

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
Trinity Green Area			
100/22, 336/61, 350/33	Local residents, Lee Residents Association	Support principles. Cautiously welcomes proposals. (326/21)	Noted.
294/80, 342/30	Gosport Society, Gosport Heritage Open Days	Supports the objectives set out for this Character Area particularly the emphasis on the need to protect and enhance the setting of both the Grade II* listed Trinity Church and the Vicarage.	Noted.
192/9	Local resident	Trinity Green is attractive as it is and any proposals should be approached with care.	Agree.
225/11	Local resident	Support opening up harbour views. Beautifying and greening Trinity Green is desirable.	Agree.
246/11, 277/6, 344/14, 248/18	Local residents	Lovely Area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Well-kept and lovely green space it is steeped in history if people took the trouble to find out (344/14). - This area is The Church has lots of activities on to attract people into the town (344/14) - Coming from Portsmouth on ferry – breath of fresh air – simple, natural beautiful trees, Trinity Church (246/11) - It's a place to breath, relax and feel part of the gentle flow of the town (246/11) - People use esplanade to take in views and breathe in the sea air. Too much building around waterfront and Trinity Green will take away this peaceful area (248/18) 	Agree and noted.
Residential development on open space at Trinity Green			
195/9, 242/4	Local resident	Support the need to protect open spaces, therefore the green areas around Trinity Green should be kept. (195/9) (242/4)	It is proposed to amend the SPD to maintain the open space at Trinity Green.
4/8, 5/19, 12/21, 20/24, 21/21, 22/10, 23/10, 24/11, 28/21, 34/13,	Local residents, Gosport Society, Councillor Mrs	Trinity Green area should be left as it is <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impact on the residents in Harbour, Seaward Towers and Trinity Green not considered at all (47/25) 	The proposal set out in the consultation draft of the SPD was included to re-introduce some residential properties to an area where dwellings

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
<p>40/23, 45/12,47/1, 47/3,47/14, 47/19,47/21, 47/25,54/3, 62/2, 63/13, 64/34, 65/16, 67/33, 69/16, 71/9, 76/13, 79/8 80/15, 97/5, 99/12, , 102/21, 107/41,108/9, 109/19, 112/2, , 116/14, 121/12, 124/19, 132/34, 133/17, 135/16, 195/9, 197/17, 198/3, 200/8, 202/4, 203/21, 214/7, 215/4, 216/13, 221/21, 223/6, 235/3 240/15, 242/14, 243/2, 244/3, 245/5, 247/7, 250/6, 251/6, 252/4, 252/7, 253/6, 255/10, 256/21, 257/1, 258/11, 259/21, 260/19, 261/18, 262/7, 263/6, 264/3, 266/20, 268/13, 271/19, 272/17, 273/4, 274/6, 278/17, 285/22, 286/11, 288/16, 291/21, 294/47, 340/15, 341/9, 349/20 , 355/12, 365/9, 369/5, 378/4, 358/28</p>	<p>June Cully</p>	<p>Retain character of the area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Building on Trinity Green will destroy the character of a quiet and beautiful area of the town (64/34, 214/7, 215/4, 245/5) - Detract from setting of important heritage buildings including – Trinity Church, the Vicarage (203/21, 215/5) and Bastion No1 (203/21) - Impact on views (258/11,261/18, 262/7, 365/9) - Special place for residents and is of historical significance. Any kind of in-filling and further tall buildings would change this (288/16) - Would isolate the Church (76/13) - Fought hard to save the area formerly covered by Stanley House- now good trees and grass (112/2) - Please leave it's a very nice area to visit and walk through to our waterfront (63/13) - <i>What remains of the open nature and sightlines between Trinity Green and the Harbour has already been compromised and should not be allowed to be further restricted (294/47).</i> - Housing on the green behind Trinity Church is not appropriate the design was for Trinity Church view line through the Timespace across to Portsmouth cathedral. (The Timespace is the largest sun dial in England) (382/1) - The area between Hammond Court and Harbour Tower is a popular route through. (382/1) <p>Any new dwellings would detract from the appearance of the area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The development could only positively address the street if they are well-maintained and well looked after. Visually most people use their front gardens for their recycling bins.(215/4) 	<p>were previously located. The concept was to include a small number of townhouses with a high quality homes, and attractive road treatment and surrounding public realm. Large scale development nor tower blocks were proposed.</p> <p>Given the response from the public and that the green area is already an attractive area and highly valued by those local residents in the immediate vicinity and those elsewhere in the Borough it is considered not appropriate to incorporate the original idea in the final version of the SPD. Consequently, it will be necessary to amend the SPD to remove references to residential development in this area.</p> <p>Instead reference will be made of incorporating a good-quality finish on a similar alignment to the proposed road in order to enhance views of the Vicarage. There may be scope for some other landscaping improvements to the area around Trinity Church.</p> <p>In summary amend SPD to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete proposals for residential proposals at eastern end of Trinity Green and access road. • Include a north-south footway towards the Vicarage and associated public realm improvements.

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"> - The height of any buildings is a key concern. .(215/4) - As it would create more parking spaces.(215/4) - It is hard to understand how the development proposed will 'create a new visual link focused on the Vicarage' since the terrace houses appear to jut out onto the frontage of the house. The proposed space cannot accommodate terrace houses with rear gardens and parking without significantly impacting the line of sight from the front door. .(215/4) - The proposed terrace houses in no way protect and enhance the existing areas of open spaces. (215/4) <p>Retention of open space and trees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Contradict other objectives to retain open space (24/11, 195/9, 242/14) - Not a good idea to take green infrastructure away by building on Trinity Green (63/13) - Confused - There is protected open space on Trinity Green but Council wants to build houses on it (47/14) - This area needs to be for open space and relaxation (271/19) - Would reduce open space provision (215/4, 244/3, 257/1) - Housing around Trinity Green was designed to be surrounded by open space (235/3) - it is a wonderful haven well managed by Hyde Housing Association and is an asset as a play area (256/27) - Compromise the original landscaping of the area - far from framing the spaces the open spaces it will severely impact the green space - itself a preservation area (215/4) - Would destroy perfectly healthy trees (22/10,23/10) - Loss of mature trees (355/29 The tree lined roads of 	

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		<p>Trinity Green are lovely and should be left as such (251/6)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This is consecrated land and a former burial site (294/47) - Reduce open space originally designed as part of the Tower developments for the local community(215/4) - Green space is also used for the extremely successful Gosport Marine Festival, drawing people into Trinity Green. This development would mean the festival lose this area to make use of and the associated benefits. - Where would the children play? (242/16), (243/5), (259/24) - Area around Trinity Green should be left alone – wonderful green space adds to the ambiance of Gosport developing it would make it one great housing estate - It is a green and pleasant area and revising the car parking for Harbour Tower and providing it for a few houses would be counterproductive (258/29) - Should be kept as an oasis of calm (341/9) - Key green lung (355/12) - This is an essential green space area and must remain as an amenity for visitors and local communities without interruption (349/20) - Objection to building on open ground to the east of the Church. The space is a breath of fresh air with views of the Harbour and of the church from the waterfront. (378/4) - Town house development between Harbour & Hammond Towers will cause loss of green spaces which people sit on in the summer. Houses will spoil the view for residents in Hammond who can see Portsmouth through the gap (285/22) 	

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"> - Object to development of Trinity Green open spaces. No existing green spaces should be developed for new housing when there are plenty of other areas able to be developed over time. These should be developed first before green spaces. (107/41) <p>Retain green space and parking areas between Harbour Tower and Hammond Court</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No future housing development of the land between Hammond Court and Harbour Towers (349/23) - Doesn't make sense to build on this area (259/21) - needed for car parking for existing residents due to knock on effects of loss of parking as a result of the Grenfell Tower fire – residents need somewhere free and close to park (69/23) - Leave green area between Harbour Tower and Hammond alone (255/20) - New housing to be built between Blake Court through to Harbour Tower. Would use all the green landscape which enhances the area. There are not even enough parking spaces and the area would be turned into a concrete jungle not attractive so close to the Waterfront (369/5) <p>Concerns about the quality of development proposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development would look horrible (47/1), (47/19); be oppressive and ugly (24/11, 214/7) would not enhance any open space (215/4) - Trying to cram houses on tiny pieces of land (24/11, 214/7, 235/3, 291/21) - would not be mitigated by any amount of waffle about under-utilised areas(64/34) - Concern about the design of infill housing. (358/28 	

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		<p>Principle of housing or development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - More houses and then more traffic in and out of Gosport (249/3) - No further development on Trinity Green (252/7) - No housing on Trinity Green (243/2) (247/7), (250/6), (252/4), (253/6) - Opposition to last residential scheme – pole of residents of Blake & Hammond Courts – some 90% against can't see it would be any different this time round (62/2) - Very important green area supporting 4 high density tower blocks – no more housing (257/3) - you are building more tower blocks with nothing for families. (340/15) <p>Amenity issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concern about lack of privacy if more housing were built in this location (255/12) - Overlooking issues (242/14, 247/7, 250/7) would be overlooked by Hammond House and Harbour Tower (258/11) - Overbearing impact - Spacing is needed around, Blake Court, Hammond Court and the Harbour and Seaward Towers to protect residential amenity. (132/34) - Effect on views <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to and from Old Vicarage (215/4) • council tenants deserve the waterfront views as much as private owners (256/21) - Overshadowing(355/29) and light (365/9) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hammond Court would have little or no natural light (242/14) • Building houses would block early morning 	

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		<p style="text-align: center;">sun on existing buildings (286/15)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase pollution (214/7, 215/4) - Increase noise levels for existing resident (47/1, 214/7, 215/4, 221/21, 47/21) and vibration. (215/4) <p>Access issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - increase traffic in this area (215/4, 355/29) - access would be via one road i.e. Trinity Green (286/16) <p>Insufficient parking in the area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Will exacerbate existing parking issues (221/21, 235/3, 250/9, 261/18, 355/29) - Create parking problems for residents - There are not enough parking spaces at Hammond Court (286/13). Do not develop the shared garden and car park facing South Street & Blake & Hammond. There are not enough car parking spaces as it is for 130 flats (285/15), (286/1) - cramming in more homes with parking chaos at Trinity Green (62/2) - need more parking (47/21) - Retain garages for residents. (355/29) <p>Other difficulties regarding developing this area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Grass in front of Blake Court has tanks underneath it associated with old brewery (221/21) - Further building will have consequences to ground stability. The Vicarage is a 200 year old property and any major building work would have to be undertaken with lawful guarantees that they could in no way cause damage to the stability of our property. (215/4) 	

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		<p>Build on other sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Better alternative sites (258/11) - Abundance of MOD land particularly around Explosion better suited (62/2) - Why develop Trinity Green when there are many other sites i.e. Haslar, Explosion Museum, Walpole Park, areas near Clarence Yard.(256/21) - If more homes are needed then why not build on Walpole Park by the boating lake? (242/18), and the Police Station (even for a hotel)(259/25) - Walpole Park by the exercise equipment that is rarely used and looks shabby (285/22) - Area by boating lake would be better site for more housing – little enough green area by the waterfront. (255/10) <p>Other comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Will affect the value of the Vicarage (215/4) - Public land should not be sold off to private developers (235/3) - This proposal it is just a developer wishing to extract more potential and maximise the benefits of the space. (215/4) 	
<i>Parking comments relating to the Trinity Green proposals (eastern end)</i>			
98/11	Local resident	Residents Parking and visitor parking is poor, especially around Trinity Green.	These concerns are noted. The landowner may wish to consider options to improve parking provision at this site.
69/15, 261/5	Local residents	Not enough car parking spaces for residents of Harbour Tower – situation made worse since the Grenfell Tower fire. As a permit holder who pays to park here this is unfair and frustrating. (69/15, 261/5) Make some of the surplus public car parking available for the towers. (261/5)	
363/1	Local resident	Parking is being restricted at the current tower blocks. Where are all the new cars going to go?	

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
89/30, 304/23	Local residents	If housing is to be built here it should be 2 storeys with parking below built in a traditional style.	These proposals are no longer being progressed in the SPD.
371/29	Local resident	- Trinity Church must be treated with care and respect at all times .(371/29)	Any proposals will need to take full consideration of Trinity Church and the other heritage assets of the area. As mentioned previously as it is proposed to delete the proposals for residential at the east end of Trinity Green, such consideration will mainly be applicable for proposals at Barclay House.
342/31	Gosport Heritage Open Days	- We have concerns about any further new/modern development in this area.	
<i>Creation of additional residents' car park in the vicinity</i>			
349/23	Local resident	Redevelopment of the Hammond (east) garage blocks in conjunction with building a residents car park on part of the land east of Hammond Court would not detract from the amenity of Trinity Green. (349/23)	Noted that there could be potential for this. However it is not proposed to include this in the SPD as there would not be an opportunity for further consultation on this potentially controversial proposal as part of the SPD process.
<i>Townscape and heritage comments relating to the Trinity Green proposals (eastern end)</i>			
215/5	Local resident	1st para incorrect: the buildings surrounding the Green date from mid-late 20 th century and reflect building practices of the time-this is correct. However there is also a Grade II listed property which was built in 1790. It is part of the setting of the area, just as the locally listed Harbour and Seaward Towers	Amend accordingly.
107/42	Local resident	The inclusion of the 1909 OS map to justify the proposed removal of a large area of Trinity Green to build houses is misleading and disingenuous the map does not include Harbour and Seaward Towers that are now established replacing much of what was there originally. It is not reasonable to try and go back to something that was taken away and replaced just to raise money and satisfy an inappropriate directive.	The map has been included to highlight that the area included residential properties in this area. The proposal has now been taken out of the SPD.
<i>Covenant issue</i>			
195/27, 242/22, 243/3,	Local residents	I believe there is a covenant which restricts development on	Development is no longer being proposed on this

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
256/5, 256/23, 259/22, 377/2		<p>Trinity Green to that which has the churches permission. (195/27), (377/2)</p> <p>There is a covenant on the grass between Hammond Court and Harbour Tower which could prevent any building on it (242/22), (243/3)</p> <p>Destruction of green spaces near Harbour and Seaward Towers would be a disaster as the green area has a legal covenant preventing building (256/5)</p> <p>As GBC placed the legal covenant on the land when it was purchased by Hyde Housing Association how convenient would it be and to whose advantage if this was rescinded? (256/23)</p> <p>Land does not belong to Council it is owned by Hyde Housing Association in which case Council and a developer would have to purchase this land. (259/22)</p>	<p>area consequently it will not be necessary to consider the legal issues posed by the covenant in detail. However upon initial reading the covenants do not appear particularly onerous providing certain conditions can be demonstrated. Further legal advice would be required on this matter.</p>
<i>Barclay House and north-side of Trinity Green</i>			
263/6	Local resident	Against Barclay House Proposal	<p>The Council consider that a redevelopment here will provide better quality housing and an improved frontage to Trinity Green.</p> <p>The SPD aims to redevelop this block which will improve the appearance of this frontage opposite Trinity Church.</p> <p>The scale, form and materials need to be appropriate for its sensitive location opposite Trinity Church.</p> <p>Several suggestions have been proposed regarding the design which have merit including the proposal submitted in digital format of a</p>
192/3	Local resident	Barclay House is an eyesore.	
24/12	Local resident	More could be done to improve the appearance of the social housing immediately north of the Church.	
202/3	Local resident	A re think of Barclay House would be good, perhaps change to permanent housing.	
268/13	Local resident	Barclay House could be developed in the style of Chapel Row.	
361/7	Local resident	<p>Create a park where Barclay House is now with a new row of houses and flats in the north side of Trinity Green all designed to complement Trinity Green and the Vicarage.</p> <p>This would include arches linking Trinity Green with South</p>	

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		Street. Trinity Green would be quiet with underground parking and the houses and flats made affordable for families bringing the community back with a community trust. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fG9nP-FrUic	'Georgian style' design. Amend the SPD to include more information regarding design.
340/33	Local resident	- This area is already an eyesore due in part to previous building designs of earlier years. Demolish it all (except the church) and replace with small housing areas with gardens. We know this will not happen – you just want your concrete blocks.	
349/20	Local resident	No future redevelopment of the east and west of Barclay House. If units are required these buildings should be demolished to provide more green space around the church and create a better amenity. The residents can be rehoused in a redevelopment of the Addenbrooke site. (349/20)	The indicative plan does show that there is scope for redevelopment on some of the small areas of amenity green space to the east and west of Barclay House. Some open space could be re-created in the centre portion on the north side of Trinity Green. There could also be other public realm improvements in the vicinity, particularly as there are areas of open spaces that are under-utilised as they lack benches and other park features (e.g. in close proximity to the Timespace).
78/9	Local resident	Convert Barclay House into an old persons accommodation as it used to be – move homeless to the Old Detention Centre.	Appropriate arrangements will need to be made as part of any development. Make this explicit reference in the SPD.
288/17	Local resident	Barclay house is an important resource for homeless families and could be improved or extended.	
355/28	Local resident	Barclay House could be redeveloped if an alternate location for the temporary accommodation could be found.	
378/5	Local resident	The redevelopment on the north side of Trinity Green Road is a good proposal to provide housing and to enhance the appearance of the area.	
124/18	Local resident	Barclay House has been recently refurbished; the plans do not make this clear.	

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
			proposal for Barclay House are not immediate and will need further consideration over the Plan period (to 2029).
195/25, 378/5	Local resident	If Barclay House is demolished then proposals to replace it will need to deal with how parking will be provided as well as for Blake and Hammond Court.	Agree. Parking provision for Barclay house and the adjacent Blake and Hammond Court would need to be fully considered.
262/7	Local resident	Would cause a loss of light to Blake Court.	
263/6	Local resident	Don't redevelop the shared garden for Blake Court.	The proposal shows the amenity site on the corner of Haslar Road and Trinity Green to be developed. However the garden area between Blake Court and Hammond Court would be retained with potential improvements.
285/16, 286/12	Local residents	Development of Barclay House (east & west) should not be allowed and would lose afternoon sun caused by the multiple levels of Barclay House this would affect floors Ground floor to 4 th floor as a minimum.	The scale and the distance from the ground/lower floor windows of Blake Court in particular would need to be considered as part of any detailed proposal.
221/21	Local resident	Concern development at Barclay House will increase noise issues.	The proposal would be replacing one form of residential with another. Noise issues are considered as part of such planning applications.
<i>Tower Blocks</i>			
293/23	Local resident	Harbour Tower is probably the most affected building by the proposals in the SPD -North- Bus Station -West residential development and the potential loss of parking East- incursion of noise and smells from café/restaurants Thus each of the 120 homes will one way or another be detrimentally affected which would be unfair to residents to have the quiet enjoyment of their homes so adversely influenced.	As mentioned elsewhere in the document. The Bus Station development will consider the amenities of local residents. Further text has been included in the Bus Station section relating to this issue. However it is important to recognise that the Bus Station represents a very important opportunity to improve the appearance of this gateway site and bring in investment which can assist the economy of the Town Centre. The proposed development immediately to the west is no longer being included 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)
			The proposed commercial development is still being considered by the Council and is included in the SPD. It is recognised that careful consideration is required on how such uses will be operated.
84/2	Local resident	Knock down the horrible high rise blocks.	There are no proposals to change the residential function of the existing tower blocks which provide good quality homes.
69/16	Local resident	Both Harbour and Seaward Towers should either be taken back into local authority management or turn them into hotels for tourists and holiday makers. (69/16)	
366/21	Local resident	The Seaward / Harbour Tower could be adapted to create a landmark through, top floor hotel and restaurant accommodation. (336/21)	
294/80	Gosport Society	Developing a plan that respects the locally listed Harbour and Seaward Towers is important and a challenge. We would like GBC to think creatively about possible adaptation/improvements/opportunities at the top of these towers which are very visible from the water and Portsmouth.	It is recognised that Harbour and Seaward Towers are local listed. The Council will explore further opportunities to enhance the appearance of these prominent buildings. The SPD includes provision of restarting the use of architectural lighting on the waterfront side of the buildings as used in the early years of this Century. However this initiative and any others could only take place in close cooperation with owners and occupants. Reintroducing the lighting would need to consider many elements. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Costs to restart and maintain - The availability of internal and external funding - Management of the timing of when the lighting would be used including number of times a years and the hours of operation – Any other initiative will also need to address feasibility issues and gain the support of those living in the blocks.

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
			Section A of the SPD relating to 'Creating An Attractive Townscape', has been amended to reflect these considerations.
69/20, 222/1, 355/9	Local residents	Concern about the possible use of floodlighting due to intrusive lighting disturbing sleep of residents Should be consultation with residents first.	Any proposal would involve consultation with residents. It is envisaged that any such scheme would operate within restricted hours and a limited number of evenings.
69/21	Local resident	Concern about any increases in service charges as a result of the maintenance of any proposed floodlighting.	The funding of any such proposal including maintenance costs would not be borne by the residents of the blocks. Section A of the SPD relating to 'Creating An Attractive Townscape', has been amended to reflect these considerations.
<i>Car parking associated with the Towers</i>			
22/17, 23/11, 32/7, 35/8, 47/3, 47/18, 62/2, 69/3, 104/1, 214/8, 215/4, 221/21, 242/5, 243/4, 247/9, 250/8, 252/5, 255/11, 256/25, 258/13, 259/23, 259/29, 262/7, 263/2, 285/2, 285/3, 285/17, 370/6, 382/2	Local residents, Councillor Mrs June Cully	Already lack of/ restrictive parking in this area <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Including Harbour Towers (69/3) - Any development should not be at the expense of the permit controlled exclusive parking which exists at Harbour Tower- there must remain a total of 61 spaces (including 6 disabled spaces) with opportunities sought for more. - With four blocks and a church(22/17) - Proposal does not consider residents already living here (23/11) - Proposals on Trinity Green would remove nearly 50% of residents parking - Residents do not want to lose any car parks in this area (35/8,47/3, 108/9, 221/21) Loss of residents parking at Church Path (221/21, 262/7), (285/17) - Loss of car parks or on street parking would make it difficult for those accessing the church. 	The proposals for the new dwellings relating to the potential development at the eastern end of Trinity Green are no longer being included in the SPD. The dwellings would have provided their own car parking and there would have been no net loss of parking spaces for the Towers in relation to the proposed new access route. It is also now proposed to retain the parking spaces between Seaward Tower and the Millennium Promenade.

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"> - Leave car parks (242/5), (243/4) - Concern about where residents would park if proposals went ahead (242/15), (247/9), (250/8), (258/13) - Building new properties would take away car parks – this does not seem like a feasible option (242/19) - Taking parking spaces and green area from Harbour Tower is not on for people at Harbour Tower who pay maintenance charges (47/18) - Removal of the 25 car parking spaces means people could not visit and park in the designated areas (255/11) - Taking car parking from Trinity – already lack of parking people want parking near their homes no good saying there are sufficient parking spaces elsewhere in Gosport (256/25) - Not enough spaces Why would residents at Harbour Tower and Hammond Court want to look out onto more housing and cars instead of lovely grass and the trees we have now? (259/23) - Access also very tight (285/3) - By building outside Seaward Tower GBC is removing limited parking spaces including many disabled spaces for local residents. So where will staff, customers and residents park? And how will building firms get there without causing a nuisance? (370/6) - Nowhere for Harbour Tower residents to park - Emphatic no to reducing car parking at Harbour Tower or loss of other car parks or new development proposals affecting Harbour Tower, Falkland Gardens, The Waterfront with the Bus Station being the only positive to come out of all this. (259/29) 	
<i>Proposals for uses along Millennium Promenade</i>			
257/9	Local resident	It is the peoples' waterfront view and esplanade that is loved.	Noted.

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		Seeing families of all generations enjoying pleasure of walking together and enjoying the view must not be compromised – the plan to extend the waterfront access deserves full support. (257/9)	
372/3	Local resident	Area between the ferry and Timespace is wasted. It would be a good place for cafes, gift shops etc. with outdoor seating facing the waterfront.	Agree that there is some potential here but recognise that it needs to be carefully considered in terms of its feasibility, how it will operate and the consideration of design and amenity issues.
19/6	Local resident	Agree with a sleek waterfront living area with cafes bars, restaurants and outlets.	
68/57	Gosport Marine Scene	Seasonal pop ups and insets akin to the those on London's South Bank and other initiatives could enhance the flow and footfall along the Esplanade de Royan, Millennium Pier and Trinity Green.	
23/18, 32/8, 47/2, 47/22, 47/26, 47/27, 51/4, 85/19, 90/10, 107/52, 114/14, 117/6, 124/20, 132/35, 192/10, 204/1, 214/9, 221/21, 222/3, 242/13, 243/1, 245/7, 247/6, 248/14, 250/5, 254/1, 255/18, 256/18, 258/7, 259/26, 260/19, 262/4, 263/6, 286/17, 291/62, 293/1 338/1, 349/24, 355/30, 369/7, 369/9, 370/9, 379/15, 383/6	Local residents	<p>Object to restaurant/café proposals adjacent Towers and Millennium Promenade:</p> <p>Parking issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - further reduce parking for residents of the Towers(32/8,47/2, 51/4, 107/52,214/9, 222/3 247/6, 259/26, 338/1, 355/30) - Taking private residents' parking to build more homes completely insane (47/27) - Would reduce the disabled parking available (51/4) - Object to Seaward tower proposal only due to loss of disabled parking. (90/10) - Shocked to see Watergate parking was to be used for pop-up café. Where are they going to park, not on the green it is an open space - Against pop-up café in area of disabled parking. It is a wonderful area for people with mobility problems to get out and meet people. (383/6) <p>Access issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would impact on the delivery vehicles for Trinity's 	<p>The consultation draft of the SPD very much highlighted the idea of commercial premises along the Millennium Promenade as a concept that needed further thought. It was based on the idea of how well this space had been used as part of the Gosport Marine Festival and the idea is to consider whether there is further scope to have commercial use here on a permanent or temporary basis (e.g. for events).</p> <p>Following consultation there was significant concern raised about the principle of this suggestion.</p> <p>As a result of these comments it is considered appropriate to make some changes to the proposal as well as include some additional text to help alleviate particular concerns.</p> <p>These comments are addressed below:</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>restaurant. (51/4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How would refuse vehicles access the area? (245/7) - Art Seaward Tower if this area is used How will the emergency services get there in case of fire/flood etc? are you able to re-house the residents immediately if there is a fire? (370/9) <p>Noise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - create noise pollution to local residents(32/8, 47/2, 51/4, 107/52,114/14, 222/3, 247/6, 249/9, 255/18, 256/18, 258/7, 259/26 293/1, 355/30) till late at night (114/14, 204/1, 222/3, 259/26, 338/1); when night club was above coffee#1 residents were kept awake until 2am at weekends and noise when people were making their way home (255/18); already existing problems very late at night particularly in summer-no-one to police this problem (293/1). <p>Other residential amenities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Has any thought been given to the residents of Harbour & Seaward towers having to put up with the downsides to having cafes/restaurants in front of them (107/52, 256/18) - Unpleasant smell for local residents (107/52,144/14, 221/21, 247/6, 249/9, 258/7,259/26) - unattractive appearance of wheelie bins (114/14) - Against cafes/restaurants along promenade if situated adjacent to Seaward Tower/Watergate residences. Watergate traditionally housed older residents concern that café/restaurant would cause nuisance especially late at night (117/6) - Facility would be better placed away from residential housing (117/6) - Problems with crime (107/52) - Do not want pop up shops near the tower blocks 	<p>Firstly, it is proposed not to include the suggestion for the area between Seaward Tower and the Promenade and thereby retaining residents' parking and public spaces or blue badge holders. It has been recognised from the consultation that there has been a loss of some parking spaces associated with the Towers and therefore it will be necessary to retain spaces at this location. Also it is considered important to have spaces for blue badge holders right along the waterfront to maintain access for these users.</p> <p>As far as noise and smells is concerned it will be important to ensure that any proposal in the area between Harbour Tower and the Promenade addresses this matter. This would need to be considered firstly as part of any feasibility study which would look at whether such a proposal could be viable and how it would be managed. It would need to consider whether it would be of a temporary nature and the hours of operation. Environmental Health issues would need to be addressed. These matters will also need to be considered as part of any planning application if the proposals would operate on a regular or permanent basis. Issues of how the site would be serviced would also need to be considered further including use of bins.</p> <p>It is proposed that such uses would be of a limited scale in terms of units. They would be single storey pods.</p> <p>It is not intended that the viewing platform would be removed.</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>creating food smells, litter, noise from group of youths loitering (369/7)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How would a restaurant be policed in the event of drinks, drug dealers, noise, pollution? And how affordable would it be? (370/9) - Too many cafes in Gosport. More cafes would create smells and noise for residents in the Towers plus there would be no parking for customers (242/13), (47/22), <p>Facilities for local residents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would remove viewing platform (32/8) - If it was too tall it would impact on the lower floors (51/4) <p>Impact on Promenade and environment</p> <p>Esplanade should be left alone (242/13)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would spoil people's enjoyment of the esplanade with its trees and beautiful flowerbeds (214/9) - Town already has too many cafes building more would ruin a popular promenade views and smell of cooking would permeate the whole area (245/7) - Litter would be an issue (107/52, 245/7, 259/26, 355/30) - Leave the Prom as a place for people to promenade, sit and enjoy the view (291/6) - Buildings are locally listed –proposals would detract from this (293/1) - Keep the Waterfront area free from clutter it is unique as it is peaceful and pleasant (369/9) <p>Not necessary/too many cafes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No cafes on the esplanade (243/1) - Too many cafes already (23/18, 249/9, 259/26, 293/1 338/1)- Gosport already tops the obesity charts (293/1) 	<p>Any feasibility would need to look at competition and whether there is a market for such a facility at this 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)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appalled that a pop-up café is being considered with the amount of cafes already in the town (249/9) - Do not understand the need for pop-up cafés when there are so many cafes in the High Street. It would be a waste of money and it would spoil the tranquillity of the Harbour front (250/5), (47/26), - Better to focus attention on helping existing businesses to perform better (107/52) - No pop up outlets (285/19, 286/17, 349/24), Café anywhere along the waterfront would be a risky business – inclement weather would put people off using it (alongside staff and rent costs). Cafes in High Street only just break even and they have daily visits (254/1) - Would direct potential customers away from the High street. (192/10) - There would be sufficient provision at the redeveloped Bus Station site (291/6) - If pop-up cafes and restaurants were to be built will it have an effect on the High Street and do we need any more following the 42 already here (370/9) - Concerned about shops and other uses proposed on the front. The High Street needs bigger name shops to attract people to Gosport before the waterfront shops are considered. (255/18) <p>Property values</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Have you considered that the value of properties would be lower with these developments. (259/26) <p>Seasonal facility may be supported</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would support the proposals if seasonal pop up and disabled parking is retained. (132/35) 	
<i>Time space and associated green space</i>			
369/6	Local resident	Timespace needs cleaning and repairs. It's not attractive	Proposed improvements to the public realm of

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		Lack of maintenance at focal points in the Waterfront area. It's not attractive. These things matter.	this area will need to consider this issue further as part of the public realm audit/action plan. It is also recognised that the space could be utilised more for events.
83/4	Local resident	children's play areas could be located to the sundial area which has not been fully utilised including outdoor performances (83/4)	
219/25	Cllr Bateman	Green space needs to be effectively integrated with the waterfront and utilised to maximum extent with Esplanade de Royan and Millennium Pier.	
47/24, 72/14, 195/17, 242/2, 248/1, 248/12,	Local resident	No mention is made of the Timespace which is under-utilised, looking scruffy, rusting ironwork and water-stained stone. (72/14) Time space requires TLC and is an asset SPD needs to mention this (248/1) Time space is the tallest sundial in Europe – locals and visitors are unaware of this (248/2) Change time space between Harbour and Seaward Towers maybe more seating and Harbour themed (47/24) Relocate sundial so it works. (195/17)	
225/11, 294/83	Local resident, Gosport Society	The Millennium Timespace is an underutilised asset and could benefit from a year-round programme of events. - Perhaps administered by the tourist office. (225/11).	
344/15	Local resident	The Millennium circle is not used enough and it is not advertised that people can hire this area for functions such as bands, dancing etc.	
294/45	Gosport Society	The Timespace should be used for an extended programme of events.	
342/33	Gosport Heritage Open Days	We welcome proposals to use the Millennium Time Space more proactively and the possibility of temporary pods for events.	
69/13	Local resident	The space between Harbour and Seaward Towers is used twice a year. A marching band and Gosport Marine Festival is not enough to warrant a big waste of space nobody uses. A play area for 0-18 would be better for our children instead. (See also green infrastructure)	

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
209/11	Local Resident	This area needs to be better utilised perhaps for shows.	
260/19	Local resident	Timespace needs renovation.	
257/4	Local resident	Time space brilliant but needs work and imaginative ideas for full use.	
68/13	Local resident	Lack of regular events at Walpole Park, Falkland Gardens or Timespace to encourage visitors to come to Gosport.	
<i>North side of Trinity Green</i>			
261/20	Local resident	Loss of garages at Blake Court will devalue properties.	There are no proposals to redevelop the garages at Blake Court.
<i>Link with Bastion No.1</i>			
294/82	Gosport Society	Would like to know more about the 'welcoming entrance to Bastion No.1 open space. This does not appear to be mentioned in the accompanying text.	This forms part of the Gosport Lines proposal. Useful to mention the link within this section including a welcoming entrance to Bastion No1. Amend SPD accordingly.
<i>Church Path</i>			
	Local resident	Church Path Car Park development – good idea.	Support welcomed.
132/33, 195/24, 206/16, 232/1 263/6, 286/14, 349/22, 355/27	Local residents	Disagree with the development of Church Path <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - used as an overflow by all the residents (286/14, 349/22) - must be retained for church functions. - Residents spaces occupied and need protecting (225/14, 355/27) 	The car park is underused during the day, as demonstrated by the Council's car parking surveys and there is alternative parking close by at Walpole Park Car Park (at the Haslar Road end).
281/18	Local resident	<i>. Church Path Car park could be made long stay as its under occupied and within easy walking distance and almost as close to the ferry and the High street as Minnitt Road. (281/18)</i>	Residents' parking provision would need to be considered in further detail as part of any detailed proposals. The Town Centre has a significant surplus of long stay provision, so no further spaces are required.
262/7, 263/6, 285/20, 286/18, 292/7	Local residents	Support additional moorings.	Acknowledged.
278/13	Local resident	Potential for pontoon for pick up / drop off for ferry's from the	The SPD encourages wider use of water

Ref No.	Name of Individual/ Organisation	Summary of Key Points	GBC Officer Comment/Action (paragraph references refer to numbers assigned in Consultation Draft)
		wider area for example, loW or Southampton water.	transport around the Harbour and the Solent.
133/6	Local resident	Include small boat water access, provide a stopping point for yachts separate to the marina [close to bus station site]	<p>The SPD highlights the potential for additional moorings only very much as an initial suggestion which would certainly require much more work on understanding demand, viability and feasibility.</p> <p>The technical concerns are noted and the key issues will be added to the SPD.</p> <p>The Council itself would not necessarily be leading any such proposal but are willing to consider assisting any feasibility and viability study, noting the concerns raised by Dean & Reddyhoff. The main objective of the SPD is to provide a set of guiding principles should this type of proposal be considered further. The proposal was originally suggested by local businesses as part of the Coastal Partnership Economic Plan work.</p>
68/24	Gosport Marine Scene	<i>GMS understands that there is demand for additional visitor berths with pontoons or moorings for visiting yachtsmen to the north and south of the Ferry. To the south of the Ferry terminal the moorings are leased by Portsmouth Sailing Club but are under-utilised for most of the year.</i>	
349/26	Local resident	<i>The Haslar Marina or other marinas should be allowed to extend the moorings from the wave screen up to the Ferry pontoon to provide a mix of long term yacht moorings, local sailing club moorings, harbour pilots or police moorings or Home Office customs boarder control with facilities.</i>	
348/11	Dean & Reddyhoff Marinas	<p><i>Comments relating to proposed provision of short-stay moorings:</i></p> <p><i>First the principle of increasing visitors to the Harbour. It is considered they will enhance the sailing offer in Gosport and in turn attract more short term sailing visitors to the town.</i></p> <p><i>However Dean & Reddyhoff would question the economic viability of the provision of additional moorings in this location. The infrastructure required to service the moorings i.e. dredging, wave protection and possibly pontoons or a ferry to land visitors is very costly. Would urge the Council to fully explore the economic aspects of such a scheme before progressing.</i></p> <p><i>It should be noted that Dean & Reddyhoff already have significant well-serviced capacity in the form of visitor berths at Haslar Marina. Therefore Gosport does already currently have provision to encourage and service short-term boating/visitors.</i></p>	
292/7	Local resident	<i>Provide a 'Town Quay' between Gosport Ferry pontoon and the Haslar Marina Breakwater to encourage short stay visits</i>	The SPD is looking at the potential for additional berth near the ferry.

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>by leisure craft</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Provide direct access from the water to new waterfront cafes and restaurants</i> - <i>Provide a modest source of income to the Council through overnight tariffs on visiting yachtsmen</i> - <i>Help to add a sense of vitality to the waterfront and High Street, provide greater footfall for all businesses on the waterfront and High Street</i> - <i>Provide a landing space for pleasure cruises and facilitate visits from vessels such as the Waverly paddle steamer</i> - <i>Could also help connectivity between Gunwharf Quays, the Ilse of Wight and other parts of the Peninsula with the High Street</i> - <i>With difficult road access to the peninsula it makes sense to improve access by sea</i> - <i>Town quay at Dartmouth is a great example of what can be achieved.</i> 	<p>The SPD supports the provision of direct access from the waterfront to the water. The SPD does not consider tariffs. Agree that more water traffic will have positive knock on affects for the Businesses.</p> <p>This suggestion will be included in the Ideas Compendium in connection with the proposal for additional mooring in the SPD area.</p>
33/17	Local resident	<p>Additional yacht mooring between the pier and the ferry pontoons should not be used as an excuse to restrict public access along the esplanade <i>-the facilities should incorporate public access'</i> imply some restrictions on hitherto public access are intended.</p>	<p>No restrictions on public access are proposed on the Millennium Promenade. The phrase (in italics) included in the SPD relates to the pontoons themselves where it is envisaged that the public will have access to the pontoons to enjoy being close to the water.</p> <p>Add 'to the mooring area' for the avoidance of doubt.</p>
355/20	Local resident	<p>Visitor moorings would detract from views across the Harbour, there are already a number of marinas and sailing clubs in the area.</p>	<p>The SPD includes provision to ensure that the mooring are aligned to minimise any impact on views.</p>
225/14	Local resident	<p>Are guest moorings needed? There are already issues with 'mast pollution' and wind noise.</p>	<p>This is an important sector of Gosport's economy in which the Borough as a genuine locational advantage. Consequently, this provision should be explored further through feasibility work led by</p>
371/32	Local resident	<p><i>All short stay visitor moorings to be accommodated within existing marinas and keep the areas of water to the south of</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)
		<i>the Ferry Pontoon empty.</i>	the marine sector.
<i>Other sites</i>			
245/6	Local resident	Extend Trinity Close and build social housing on the lower end of the Walpole Car Park – a multi storey car park would not be out of place. There would be room for parking and children would have easy access to play areas without having to cross the road. (245/6)	It is proposed to retain the Walpole Park Car parks as the main parking area in the Town centre area.
<i>Other comments</i>			
33/16	Local resident	The provision of rear and undercroft parking contradicts the requirement to ensure new buildings are flood resilient.	Undercroft parking can assist with flood resilience as it ensures that living accommodation is higher off the ground. Such parking provision will need to ensure that it will not increase surface water run-off in accordance with Policy LP45 of the GBLP which requires no net gain in surface run-off.
62/3	Local resident	Suggest GBC undertakes obligations to maintain existing properties, gardens and pathways to the same standard as Hyde Properties maintain their buildings and grounds .Please put your efforts into properly maintaining what you have already rather than subscribing to overcrowding.	The Council have contractors to maintain its open spaces and buildings.