Local resident	The Council should have stuck to its original plans for RCY.	Unfortunately the plans were changed by the

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
			developer and despite being refused by the Council they were approved by a Government Planning Inspector on appeal.
112/24	Local resident	Some residents have put in a great deal of work and thought [to address the issues raised]	This is acknowledged and it is considered that the Council needs to be proactive in assisting businesses on this site.
<i>Commercial Units (A Class uses)</i>			
294/41	Gosport Society	Support the objective to ensure the empty commercial units should be reserved for commercial uses only-	Support noted. The Council considers that this area has significant potential for commercial use. The opportunities would increase once development takes place at the retained Area.
22/15, 23/5, 44/1, 57/28, 68/29, 70/24, 72/5, 83/19, 84/17, 201/17, 288/14, 289/15, 304/18, 355/23, 367/24, 378/10	Local residents, Gosport Marine Scene	<p>There are a number of current issues relating to the empty units</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shops/commercial units still empty (22/15, 23/5,44/1, 70/24, 72/5, 83/19, 84/17, 201/17, 304/18, 355/23, 367/24), So many shops in RCY still empty and concerned that retail development in the town centre is likely to be at the expense of development in RCY(288/14) • Fill the empty units (83/19) • Too many people do not realise that there are shops at RCY – it's a beautiful area and potential is obvious (289/15) • Need to encourage businesses to take a chance on this area - would make an ideal location for boutique and special interest retail – need to consider whether rents are putting off small businesses form relocating her (289/15) • Not enough resident population to guarantee the survival of food outlets (68/29) • No need to improve lighting if all the retail units are unoccupied (72/5) • Attempts to emulate Gunwharf Quay type businesses with entertainment at Clarence Yard 	Acknowledge that the site has a number of current difficulties including the related issues of empty units and a lack of footfall. This is a challenge as businesses will want to be located where there is significant footfall and customers and visitors will only come where there is sufficient on offer. Increased confidence will bring additional businesses to the area including retail and food and drink type businesses. The SPD puts forwards suggestions on how some of these issues can be addressed. It is important to recognise that this will need the determination and support of the developer, businesses and local residents together with the Council if this is to succeed.

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		have left it an empty backwater with units not taken up or vacated in part due to the sensitivities of residents to evening and leisure uses (378/10).	
5/14, 19/6, 224/8, 266/26, 270/8, 362/18	Local residents	Suggested food and drink uses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - bars and restaurants (5/14, 19/6, 224/8) - pub chain (266/26) - Attract a good restaurateur like Rick Steins to create a buzz. (270/8) - Use the building for cafés etc. (362/18) 	
12/17, 19/6, 21/17, 57/28 78/8, 241/8 260/15, 266/16	Local residents	Suggested retail uses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - shops (12/17, 19/6, 21/17, 260/15, 266/16) - a convenience store (78/8) - Grocery store urgently needed for visiting boaters – High street poor on providing top-up supplies (opinion provided to respondent by mooring visitors to the Town) (241/8) - –could be a mini Whiteley (57/28) 	
<i>Leisure and Tourism uses</i>			
22/15, 358/22	Local residents	The site has no night life (22/15)	Acknowledge that the site has a number of current difficulties including the relating issues of empty units and a lack of footfall. This is a challenge as businesses will want to be located where there is significant footfall and customers and visitors will only come where there is sufficient on offer. Increased confidence will bring additional businesses to the area include leisure and tourism type uses. The SPD puts forwards suggestions on how some of these issues can be addressed. It is important to recognise that this will need the determination and support of the developer, businesses and local residents together with the Council if this is to succeed.
28/16, 114/13, 266/16, 362/18	Local residents	The site has the potential for leisure uses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - cinema (28/16, 114/13, 266/16) - Use the building for leisure etc.(362/18) 	
139/2, 202/6, 221/18, 277/4, 289/15, 336/51, 350/8, 355/23, 358/22	Local residents	The site has the potential for heritage/tourist attractions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A heritage attraction, its history and waterside location, previously supported by Berkeley Homes, to create jobs (139/2) - Tell the Story of RCY's heritage and the Rum Store, and other historic trades (139/2, 202/6, 221/18) - Gosport's Role in the Royal Navy, including the wider story of Portsmouth Harbour (139/2) - Use of interactive displays , facility linked to other Gosport tourist facilities (139/2) - The first floor of the granary, the bakery and 	

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		<p>slaughterhouse are an ideal location for a heritage attraction.(139/2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The current commercial element is not well known and would benefit from an attraction here like the converted rum store. (358/22) - Show off the History and culture of the site (277/4) - Use of the area for events and markets (355/23) - Could be opportunities to run weekly markets at RCY or a seasonal markets to help improve visibility and vibrancy of the area (289/15) - Welcome the reunification proposals especially the former victualling yard as a heritage zone with a range of uses. (336/51) - Welcome the use of the western area and historic buildings for heritage tourism (336/51) - Has the potential to be Covent Garden on the Harbour (350/8) 	<p>Amend the consideration on commercial uses to specifically identify potential uses which could help bring vitality to this area including leisure uses and events. A hotel may be difficult to accommodate on the site in practical terms given the amount of limited amount of space available.</p> <p>Include additional consideration relating to the importance of making more of the site's heritage (exhibition, interpretation, events). Add specific suggestions to the 'Ideas Compendium'</p> <p>The rum store is located on the Retained Area and it is proposed to amend the SPD to include this as a suggestion of a potential use.</p>
108/12, 114/13, 266/16, 371/4	Local residents	<p>The site has the potential for tourist facilities including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - hotel (114/13), (371/4) hotel/spa (266/16) - tourist centre (114/13) - Tourist shops (108/12) 	
<i>Marine uses</i>			
68/29	Gosport Marine Scene	Waterfront cut off from marine services (68/29)	This weakness is acknowledged. Proposals at the Retained Area could assist with this and there may be opportunities in the future for certain services to operate from the empty units on the waterfront at RCY.
261/15	Local resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Boat yards and marine can be noisy care needed when incorporating with residential (261/15) 	This is acknowledged. No further residential is being proposed adjacent the marina than currently exists. Policy LP46 of the GBLP is relevant.
<i>Employment uses (B-types uses)</i>			
135/13, 271/15, 365/5,	Local residents	Small maker spaces and reasonable rental start-ups to create tech hub with innovation and shared learning.	The Cooperage and North Meadow units provide for this type of facility and will be retained as

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		(135/13) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Small businesses (271/15) - Ideal area for employment development. More greenery needs to be included – look at Cooperage Green for a bad example (365/5) 	such. There may be additional opportunities as part of the retained area redevelopment (365/5). The character of the Cooperage reflects its historic identity as a working yard.
<i>Residential</i>			
20/21, 22/15, 48/11, 68/29, 138/17, 340/29, 371/5	Local residents	Concerns about the residential element of the site <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No more housing- Site already attractive (48/11, 340/29) - Site already attractive Just a dormitory (22/15) - Overdeveloped with housing (68/2) - Little there but residential. (138/17) - This is a dead end only suitable for people who want to live in a Listed building (20/21) - RCY does not need more empty flats (371/5) 	There are no additional dwellings proposed for the site other than those with extant planning permission on two parcels of land. One of which has almost been completed and the other has just started to be developed. Including these two sites the extant permission is for 105 dwellings but it is likely that approximately 70 will be completed. The site is more than a dormitory as it contains two successful small business areas (North Meadow and the Cooperage. It also has a marina and there is potential to have a more active waterfront with a variety of food and drink, retail, heritage and leisure proposals.
<i>Other uses</i>			
271/15	Local resident	Include schools	No schools on this site are planned by Hampshire County Council, as the local education authority. The space available on the site for alternative school provision is limited and may not be suited for educational purposes. Nursery provision may be appropriate for certain vacant buildings.
68/29	Gosport Marine Scene	Inadequate on-site services (68/29)	The proposals in the SPD aim to assist in increasing footfall which can assist in encouraging additional services to locate to this site.

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
<i>Promotion and Marketing</i>			
4/22, 39/18, 72/10, 83/19, 108/8, 107/59, 113/5, 139/1, 209/10, 225/4, 294/74, 350/27	Local residents, Lee Residents Association, Gosport Society	<p>More promotion of the RCY businesses required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - raise its profile (83/19,) - Lack of footfall (139/1) - More attention and stimulus needed to promote human interaction in this area (225/4) - More/clearer signage (39/18, 209/10, 294/74) - Improved marketing (108/8, 209/10) - Site should retain its original name and be promoted as such i.e. Royal Clarence Yard-rather than another marketing designation dreamed up by developers (294/74) - The whole site should be marketed/ named as Royal Clarence Yard (350/27) not under any other name. (336/55) - With regard to item 4 the key considerations relating to lighting and pedestrian signage is already a requirement of the developer to provide for the site and we are still waiting for these items to be provided. 113/5) - Resolve links to RCY using innovative ideas perhaps some type of free transport and make it number 1 priority (107/59) 	<p>Agree more promotion is required. The Council considers that a partnership approach is required to assist with a number of elements relating to marketing and promoting including improved wayfinding, lighting and marketing of the site for investors and customers.</p> <p>The Council recognises that as part of the development the developer is required to provide improved public parking and associated waymarking.</p> <p>The Council call the site by its historic name, Royal Clarence Yard in the SPD.</p>
29/19, 72/10, 209/10	Local residents	<p>Incentives are required</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Council to offer incentives (72/10, 209/10) - Reduce business rates to encourage more businesses 	<p>Ultimately the site is owned by a private developer. It is understood there have been some incentives for businesses to occupy the site. More can be done to encourage businesses to the site. The Council is proposing to assist in this matter.</p> <p>Business rates are determined nationally. Small Business Rate Relief is available.</p>
294/42	Gosport Society	<p>Residential amenities- Support commercial units but need to ensure that they do not generate excessive noise,</p>	<p>Acknowledged. Policy LP46 is applicable on residential amenities when considering any</p>

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		particularly at night- the nature of sound and absence of double glazing in the residential apartments above could be an issue.	proposals which require planning permission. There are also relevant regulations operated by Environmental Health.
<i>Parking</i>			
29/18, 64/30, 68/29, 89/24 94/11, 108/8, 83/20, 224/8, 268/14, 291/19, 304/18, 336/54, 378/11	Local residents, Lee Residents Association	<p>Parking needs to be improved/insufficient</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - for visitors (29/18) (83/20, 224/8) - Insufficient parking to provide for proposed retail and residential (268/14) - Confusing parking (89/24 , 304/18) - Lack of parking or convenient parking seems to be a major factor at Clarence Yard in deterring businesses offering leisure time activities. (378/11) - Lack of parking paralysed the area needs to be addressed before any further development. It could be a great space an asset to the town - No-one wants to walk from Cooperage Green to the waterfront in the wind an drain if they are dressed up to go out for the evening (378/11) 	<p>Agree that the parking arrangements are not suited for visitors including those potential customers to the waterfront businesses. These weaknesses are acknowledged in the SPD. The SPD is proposed to be amended to include some further detailed suggestions on how this situation could be improved. A partnership approach is required with the developer, businesses, residents and the Council to try and achieve this.</p> <p>This will need to include improving provision at both the Cooperage and North Meadows, making it welcoming, easily understood, with clear routeing from Mumby Road and a suitable pedestrian link to the waterfront.</p>
7/1, 113/4, 136/2, 210/6, 224/2, 279/3, 294/73, 295/1, 295/3 295/4, 295/2, 336/54, 342/27, 350/28, 360/4, 363/1	Local residents, Lee Residents Association, Gosport Society, Gosport Heritage Open Days	<p>Object that the Council is amenable to parking in Brewhouse Square.</p> <p>Strongly object to the square becoming a parking area because:</p> <p><i>Appearance and character</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This a historical area (113/4, 136/2, 279/3), (360/4), • Distract from the setting of the adjacent listed and important buildings (294/73)Destroys the integrity of the original plan (7/1) (360/4) • could damage the appearance of what is currently an attractive pedestrianised area(294/73, 342/27) • The principle of the square is that it is an open space with pedestrian access and views across the 	<p>It is agreed that Brewhouse Square does indeed make an important contribution to the character of the area and that there may be issues trying to route vehicles to this part of the site, and that it would be preferable to have a pedestrian environment in this location.</p> <p>Consequently the reference to parking at Brewhouse Square is proposed to be removed from the SPD.</p> <p>It is therefore imperative to find an alternative solution where visitors to the commercial units can have a clear identifiable public parking area which is welcoming to visitors and that a clear</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>Harbour (7/1, 294/73). More value as a civic square (210/6)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is unsightly (7/1) • The area is currently attractive for residents and visitors to sight see and enjoy the space in a tree-lined square (295/3) • Brewhouse Square is one of the few areas within Royal Clarence Yard that allows both residents and visitors an area of space to relax and recreation. Most of the Royal Clarence Yard free space has already been allocated to car parking. (295/1, 295/2) • It was understood that this space would be kept as a piazza and would not be used for parking (363/1) • Parking in Brewhouse Square would only make the area a less attractive and would be to the detriment of the environment and all interested parties.(363/1) • Would require installation of additional barriers and bollards to restrict vehicles driving along the waterfront (294/73) • The currently safe area that is Brewers Square would be compromised with vehicular access currently restricted by bollards disabled for essential services only (295/4) <p><i>Residential amenities</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disturbance to neighbouring residents (350/28) • Additional noise of vehicles so close to residential properties is unacceptable (113/4) • It would result in driving very close to Flagstaff House which has no pedestrian pavement to protect it (113/4) <p><i>Safety</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It presents a danger to pedestrians and would be an 	<p>legible route is clearly marked from the car park to the waterfront units without detracting from the character of the area.</p> <p>It is proposed that the Cooperage Car park could form part of the solution with a clear public car parking area within it clearly sign posted from Mumby Road and Weevil Lane. Then a clear route linking the site to the waterfront (signage, lighting, and other visual markers). The SPD has been amended to reflect these points.</p> <p>The potential solution may need some expert design consideration.</p> <p>Mention is included in the SPD to potentially review the role of Brewhouse Square once the 'Retained Area' is released which could include considering some parking provision (with access via the retained area as a possibility).</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>accident waiting to happen (7/1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To have car parking at Brewhouse Square would be extremely dangerous for the residents of Flagstaff House not to mention the children that live in Wyatt Court. There are no pavements. Traffic not sympathetic to RCY – no restrictions on speed and no enforcement available. I am disabled so do not want any more hazards on RCY (360/4) • Undermines frontage walkway proposals (279/3) • Extra traffic causing safety issues for pedestrians at Flagstaff House and Cooperage Green. (279/3) • The currently safe area that is Brewhouse Square would be compromised with vehicular access currently restricted by bollards disabled for essential services only (345/1) • It is a well followed walkway and to introduce vehicles would make it hazardous to pedestrians and particularly for the children attending the pre-school (363/1). <p><i>Traffic circulation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited narrow access through ceremonial gates (279/3) • doubt whether the proposal is practical given the constraints of the already overly complex parking arrangements at RCY (342/27) • Difficulties for vehicles accessing this area especially if it was full (350/28) <p><i>Impact on waterfront</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New barriers would be needed to stop vehicles driving onto RCY waterfront (350/28) <p><i>Impact on commercial uses</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)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact upon proposed units facing Brewhouse square (279/3) • The initial plans of the developer were for a café culture to develop around the commercial units but if parking were permitted here it would effectively rule out any catering units facing the Square. (363/1) <p><i>Alternative suggestions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is still ample parking in the next door Cooperage Green (7/1, 279/3) • There is plenty of space in Flagstaff Green (350/28) • Main parking problem at RCY is at the north end of the site (350/28) <p><i>Consultation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No consultation has taken place with the residents prior to this amenable statement (295/1, 345/1) <p><i>Other comments</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was never a suggestion that this could be a parking area when we purchased the property (113/4). • Leaseholders have to pay the upkeep of the grounds and adding more vehicles on the site would increase costs (13/4) • Modern development should provide sustainable alternatives to car parking. (279/3) • If insufficient parking is leading to problems in attracting expansion of the commercial units this results from the overdevelopment of residential buildings and an alternative solution should be found (363/1) 	
<i>Design and environment</i>			
350/27	Local resident	Future developments need to respect the coherence of the	Agree. There is only one area left 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)
		Royal Naval Victualling yard no piecemeal development (350/27)	developed which was part of the original consent. It will be important that the future Retained Area developments respect the existing RCY site. Policies in the GBLP will ensure that this will be the case and supported by the guidance in the SPD.
72/10,	Local resident	No need to improve lighting if all the retail units are unoccupied (72/10)	There is a need to improve the lighting on the site in a sensitive and effective manner to enable customers parking in the car parks to walk through safely and confidently to the waterfront businesses as well as the potential to adding some vitality to this waterfront edge which is sensitive to the listed buildings, conservation area and the amenities of existing residents as well as minimising light pollution. Amend SPD to include new consideration to reflect this point.
241/24, 368/8	Local residents	<p>The walkway in front of the Bakery has been spoilt by cheap thrown together pallets</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is a great shame the 'pub' was allowed to use all of the raised walkway for seating. Did they have permission for this? (241/24), - how and why was permission given to block the raised area with horrible seating, so you can't get a lovely view of the water across to Portsmouth or watch the yachts. It seems as long as a business is bringing money in they can do what they like (368/8) 	This particular issue has been resolved through a planning enforcement case.
Retained Area			
142/4	Local residents	Welcome the proposals for the retained area.	Noted.
294/26, 342/26	Gosport Society, Gosport Heritage Open Days	Welcome most of the objectives set out for this Character Area. However GBC are urged to ensure that with the anticipated opening up and redevelopment of most of the retained land at RCY, measures are put in place to ensure that the former Royal Naval Victualling Yard should be finally regarded as a coherent whole (not developed piecemeal as	Agree more emphasis on this point is proposed in the SPD.

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		hitherto).	
216/9	Local resident	Leave alone	If left alone this area would continue to deteriorate. Instead opportunities exist to restore the historic buildings, secure improved access and contribute to the local economy.
96/14, 225/4, 256/38	Local residents	The area needs to be developed. Potential for mixed use redevelopment. (225/4)	Agree- The SPD sets out the key principles to consider forthcoming proposals.
<i>Uses: Marine-related</i>			
68/26	Gosport Marine Scene	Opportunities to use RCY retained area to develop yachting service industries further, including for large yachts.	The consultation draft SPD emphasised the need to maximise marine employment site. Amend SPD to include this specific suggestion.
68/56	Gosport Marine Scene	RCY would be a better site than Endeavour Quay [see comment 68/55] with longer deep water frontage, more space for hauling out and servicing, and separation from residential housing	The Council considers that both sites should be retained for marine industries given the importance of this sector for the Gosport economy and the limited number of such sites around the Solent.
194/1	MoD / DIO	The second paragraph under the retained area heading should be deleted and an additional sentence added reading: The site includes an area of land that will be retained for MoD operations. The remainder of the site..... The Oil pipeline should not be mentioned. The pipeline is likely to limit access over the route.	Remove reference to the oil pipeline as required by the DIO and rephrase the paragraph. However the Council considers that at some point in the future an arrangement could arise where the land required for the pipeline can be used for access purposes, for example a footpath/cycleway, if appropriate security measures are put in place. The land used for the pipeline would not be free from buildings. Details of the Oil and Pipeline Agency's operation in Gosport is included on the Government's own website. https://www.gov.uk/guidance/gosport-oil-fuel-depot-redevelopment
194/3	MoD / DIO	Plan 13 shows the boundary of the area designated for marine-led employment and by extension the land that will be retained by Mod operations purposes. It should be noted	The plan is only indicative (this will be stated in larger font) and shows long-term aspirations. The plan does not show a boundary between the

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		that the boundary between the two may differ from that shown on the plan as a result of ongoing and detailed discussions between the MoD and the LPA.	MoD operations and potential released land, only potential uses over the long-term. The boundary shown relates to an indicative flood defence boundary.
194/4	MoD / DIO	The MoD operations may limit deepwater access immediately to the North of the Jetty.	Over the long term the Council considers that deepwater access can be secured at this site.
279/2	Local resident	Support the marine use, however concerned that it could cause disturbance if operated late into the evening, perhaps needs a covenant to restrict.	Development requiring planning permission will need to be assessed in accordance with the policies of the GBLP including Policy LP46 which includes criteria regarding noise sensitive and noise generating uses and their proximity to each other. Mention as a specific new principle in this section.
<i>Heritage</i>			
294/26, 342/26	Gosport Society, Gosport Heritage Open Days	This is a hugely important heritage asset and a potential tourist attraction for Gosport which should not be squandered. Royal William Yard in Plymouth – the only other remaining Victualling Yard from this period provides a good example of what can be achieved and Gosport also has the added value to its heritage tourism offer in connection with Queen Victoria via the remains of her railway station at RCY(294/26, 342/26)	Agree this site is important in terms of its heritage. The Council considers that securing marine employment can assist in securing a positive future for these buildings. Opportunities to enable visitors to understand the heritage of the site will also be taken. An additional point relating to the heritage opportunities will be emphasised in the SPD.
107/61, 139/2, 202/6, 221/18, 294/69 298/6	Local residents, Gosport Society	<p>Opportunities to utilise listed/heritage buildings for heritage tourism and related uses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tell the Story of RCY's heritage and the Rum Store, and other historic trades (139/2, 202/6, 221/18) - Museum/visitor attraction (294/69) - Rum Museum at the site of the old Rum Store has merit and would be a welcome addition to the attractions on this side of the harbour (107/61, 298/6) 	<p>There is certainly scope to provide some interpretation at RCY and the Retained Area.</p> <p>It is proposed to include the Rum Store idea in the SPD as an option which could be further explored for this building.</p>
18/17, 294/71, 336/53	Local residents, Gosport Society	<p>Welcomes proposal to utilise the remains of Queen Victoria's Railway Station.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The old railway station would make an excellent 	Agree. The detailed elements will be included in the Ideas Compendium.

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		venue for a restaurant(18/17) or café (294/71)-could include an old dining car –could attract railway enthusiasts (18/17) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Accept that it may need to be moved slightly (294/71) - Connections with Queen Victoria could assist in promoting the town (294/71) 	
18/18	Local resident	The buildings are attractive in their own right-this should not need to stop other development.	Agree. The Council will need to consider how any new buildings will relate to the historic buildings on the site which are being retained.
<i>Environment</i>			
57/27	Local resident	The retained area looks tatty and is a dumping ground for old junk the barbed wire fence traps old bin bags.	Agree. The site is owned by the MoD. It is hoped that once parts of the site are released the appearance of the site can be improved.
<i>Access issues species to retained area</i>			
6/9	Meon Ramblers	Using Oil Pipeline as an access is a good idea as the route is through the Ramparts Any scope of getting an access nearer the water and OAPA Jetty (understand that this is related to land being released)	Support welcomed. By including such a measure in the SPD assist the Council's case in securing such measures as opportunities arise.
294/70	Gosport Society	Link coherently with the rest of RCY including extension of Millennium Promenade and enhanced cycle routes	
<i>Car parking</i>			
294/72	Gosport Society	That sufficient parking is provided within the Retained Area for both the marine businesses by the deep water access and to supplement the visitor parking to the newly available heritage buildings and the developed part of the RCY waterfront.	Agree. This would need to be considered as part of a masterplan approach to consider future proposals with the details considered further as part of any forthcoming planning application. The proposals will need to accord with the GBLP and the guidance in the Parking SPD. Add a point to the SPD relating to this issue.