

Topic	Sub-Topic	Comments	Resp No.s	Recommended Response
Context	EN.1	Many respondents expressed regret that the EN.1 Policy has been discontinued in the emerging local plan, and that the LADS would have been un-necessary had this remained. Many feel the pressure for development arises directly from this change. Several suggested that the area would be better served by a Special Policy Area designation (or similar)	5, 6, 10, 12, 17, 20	It is not within the scope of the LADS to revisit issues that have been addressed through the Local Plan process, as the LADS is subordinate to the Local Plan. EN.1 of the adopted Winchester District Local Plan was not carried through into the emerging Winchester District Local Plan Review as it was considered that the Policy was untenable in the light of revisions to PPG3 which occurred in the interim. This approach has been supported by the Local Plan Inspector in his report. In relation to the 'Special Policy Area' suggestion, the Local Plan Inspector deals with this in para 3.3.2 - "Areas requiring special attention due to their architectural or historic interest are identified separately as designated Conservation Areas and there are statutory requirements concerning development within them. I consider the arbitrary introduction of additional special areas lying outside these is inappropriate and unnecessary if an even-handed design-led approach is taken towards the remaining areas of the District." <b>It is not proposed to change the LADS in the light of these comments.</b>
Context	PPG3 & Densities	Many respondents feel that the LADS is too weak and fails either to identify appropriate densities for the sections of the road or to specify that PPG3 would not apply on CA. Many support the implied intention of maintaining below PPG3 level densities (30-50ph), with several residents proposing different maximum densities. 3 respondents believe that the LADS is unnecessary as PPG3 already allows for lower densities where circumstances can justify it.	5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 16, 20	Whilst the support is welcomed, it is difficult for the LADS to specify maximum residential densities for the various sections of Chilbolton Avenue. Para 38 of PPS1 indicates that 'policies should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail', and it is difficult to avoid being prescriptive if maximum residential densities are set. However, It is one of the purposes of the LADS to identify, through community involvement, the design-related constraints of Chilbolton Avenue that might limit the applicability of PPG3 required housing densities. The LADS is therefore necessary to identify and justify these local circumstances. <b>It is not proposed to change the LADS in the light of these comments.</b>
Context	Comprehensive Redevelopment	Many respondents believe that the LADS is too late, especially with respect to the LPA's desire to see comprehensive redevelopment. The LADS therefore requires updating relative to this issue, especially in the light of recent Inspectors' decisions on recent applications (55 CA being a cited example).	6, 7, 9, 16, 20	The development process is dynamic, and is, by definition, constantly changing as a result of many factors. It would be impossible for a LADS, or any equivalent document, to preempt every individual development. It is accepted that some developments have preceded the production of the LADS, but its purposes and intentions remain sound. In relation to the issue of redevelopment occurring within a comprehensive framework extending beyond each individual planning application, both the Local Plan Inspector and recent appeals on Chilbolton Avenue indicate that it would be unreasonable to expect applicants to formulate their planning applications mindful of considerations on land beyond their control. This position is already reflected in the LADS, at paras 1.31-1.33 and 4.14-4.20. <b>It is proposed to alter the LADS to update paras 1.32 and 1.33 in the light of having received the Local Plan Inspector's Report.</b>
Context	Timeliness	Probably similar in origin to the issue above (4), although here comments simply state that the LADS is too late	4, 6, 10, 12, 20	The development process is dynamic, and is, by definition, constantly changing as a result of many factors. It would be impossible for a LADS, or any equivalent document, to preempt every individual development. It is accepted that some developments have preceded the production of the LADS, but its purposes and intentions remain sound. <b>It is not proposed to alter the LADS in the light of these comments.</b>

Context	Implementation	3 respondents are concerned that the LADS will not be the (or a) main guiding principle that would shape any future planning application. The LADS should be made clearer as to how planning applications will be considered. One respondent (6) strongly questions WCCs capacity/ability to assess planning applications from a design perspective	5, 6, 12,	When adopted, the LADS will be a Supplementary Planning Document to the Winchester District Local Plan for the area in question. The document will therefore be a material consideration, against which planning applications will be considered. During the preparation of the LADS, care has been taken to ensure that the document is consistent with current national and local planning policies, and it has been drawn up following an extensive process of community involvement. The document will therefore be one of the more important factors in determining planning applications. Applications will be considered on a case-by-case basis, but should additional expertise be required to assess individual development proposals, the Council has arrangements in place for the provision of design advice through the appointment of specialists. <b>It is not proposed to alter the LADS in the light of these comments.</b>
Context	Scope of LADS	2 respondents feel that the scope of the LADS should extend to other infrastructure (water supply, sewerage and social infrastructure), whilst 3 support the LADS and its design focus	5, 8, 12, 15, 17	The support is welcome. With regards to the objections, the purpose of the LADS is to identify the urban design constraints that relate to developments on Chilbolton Avenue, as it is considered that it is design issues that are the main issues given that the principle of development is established by the Local Plan. All the other issues suggested by respondents to be encompassed within the scope of the LADS are important, but are addressed through other policies in the Local Plan, with which planning applications must also be compliant. These issues will be therefore addressed as part of the process of formulating and determining planning applications. <b>It is not proposed to alter the LADS in the light of these comments.</b>
Context	Segmentation of CA	1 respondent feels that CA should be treated as an entirety, 1 supports the segmentation approach adopted	12, 17	Following the design assessment of Chilbolton Avenue, which forms part of the LADS, the LADS has been constructed so as to enable the assessment of planning applications against the part(s) of the road in which they would fall. Whilst some urban design elements appear within most or all parts of the Avenue, others are only applicable to smaller sections of it. It is therefore inappropriate to consider the Avenue as a single homogenous entity. <b>It is not proposed to alter the LADS as a result of these comments.</b>
Community Involvement	Scope	Feels scope of community involvement is limited, due to his client's exclusion from the process. Also feels that the LADS resolves current community's concerns, rather than being 'imaginative' to achieve community needs	16	No development interests were intentionally excluded from the process of formulating the LADS, and the comments from this respondent are welcome. During the early stages of the preparation of the LADS, opinions were sought from residents, community groups, statutory consultees as well as development interests then known to the council. It is understood that the development interest represented by this respondent emerged after the commencement of the LADS process. In relation to the issues raised, it should be noted that developments do not occur in a vacuum, but have impacts in their vicinity, and it is considered entirely appropriate for the Council to have sought the opinions of the local community in formulating the LADS. This is an approach that is encouraged by PPS1 and is indeed required of any SPD under the provisions of planning regulations. The resulting LADS therefore is appropriate in that it seeks to reconcile residents concerns regarding developments with the needs of the wider community and the views of development interests. <b>It is not intended to alter the LADS in the light of these comments.</b>

Street scene - General	Tree Cover	Both respondents support LADS emphasis of importance of tree cover to general street scene, however 1 (17) feels that WCC should take responsibility for maintenance, rather than locals, and Resp. 20 is of the opinion that tree protection should be limited by desire for good husbandry to enhance undergrowth	17, 20	The support for the importance of trees to the street scene is welcomed. WCC control over planting is generally limited to trees, in the form of tree preservation orders (TPOs), or conditions regarding landscaping being imposed on planning approvals. The Council supports the principle of enhancing biodiversity within the district (in this instance through tree & canopy management), though is mindful of the importance of the existing trees to the street scene. Any applications for works that would affect the trees on Chilbolton Avenue which are currently protected by TPOs would be carefully considered with these factors in mind. It is important to note that the responsibility for maintenance of TPO trees rests, as in the case of buildings, with the owner of the land on which they occur. It is the role of the council to ensure that TPO trees are not harmed by their owners. WCC would only be responsible for the maintenance of TPO trees situated on WCC land. <b>It is not proposed to alter the LADS in the light of these comments.</b>
Street scene - General	Visibility from outside CA	Both respondents disagree with suggestion in para 2.69 that views into CA from outside the area are less important than views of these areas from CA.	6, 20	This is a valid comment, as views are indeed 2-way. The text is perhaps unclear in that views of the buildings of Chilbolton Avenue from adjacent residential areas are intermittent, and largely broken up and obscured by the trees in the Avenue, whereas views of these adjacent areas from within Chilbolton Avenue are less broken up by trees. <b>Paragraph 2.69 should be reworded to reflect this more sympathetically.</b>
Street scene - General	Building Line	2 respondents support retention of existing building line (no change or encroachment roadwards), but 1 (6) suggests that not all new build should be parallel to CA. 1 respondent (18) feels that there will be a need to be flexible wrt building line to achieve developments, due to rear-of-plot constraints - see section re Area C	3, 6, 18	The views of the respondents highlight valid issues here. The back of plot constraints of Area C (protected tree stand) are acknowledged as additional constraints in this location, however, it is not accepted that a flexible approach to the position of the building line should be taken as a result. The reason is that, with additional flexibility, there is the possibility of encroachment roadwards, which would compromise one of the key characteristics of Chilbolton Avenue. This stance is supported by 2 of the respondents, and is currently reflected in Guideline D2 of the draft LADS. There is more justification in relation to the suggestion that not all new build should be exactly parallel to Chilbolton Avenue, however, mindful that para 38 of PPS1 indicates that 'policies should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail', there is a danger that such specification would be too prescriptive. It seems most appropriate to assess the exact building line on a case by case basis at the planning application stage, with the overriding intention that existing building lines (whether parallel or nearly parallel to Chilbolton Avenue) should not be moved roadwards. <b>The current wording of D2 allows for this non-parallel, case-by-case assessment, and it is not therefore necessary to alter the text of the LADS to reflect this.</b>
Street scene - General	Building massing	Support for design of buildings to be outwardly 2-story residential in character. 2 respondents feel that roof space development to achieve 3 storeys is possible, whilst 1 (17) is concerned that buildings should not exceed existing heights	6, 7, 9, 17	The responses on this issue are all compatible with each other, and the current text of the LADS. The 2 respondents suggesting that a 3rd storey would be deliverable in buildings on Chilbolton Avenue acknowledge that this is most likely to be in loft-space style voids with casement windows. This would not require the buildings to be taller than those existing on the Avenue, nor would it compromise the general design approach outlined in Guideline D1. <b>It is not proposed to alter the LADS in the light of these comments.</b>
Street scene - General	Building orientation	New developments should be outward (ie toward CA) facing	6	Agreed. This issue is addressed in design Guideline D5. <b>It is not proposed to alter the LADS in the light of these comments.</b>

Street scene - General	Street furniture	2 respondents are keen to keep street furniture to a minimum. 1 wishes to see parking restrictions maintained, 1 wishes to avoid the presence of bus stops.	10, 17	Agreed. This issue is addressed in design Guideline D7. <b>It is not proposed to alter the LADS in the light of these comments.</b>
Street scene - General	Fencing/Landscaping	Brick walls and close boarded fencing should be recognised as 'alien' to the locality – or be combined with planting to soften, in keeping with the rest of CA	5, 6, 17	Agreed. This issue is addressed in design Guideline D7. <b>It is not proposed to alter the LADS in the light of these comments.</b>
Development Options	Location of new build	All 3 respondents in this section support the concept of development being to rear of existing structures in areas of least constraint, although 1 (18) suggests that flexibility is required in building line if developments are to be progressed	3, 7, 18	The support is welcome, however, it is not accepted that a flexible approach to the position of the building line should be taken. The reason is that, with additional flexibility, there is the possibility of encroachment roadwards, which would compromise one of the key characteristics of Chilbolton Avenue. <b>It is not proposed to alter the LADS in the light of these comments.</b>
Development Options	Retention of existing bldgs	2 respondents (4,7) suggest that existing buildings are not worth retaining in design terms, however, 1 (20) suggests existing buildings should be retained	4, 7, 20	The LADS agrees that the existing buildings are not worthy of protection. The only method to retain existing buildings would be the inclusion within a Conservation Area, or listing the buildings in question. Given the assessment of the buildings in the LADS, neither measure could be justified. These points are therefore adequately addressed by design Guideline D5. <b>It is not proposed to alter the LADS in the light of these comments.</b>
Development Options	Locating affordable housing	Believes affordable housing should not be distributed across development sites, but aggregated	20	It is not within the scope of the LADS to revisit issues that have been addressed through the Local Plan process, as the LADS is subordinate to the Local Plan. The provision and distribution of affordable housing across development sites is a matter of detail that is addressed at the planning application stage, however, provided all units on sites (affordable or market housing) are designed in accordance with the guidance contained within the LADS, no harm would occur from whichever arrangement of the various types of housing is progressed in detailed planning applications. <b>It is not proposed to alter the LADS in the light of these comments.</b>
Development Options	Priority to develop CA	Feels WCC should promote greenfield development	20	It is not within the scope of the LADS to revisit issues that have been addressed through the Local Plan process, as the LADS is subordinate to the Local Plan. The preference for redevelopment of previously developed land is stated strongly in PPG3, as such sites are likely to be more sustainable. The strategy for development distribution within the district is in line with these principles and has recently been endorsed by the Local Plan Inspector. <b>It is not proposed to alter the LADS in the light of these comments.</b>

Development Options	Level of constraint afforded by LADS	Both respondents believe that LADS is an undue constraint on development in the area. Resp 9 feels that the LADS should not seek enhancement (para 1.27 of draft).	9, 16	The Local Area Design Statement is seeking to ensure that the attributes that contribute to the valued character of Chilbolton Ave are not lost in the event of development. National policy, in the form of PPG3, allows such a stance to be taken, and the LADS is therefore seeking to help shape development proposals, and link the objectives of the development plan, particularly Policy DP.3, with any future planning applications. It is not therefore accepted that the LADS is an undue constraint on development. Indeed, the LADS provides added clarity to the requirements of this policy in the Area in question and therefore removes uncertainty from the development process. Regarding enhancing the area, the Council will always seek to improve development proposals, but acknowledges that it is not the purpose of the planning system to remedy existing issues. Rather, the council will encourage developers to submit proposals that are in line with the LADS and also incorporate best practice with respect to urban design issues. <b>It is not proposed to alter the LADS in the light of these comments.</b>
Area A	Constraint assessment & Conclusions	Respondent points out that Area A is dominated by a new development. LADS should identify whether this design is the aspiration or the exception for both Area A and whole of CA	17	The comments are noted. Para 38 of PPS1 indicates that 'policies should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail', and it is difficult to avoid being prescriptive regarding the urban design of developments on Chilbolton Avenue if the LADS specifies whether the design characteristics of the newly built development in Area A are the aspiration or the exception for the remainder of the road. The development to which the respondent refers is largely inward facing (ie away from Chilbolton Avenue) and the edge of the development that interacts with Chilbolton Avenue is currently mainly characterised by brick walls with softer planting yet to take effect. Given Design Guidelines D5 and D7, it would appear that developments of the nature of that which dominates Area A would be less likely to be approved in future. <b>It is not proposed to alter the LADS in the light of these comments.</b>
Area B	Constraint assessment & Conclusions	Suggests vegetation does not dominate street scene due to development activity in Area C	17	The respondent refers to development activity in Area C affecting the impact of vegetation in Area B. As the LADS describes each part of the Avenue separately, it is appropriate for the LADS to treat each part of the Avenue in isolation. The comments are noted and included within the description for Area C, but it would not be appropriate to repeat them in relation to Area B. <b>It is not proposed to alter the LADS in the light of these comments.</b>
Area C	Constraint assessment	Resp 16 suggests that the part of Area C south of Sarum Rd has been incorporated into the process late - apparently evidenced by presentation slides in Appendix 2. Resp 18 feels that nos 26-40 CA are further back from the road than the rest of Area C, and that the LADS should acknowledge the additional stand of trees to the rear of these properties	16, 18	Regarding 26-40, the building line is a key aspect identified in the LADS. As identified by Design Guideline D2, new building should not be forward of the existing building line. It is not necessary for the LADS to highlight the position of these properties, or any other along the road, in this respect. The additional row of trees to the rear of these properties is mentioned in the text, as is the fact that these benefit from a TPO (see para 2.24 of the LADS). Regarding the part of Area C to the south of Sarum Road, and the respondent's suggestion that this area has been brought into the LADS process late (and therefore should be excluded from the LADS or assigned a unique Character Area), it is acknowledged that maps in Appendix II (the copy of the presentation given early in the LADS process) do appear to exclude this area, however this was an error. It is sensible for the LADS to incorporate this area, which was previously covered by Policy EN.1 of the adopted 1998 Winchester District Local Plan. The conclusions of Matrix regarding Area C, and the inclusion of the area to the south of Sarum Road within it, are considered justified. <b>It is not proposed to alter the LADS in the light of these comments.</b>

	Conclusions	Resp 16 feels the part of Area C to south of Sarum Rd should be afforded a Character area of its own. Resp 18 feels that with the row of trees to rear of properties 26-40, flexibility may be required wrt building line if development is to be accommodated	16, 18	Regarding the part of Area C to the south of Sarum Road, and the respondent's suggestion that this area has been brought into the LADS process late (and therefore should be excluded from the LADS or assigned a unique Character Area), it is acknowledged that maps in Appendix II (the copy of the presentation given early in the LADS process) do appear to exclude this area, however this was an error. It is sensible for the LADS to incorporate this area, which was previously covered by Policy EN.1 of the adopted 1998 Winchester District Local Plan. The conclusions of Matrix regarding Area C, and the inclusion of the area to the south of Sarum Road within it, are considered justified. Regarding the additional row of trees, and the respondent's conclusion that a flexible approach to the building line may need to be taken at this location, para 2.24 of the LADS is clear in this respect. The comments of this respondent are disagreed with because, with additional flexibility, there is the possibility of encroachment roadwards, which would compromise one of the key characteristics of Chilbolton Avenue. Rather, the additional line of trees at this location is acknowledged as an additional constraint to development. <b>It is not proposed to alter the LADS in the light of these comments.</b>
Area D	Constraint assessment & Conclusions	Support to the 'both sided' focus to constraints faced by area D. Resps 7 & 9 nonetheless are of the opinion that some small scale, low level development to rear of existing properties is achievable	7, 9, 17	The support for the 'double sided' focus to Area D is welcome. With regards the specific comments that low level development being possible to the rear of properties in Area D, the LADS does not entirely exclude such development. As the focus of the LADS is on a design-led approach to development, provided the design criteria outlined in the LADS are considered and complied with at the planning application stage, such proposals would be in line with the spirit and content of the LADS. <b>It is not proposed to alter the LADS in the light of these comments.</b>
Area E	Constraint assessment & Conclusions	Resp 20 suggests that lower tree canopy coverage is due to historic management practice & thinning resulting in better undergrowth and higher biodiversity. Resps 7 & 9 feel that development is possible in this area	7, 9, 20	The comments in this respect are noted, but it is not necessary to include the comments into the text of the LADS. <b>It is not proposed to alter the LADS in the light of these comments.</b>
Area F	Constraint assessment & Conclusions	Resp 4 strongly questions tree coverage assessment and aspects relating to the frontages of properties. Resps 7 & 9 feel that development is possible in this area	4, 7, 9	The conclusions drawn by Matrix relating to the attributes found within this section of Chilbolton Avenue are based on a survey and an assessment of this area. It is acknowledged that some aspects associated with the appearance of developments (eg front garden/hardstanding/landscaping) may be beyond the scope of ongoing control at the planning application stage. However, the council is keen to ensure that the factors underlying these, which have much influence on occupants subsequent decisions (eg building & access locations relative to each other and to Chilbolton Avenue), are considered in those elements which do fall within the planning system. The comments from the other respondents that development is possible within this area are acknowledged, but it is not necessary to include these in the text of the LADS. <b>It is not proposed to alter the LADS in the light of these comments.</b>
Area G	Constraint assessment & Conclusions	Feels LADS should acknowledge that these playing fields are in private, rather than public ownership, and suggests that motivation for private landowner might be less in the wider public interest	17	The respondent makes a valid point here. Private owners are often subject to different motivation than are public owners. However, the playing fields are protected by Policies RT.1 and RT.2 which seeks to protect and retain existing amenity and recreational areas, regardless of ownership, however it would be beneficial to highlight the private nature of the ownership in para 2.46 of the LADS. <b>Para 2.46 will be altered to emphasise the private ownership of the playing fields.</b>

Traffic	Road Junctions - Sarum & Romsey Rd	Much comment suggesting that junction types at Romsey Rd and Sarum Rd should be the same, regardless of whether roundabouts or lighted junctions. Concern expressed regarding the deliverability of improvements due to land take required & processes associated. Resp 2 supports roundabouts at Romsey Rd. Resp 20 feels that, if lights are to control Romsey Rd junction, they should be intelligent/sensored	HCC Highway s, 2, 19, 20	The design of road junctions is a complex, and technical process, and whilst in ideal circumstances certain types of junction might be preferred, there are often other factors involved in such decisions, not least of which is whether there is adequate land available to provide the junction type. It is therefore inappropriate for the LADS to specify at this stage which junction type should be implemented at the Romsey Road and Sarum Road junctions. As regards these junctions, Hampshire County Council Highways Department are in discussions with landowners with a view to improve the Sarum Road/Chilbolton Avenue junction. It is hoped that these improvements may be delivered in due course. As the implications of junction design extend well beyond the design-based scope of the LADS, <b>it is not proposed to alter the LADS in the light of these comments.</b>
Traffic	Additional accesses to serve new devels	Resp 2 supports roundabouts for all new accesses. Resp 14 & 19 suggest it is not possible to deliver visibility splays to serve developments given desire to maintain existing building lines. Resp 14 is concerned at safety implications of additional right turns off CA, while Resp 19 would like to see a clear strategy for delivery of any necessary improvements related to size, scale and nature of devels.	HCC Highway s, 2, 14, 19	The design of road junctions is a complex and technical process, and whilst in ideal circumstances certain types of junction might be preferred, there are often other factors involved in such decisions, not least of which is whether there is adequate land available to provide the junction type. It is therefore impossible for the LADS to specify which junction type should be implemented for any given development. Access to developments, including the detail of the design, can only be considered on a case-by-case basis as and when development proposals occur. Council highways engineers are consulted in relation to planning applications and this process will continue. The LADS provides the context within which access points will be designed and assessed. <b>It is not proposed to alter the LADS in the light of these comments.</b>
Traffic	CA capacity	Many respondents express concern relating to the levels of traffic on CA (both existing and as a result of developments). Some would specifically wish the LADS to indicate the capacity of CA. Resp 12 would like to see results of traffic counts in the doc.	HCC Highway s, 2, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 19	It is not the purpose of the LADS to document current traffic levels on Chilbolton Avenue, and providing the results of traffic surveys is outside the scope of the LADS, which seeks to identify and evaluate design-related constraints to development. Furthermore, road capacity is a highly subjective issue, dependant on vehicle types and road characteristics, as well as vehicle speed. A single maximum capacity for any given road is therefore a dubious concept. The LADS should therefore not be altered to incorporate these issues. Increasing development density is likely to increase traffic movements, but these can only be considered on a case-by-case basis as and when planning applications are being formulated. It is likely that, in terms of traffic numbers, the numbers of additional movements arising from the development will be very limited compared to the numbers of traffic movements on Chilbolton Avenue. <b>It is not proposed to alter the LADS in the light of these comments.</b>

Traffic	Pedestrian crossings/ cycling	HCC Highways indicate that desire lines and assessments are v. weak re provision of crossings. In addition, concern expressed as CA is a high and wide load route - with islands likely to force high loads under overhanging tree canopy. Resp 12 feels emphasis given to cyclists is unwarranted	HCC Highway s, 12	The comments from HCC Highways regarding the desire lines regarding pedestrian crossings are noted. Relevant sections of the Transport Appendix will be amended to reflect the situation.
Traffic	Parking & Parking restrictions	Many respondents are keen to see parking restrictions on CA retained. HCC Highways is keen to see parking standards complied with, while Resp 16 feels that parking standards should be applied to developments on a case-by-case basis	HCC Highway s, 10, 12, 14, 16	The comments are noted. It is likely that decisions on planning applications regarding parking provision will be made on a case-by-case mindful of parking standards. Design Guideline D7 addresses the concerns to ensure that Chilbolton Avenue retains its parking restrictions. <b>It is not proposed to alter the LADS in the light of these comments.</b>
Traffic	Public Transport	Minimal comment re public transport. Resp 17 does not wish to see bus halts introduced into the street scene	17	Design guideline D7 addresses the concerns regarding street furniture. <b>It is not proposed to alter the LADS in the light of these comments.</b>
Traffic	Speed enforcement/ management	Similar to issue re CA capacity, many respondents would wish to see greater enforcement of traffic speed limits. Resp 8 suggests inclusion of traffic calming measures.	HCC Highway s, 2, 8, 10, 14	It is not within the scope of the LADS to enforce speed limits or to propose other traffic management measures. Whilst these issues are of significant concern to many respondents there are other mechanisms that seek to address them, and it would not be appropriate for the LADS to attempt to duplicate or replace these <b>It is not proposed to alter the LADS in the light of these comments.</b>
Traffic	Noise	Would like to see flexible planning approach to soundproofing measures along CA	8	The LADS does not exclude the possibility of the installation of soundproofing measures. Should residents wish to propose soundproofing measures for their individual properties, there would be support wherever possible. It should be noted, however, that any artificial physical barriers should be designed and constructed mindful of the design considerations outlined in the LADS. <b>It is not proposed to alter the LADS in the light of these comments.</b>