



The Planning Inspectorate

M25 Junction 28 Improvement Scheme

**Examining Authority's (ExA)
Consultation Draft Development Consent Order (DCO)**

**Schedule of ExA's recommended amendments to the Applicant's draft DCO
Version 6 [REP7-003]**

Note to Interested Parties:

The Examining Authority (ExA) reminds Interested Parties (IP) that the recommended schedule of changes to the draft DCO [REP7-003] as set out below follows a statutory process. It is made irrespective of the recommendation the ExA will make to the Secretary of State (SoS) and is not an indication that ExA has already made up its mind on the Application. IPs participation and written responses will be treated as being given without prejudice to any position or view they hold on the scheme. IPs are invited to identify any outstanding concerns previously raised that are not addressed below.

The ExA has not responded to those changes to Articles and Schedules requested by Transport for London (TfL) in its Deadline 4 [REP4-038] and Deadline 6 [REP6-044] responses where TfL confirmed at Issues Specific Hearing 3, held on Wednesday 7 May 2021 (ISH3) [EV-038] that such changes would be covered either by its Protective Provisions in Schedule 9 of the draft DCO or by any private agreement between themselves and the Applicant.

No.	Article/ Schedule	Text as set out in draft DCO Version 6 [REP7-003]	ExA's recommended amendment	Reason and Notes
1.	<p>Part 3, Article 13(1) and (2)</p> <p>Temporary closure, alteration, diversion and restriction of use of streets</p>	<p><i>(1) "The undertaker, during and for the purposes of carrying out the authorised development, may temporarily close, alter, divert or restrict the use of any street and may for any reasonable time-"</i></p> <p><i>(2) "Without limitation on the scope of paragraph (1), the undertaker may use any street temporarily altered, diverted or restricted under the</i></p>	No changes proposed.	While the ExA acknowledges the term "use of any street" is a broad one, the ExA is satisfied that such power is constrained by paragraph (4) in which the consent of the street authority is required. Little evidence is before the ExA to suggest that in practice, the Applicant would utilise the power on more roads than it needed. On that basis, the ExA does not propose to change the paragraphs as recommended by IPs.

No.	Article/ Schedule	Text as set out in draft DCO Version 6 [REP7-003]	ExA's recommended amendment	Reason and Notes
		<i>powers conferred by this article, and which is within the Order limits as a temporary working site."</i>		
2.	Part 3, Article 13(6) Temporary closure, alteration, diversion and restriction of use of streets	<i>(6) "If a street authority which receives an application for consent under paragraph (4) fails to notify the undertaker of its decision before the end of the period of 28 days beginning with the date on which the application is made, it is deemed to have granted consent".</i>	<i>(6) "If a street authority which receives an application for consent under paragraph (4) fails to notify the undertaker of its decision before the end of the period of 28 days 42 days beginning with the date on which the application is made, it is deemed to have granted consent".</i>	The ExA accepts that previous Orders cited by the Applicant have made similar provisions for 28-day notice periods. However, the ExA is mindful that the Covid-19 pandemic has placed additional pressures on all organisations including local authorities. While the ExA considers 56-days to be overly long, the ExA is recommending an additional two weeks be added as a goodwill and reasonable gesture during these times. Little evidence is before the ExA to suggest that the recommended additional period would cause any serious bearing on the timely delivery of the Proposed Development.
3.	Part 3, Article 18(2)(c) Traffic regulation	<i>(c) "Authorise the use as a parking place of any road".</i>	[DELETE]	The ExA notes the Applicant's response to Action Point 2 [REP4-026] to Issue Specific Hearing 2 [EV-010]. However, the ExA remains

No.	Article/ Schedule	Text as set out in draft DCO Version 6 [REP7-003]	ExA's recommended amendment	Reason and Notes
				provisionally unconvinced that this power is necessary given that it is intended that operative parking would take place on site. The ExA recommends the power is deleted.
4.	Part 3, Article 18(11) Traffic regulation	<i>(11) If the traffic authority fails to notify the undertaker of its decision within 28 days of receiving an application for consent under paragraph (2) the traffic authority is deemed to have granted consent.</i>	<i>(11) If the traffic authority fails to notify the undertaker of its decision within 28 days 42 days of receiving an application for consent under paragraph (2) the traffic authority is deemed to have granted consent.</i>	See response to Point 2.
5.	Part 4, Article 19(9) Discharge of water	<i>(9) If a person who receives an application for consent under paragraph (3) or approval under paragraph (4)(a) fails to notify the undertaker of a decision within 28 days of receiving an application that person will be deemed to have granted consent or given approval, as the case may be.</i>	<i>(9) If a person who receives an application for consent under paragraph (3) or approval under paragraph (4)(a) fails to notify the undertaker of a decision within 28 days 42 days of receiving an application that person will be deemed to have granted consent or given approval, as the case may be.</i>	See response to Point 2.

No.	Article/ Schedule	Text as set out in draft DCO Version 6 [REP7-003]	ExA's recommended amendment	Reason and Notes
6.	<p>Part 4, Article 22(2)</p> <p>Authority to survey and investigate the land</p>	<p><i>(2) "No land may be entered or equipment placed or left on or removed from the land under paragraph (1) unless at least 14 days' notice has been served on every owner and occupier of the land".</i></p>	<p>No change proposed.</p>	<p>The ExA is not persuaded that 14 days' notice would be insufficient to notify persons with an interest in the land.</p>
7.	<p>Part 5, Article 35(2)</p> <p>Temporary use of land for the carrying out the authorised development</p>	<p><i>(2) "Not less than 14 days before entering on and taking temporary possession of land under this article the undertaker must serve notice of the intended entry on the owners and occupiers of the land and explain the purpose for entry is taken in respect of land specified under paragraph (1)(a)(ii)".</i></p>	<p>No changes proposed.</p>	<p>See response to Point 6.</p>
8.		<p><i>(2) "The authorised development must be</i></p>	<p><i>(2) "The authorised development must be</i></p>	<p>The ExA has expressed in written questions [PD-008] and further</p>

No.	Article/ Schedule	Text as set out in draft DCO Version 6 [REP7-003]	ExA's recommended amendment	Reason and Notes
	<p>Schedule 2, Requirement 3(1)</p> <p>Detailed design</p>	<p><i>designed in detail and carried out so that it is compatible with the preliminary scheme design shown on the engineering drawings and sections unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Secretary of State, following consultation by the undertaker with the relevant planning authority and relevant highway authority on matters related to its function..."</i></p>	<p><i>designed in detail and carried out so that it is compatible with the preliminary scheme design shown on the engineering drawings and sections unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Secretary of State, following <u>an independent design review and a report on its findings on the design of the bridges and structures and</u> consultation by the undertaker with the relevant planning authority and relevant highway authority on matters related to its function..."</i></p>	<p>written questions [PD-015] as well as at ISH1 [EV-009] and ISH3 [EV-038] its concerns with the design aspect of the scheme, particularly the bridges and structures. The ExA has noted the applicant's response. In particular the ExA notes the Applicant's Design Process Summary document submitted at Deadline 7 [REP7-028]. This document sets out the Applicant's reasoning for the design approach taken during the early design stages.</p> <p>The Applicant does not give any further explanation in this document of the design process undertaken to secure the best possible aesthetic appearance but does reiterate points made in previous submissions to support the design decisions that they have made. The additional information submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 7 does not provide additional information sufficient to alter the ExA's initial view that in order to fully comply with paragraphs 4.28, 4.29, 4.32, 4.33 and 4.35 of the National Policy Statement on National Networks, the</p>

No.	Article/ Schedule	Text as set out in draft DCO Version 6 [REP7-003]	ExA's recommended amendment	Reason and Notes
				<p>SoS should have evidence that the bridges and structures have been subjected to an independent design review process prior to determining their acceptability in design terms.</p> <p>For this reason and to allow flexibility, the ExA proposes to retain the words "compatible with". Should the ExA not proceed with the recommendation that the bridge and structure designs be subjected to an independent design review, or that the SoS deems it as unnecessary, then the ExA will recommend that "compatible with" be replaced with "in accordance with", which the ExA considers represents affirmative wording.</p>
9.	<p>Schedule 2, Requirement 3(2)</p> <p>Detailed design</p>	<p><i>(2) "Where amended details are approved by the Secretary of State under sub-paragraph (1), those details are deemed to be substituted for the corresponding engineering drawings and sections and the undertaker must make those amended details</i></p>	<p><i>(2) "Where amended details are approved by the Secretary of State under sub-paragraph (1), those details are deemed to be substituted for the corresponding engineering drawings and sections and the undertaker must make those amended details</i></p>	<p>In written question DCO 1.30 [PD-008] the ExA requested that Requirement 17 be amended so the "electronic form" was replaced with "online" as the former did not necessarily mean the latter. The Applicant duly obliged. The recommended change here follows the same reasoning.</p>

No.	Article/ Schedule	Text as set out in draft DCO Version 6 [REP7-003]	ExA's recommended amendment	Reason and Notes
		<i>available in electronic form for inspection by member so of the public".</i>	<i>available in electronic form online for inspection by member so of the public".</i>	
10.	Schedule 2, Requirement 4(1) Construction Environmental Management Plan	<i>(1) "No part of the authorised development is to commence until a CEMP, substantially in accordance with the Outline CEMP..."</i>	<i>(1) "No part of the authorised development is to commence until a CEMP, substantially in accordance with the Outline CEMP..."</i>	The ExA is concerned with the term "substantially in accordance" as expressed in WQ1 DCO 1.26 [PD-008]. The ExA considers the term is imprecise because "substantial" is not defined and is subjective and could mean anything from, for example, 99% to 51% accordant. There is a possibility that the CEMP could resemble a different document to its outline counterpart, with the potential for measures to have been previously unassessed or examined. The recommended change would provide this certainty to all parties concerned.
11.	Schedule 2, Requirement 4(2) Construction Environmental Management Plan	<i>(2) "The CEMP must be written in accordance with ISO14001 and, so far as is relevant to that part of the authorised development, must reflect the mitigation measures set out in the REAC..."</i>	<i>"The CEMP must be written in accordance with ISO14001 and, so far as is relevant to that part of the authorised development, must reflect is in accordance with the</i>	See response 10, which is considered to equally apply to the term "must reflect/reflecting".

No.	Article/ Schedule	Text as set out in draft DCO Version 6 [REP7-003]	ExA's recommended amendment	Reason and Notes
			<i>mitigation measures set out in the REAC...</i>	
12.	Schedule 2, Requirement 5(2) Landscaping	<i>(2) "The landscaping scheme and LEMP must reflect the mitigation measures set out in the REAC and be substantially in accordance with the Preliminary Environmental Design and the Outline LEMP".</i>	<i>(2) "The landscaping scheme and LEMP must reflect be in accordance with the mitigation measures set out in the REAC and be substantially in accordance with the Preliminary Environmental Design and the Outline LEMP".</i>	See response to Point 11
13.	Schedule 2, Requirement 5(3)(g) Landscaping	<i>(g) "; and a permanent visual screening fence to be installed and planting to be undertaken in the interests of the visual amenity of the residents of Grove Farm".</i>	[DELETE]	See response to Point 20
14.	Schedule 2, Requirement 5(4) Landscaping	<i>(4) "All landscaping works must be carried out to a reasonable standard in accordance with the relevant recommendations of appropriate British Standards or other</i>	<i>(4) "All landscaping works must be carried out to a reasonable standard in accordance with the relevant recommendations of appropriate British Standards or other</i>	The Applicant has not advanced the "other recognised codes of good practice" in evidence in this Examination. The ExA considers that unchecked, these other codes could well be inferior to the British Standards. The ExA recommends that

No.	Article/ Schedule	Text as set out in draft DCO Version 6 [REP7-003]	ExA's recommended amendment	Reason and Notes
		<i>recognised codes of good practice</i> ".	<i>recognised codes of good practice <u>which must first be agreed by the Secretary of State</u></i> ".	if the Applicant intends on using other codes, they must first be agreed by the SoS to ensure that such other codes are appropriate.
15.	Schedule 2, Requirement 8(1) Surface and foul water drainage	<i>(1) "No part of the authorised development is to commence until for that part written details of the surface and foul water drainage system, reflecting the mitigation measures set out in the REAC..."</i>	<i>(1) "No part of the authorised development is to commence until for that part written details of the surface and foul water drainage system, reflecting the <u>in accordance with the</u> mitigation measures set out in the REAC..."</i>	See response to Point 11
16.	Schedule 2, Requirement 9(2) Archaeological remains	<i>(2) "The Archaeological Management Plan must be substantially in accordance with..."</i>	<i>(2) "The Archaeological Management Plan must be substantially in accordance with..."</i>	See response to Point 10.
17.	Schedule 2, Requirement 10(2) Traffic management	<i>(1) "No part of the authorised development comprising the construction, alteration or improvement of the M25 or A12 is to commence until a</i>	<i>(1) "No part of the authorised development comprising the construction, alteration or improvement of the M25 or A12 is to commence until a</i>	Capital letters replacing the lower case to be consistent with other Requirements where plans are mentioned.

No.	Article/ Schedule	Text as set out in draft DCO Version 6 [REP7-003]	ExA's recommended amendment	Reason and Notes
		<i>traffic management plan for that part..."</i>	<i>traffic management plan</i> <u>Traffic Management Plan</u> for that part..."	
18.	Schedule 2, Requirement 10(2) Traffic management	<i>(2) "The traffic management plan prepared under sub-paragraph (1) must be substantially in accordance with the Outline Traffic Management Plan and reflect the relevant mitigation measures set out in the REAC".</i>	<i>(2) "The traffic management plan</i> <u>Traffic Management Plan</u> <i> prepared under sub-paragraph (1) must be substantially in accordance with the Outline Traffic Management Plan and reflect the relevant mitigation measures set out in the REAC".</i>	See responses to Points 11 and 16.
19.	Schedule 2, Requirement 11(2) Trees	<i>(2) "The Aboricultural Method Statement must be substantially in accordance with the Outline Aboricultural Method Statement and reflect the relevant mitigation measures set out in the REAC".</i>	<i>(2) "The Aboricultural Method Statement must be substantially in accordance with the Outline Aboricultural Method Statement and reflect the relevant mitigation measures set out in the REAC".</i>	See response to Point 11.
20.	Schedule 2, Requirement 19	<i>"In relation to any provision of this Schedule</i>	<i>"In relation to any provision of this Schedule</i>	See response to Point 2.

No.	Article/ Schedule	Text as set out in draft DCO Version 6 [REP7-003]	ExA's recommended amendment	Reason and Notes
	Details of consultation	<i>requiring details to be submitted to the Secretary of State for approval following consultation by the undertaker with another party, the undertaker must provide such other party with not less than 28 days for any response..."</i>	<i>requiring details to be submitted to the Secretary of State for approval following consultation by the undertaker with another party, the undertaker must provide such other party with not less than 28 days 42 days for any response..."</i>	The ExA does not consider that any change made to this Requirement would have any bearing on Schedule 2, Requirement 15(1). However, the ExA would welcome the Applicant's opinion on this should the ExA decide to recommend this change to the SoS.
21.	Schedule 2, NEW REQUIREMENT Grove Farm	N/A	<u>"No part of the authorised development is to commence until a site specific plan for Grove Farm, which sets out mitigation measures including bespoke planting and a visual screen, and a scheme for post-construction noise monitoring to determine whether an acoustic screen would be required, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Secretary of State in consultation with Transport for London</u>	The Applicant will be aware that the ExA remains concerned regarding the potential visual and noise effects the proposed development would have on the occupiers of Grove Farm. In respect of visual effects, the Application [APP-072 and REP5-007] current proposes planting along the boundary between Grove Farm and Work No.2 Change Request 8, submitted at Deadline 7 [REP7-002, REP7-028 and REP7-029] also proposes realigning the current egress road from Grove Farm as well as the provision of a visual fence. However, even if Change Request 8 were to be accepted into the Examination, nothing in the draft DCO compels the Applicant to

No.	Article/ Schedule	Text as set out in draft DCO Version 6 [REP7-003]	ExA's recommended amendment	Reason and Notes
			<p><u>and the London Borough of Havering. The authorised development must be carried out in accordance with the approved site-specific plan for Grove Farm".</u></p>	<p>undertake these works. The changes made to the draft DCO Requirement 5(3)(g) submitted at Deadline 7 does not alter our concerns in respect to guaranteed delivery of such measures.</p> <p>The ExA also remains concerned regarding peak noise levels and their potential effects. The ExA is provisionally not persuaded that it has sufficient evidence to suggest the provision of a noise barrier is unjustified because it has no evidence on what peak noise levels would be from future traffic using Work No.2, and their potential effects to the occupiers of Grove Farm.</p> <p>The ExA is of the view that an additional Requirement is necessary. This would require a bespoke plan of action for grove farm including additional noise monitoring to determine whether an acoustic fence would be required to mitigate peak noise levels.</p>

No.	Article/ Schedule	Text as set out in draft DCO Version 6 [REP7-003]	ExA's recommended amendment	Reason and Notes
22.	<p>Schedule 2, NEW REQUIREMENT</p> <p>Maylands Golf Course</p>	N/A	<p><u>"No part of the new loop road forming Work No 6 shall be used until Work No. 32 has been completed to the satisfaction of the Secretary of State".</u></p>	<p>As it currently stands, there is nothing in the draft DCO which compels the Applicant to carry out the realignment works to Work No. 32 Maylands Golf Course as shown in Change Request 7 [REP6-002, REP6-022 and REP6-023]. The recommended change would rectify this issue.</p> <p>The ExA notes the Applicant's Deadline 7 response to Action Point 9 [REP7-019] to ISH3 [EV-038] in which it is hoped that this matter would be dealt with by a private agreement. However, should such an agreement not be in place by the close of the Examination, the ExA considers such a Requirement should be inserted for the reasons given above, on a proviso that the ExA could remove it in our recommended DCO to the SoS if the agreement were signed before the close of the Examination, or that the SoS remove it prior to them making their decision.</p>

No.	Article/ Schedule	Text as set out in draft DCO Version 6 [REP7-003]	ExA's recommended amendment	Reason and Notes
23.	<p>Schedule 2, NEW REQUIREMENT</p> <p>Code of Construction Practice</p>	N/A	<p><u>"No part of the authorised development shall commence until a Code of Construction Practice has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Secretary of State in consultation with Transport for London and relevant planning authorities. The development shall be carried out in accordance with those approved details".</u></p>	<p>The ExA considers that notwithstanding the responses provided by the Applicant to Written Question GQ 1.6 [REP2-011] and the discussion at ISH 3 [EV-038], the ExA is of the view that the scheme would benefit from a single document to deal with construction practices, both environmental and practical, in the form of a Code of Construction Practice (CoCP).</p> <p>The ExA is not proposing the Applicant provide an outline document for the Examination as we accept that much of the information is contained in a number of documents, albeit needing a signposting document to inform where the information can be found [REP5-052]. However, the ExA considers at the detailed design stage, a single document in the form of a CoCP would be more helpful for the SoS and local authorities in their knowledge of construction practices the Applicant would adhere to.</p>

No.	Article/ Schedule	Text as set out in draft DCO Version 6 [REP7-003]	ExA's recommended amendment	Reason and Notes
24.	<p>Schedule 2, NEW REQUIREMENT</p> <p>Noise and vibration (s61 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974)</p>	N/A	No changes proposed	The ExA has considered the request made by the London Borough of Havering for an additional Requirement to deal with the dust, noise and nuisance management plan at Deadline 7 [REP7-034]. However, the ExA does not consider the reasons given for this change are sufficient to suggest that the method proposed by the Applicant in dealing with such matters under Requirement 5 would not be adequate.
25.	<p>Schedule 9</p> <p>Protective Provisions (Cadent Gas Ltd)</p>	N/A	INSERT NEW PART 2 – FOR THE PROTECTION OF CADENT GAS LIMITED	The Applicant is requested to comment and amend the draft Protective Provisions for Cadent Gas as per version submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 6 [REP6-017] and subject to the following changes to Paragraphs 3 and 10 and 11 as requested by Cadent Gas in its submissions at Deadline 7 [REP7-037]. It is noted that the additional wording to Paragraph 11(3)(c) as requested by Cadent Gas are already included by the Applicant at Deadline 6 [REP6-017].

No.	Article/ Schedule	Text as set out in draft DCO Version 6 [REP7-003]	ExA's recommended amendment	Reason and Notes
				<p>The Applicant is requested to insert these changes into the next iteration of the draft DCO at Deadline 8, Wednesday 8 June 2021.</p> <p>SEE ANNEX A (below)</p>
26.	<p>Schedule 9</p> <p>Protective Provisions</p> <p>Part 6 (Transport for London)</p>	N/A	<p>INSERT NEW PART 6 -</p> <p>FOR THE PROTECTION OF TRANSPORT FOR LONDON</p>	<p>As stated at ISH3 [EV-038] and acknowledged by the Applicant in its Deadline 7 submissions [REP7-019] and [REP7-027] in lieu of a private agreement between the Applicant and Transport for London being signed the ExA requires Protective Provisions for Transport for London. The ExA notes, however, that matters between the parties on the appropriate wording is ongoing and notes that the Applicant's suggested tracked changes to Transport for London's draft version.</p> <p>The ExA is content to allow the parties further time to agree a final version of wording to be inserted into the recommended DCO to the SoS, and as such does not recommended such wording here. However, if by Deadline 9 agreement is not reached,</p>

No.	Article/ Schedule	Text as set out in draft DCO Version 6 [REP7-003]	ExA's recommended amendment	Reason and Notes
				<p>the ExA will expect an up-to-date tracked changed version of the Protective Provisions with an explanation of the parties position. The ExA will then determine which change/non-change should occur in its recommended DCO to the SoS.</p> <p>The Protected Provisions are inserted on the proviso that should a private agreement be signed between the Applicant and Transport for London before the close of the Examination, it would for no part of the recommended DCO to the SoS, or that the SoS delete it when they make their decision.</p>

ANNEX A

PART 2 – FOR THE PROTECTION OF CADENT GAS LIMITED

On Street apparatus

3.—

(1) This Part of this Schedule does not apply to apparatus in respect of which the relations between the undertaker and Cadent are regulated by the provisions of Part 3 of the 1991 Act, except for—

- (a) paragraphs 4, 9, 10 and 11; and*
- (b) where sub-paragraph (2) applies, paragraphs 7 and 8.*

(2) This sub-paragraph applies where any apparatus is diverted from an alignment within the existing adopted public highway but not wholly replaced within the existing adopted public highway, notwithstanding that any diversion may be carried out under the provisions of Part 3 of the 1991 Act.

~~*(3) Paragraph 10 does not apply where the authorised development constitutes major highway works, major bridge works or major transport works for the purposes of Part 3 of the 1991 Act, but instead—*~~

- ~~*(a) the allowable costs of the relocation works are to be determined in accordance with section 85 (sharing of cost of necessary measures) of that Act and any regulations for the time being having effect under that section; and*~~
- ~~*(b) the allowable costs are to be borne by the undertaker and Cadent in such proportions as may be prescribed by any such regulations.*~~

Expenses

10.—

(1) Subject to the following provisions of this paragraph, the undertaker must pay to Cadent on demand, all charges, costs and expenses reasonably anticipated or reasonably incurred by Cadent in, or in connection with, the inspection, removal, relaying or replacing, alteration or protection of any apparatus or the construction of any new or alternative apparatus which may be required in consequence of the execution of any authorised development including without limitation—

- (a) any costs reasonably incurred by or compensation properly paid by Cadent in connection with the acquisition of rights or the exercise of statutory powers for such apparatus including without limitation all costs (including professional fees) incurred by Cadent as a consequence of Cadent;*

- (i) using its own compulsory purchase powers to acquire any necessary rights under paragraph 7(3) if it elects to do so; or*
- (ii) exercising any compulsory purchase powers under this Order transferred to or benefitting Cadent;*
- (b) in connection with the cost of the carrying out of any diversion work or the provision of any alternative apparatus;*
- (c) the cutting off of any apparatus from any other apparatus or the making safe of redundant apparatus;*
- (d) the approval of plans;*
- (e) the carrying out of protective works, plus a capitalised sum to cover the cost of maintaining and renewing permanent protective works;*
- (f) the survey of any land, apparatus or works, the inspection and monitoring of works or the installation or removal of any temporary works reasonably necessary in consequence of the execution of any such works referred to in this Part of this Schedule;*
- (g) any watching brief pursuant to sub-paragraph 9(6).*

~~*(2) There will be deducted from any sum payable under sub-paragraph (1) the value of any apparatus removed under the provisions of this Part of this Schedule and which is not re-used as part of the alternative apparatus, that value being calculated after removal.*~~

~~*(3) If in accordance with the provisions of this Part of this Schedule— (a) apparatus of better type, of greater capacity or of greater dimensions is placed in substitution for existing apparatus of worse type, of smaller capacity or of smaller dimensions; or (b) apparatus (whether existing apparatus or apparatus substituted for existing apparatus) is placed at a depth greater than the depth at which the existing apparatus was situated, and the placing of apparatus of that type or capacity or of those dimensions or the placing of apparatus at that depth, as the case may be, is not agreed by the undertaker or, in default of agreement, is not determined by arbitration in accordance with paragraph 15 (arbitration) to be necessary, then, if such placing involves cost in the construction of works under this Part of this Schedule exceeding that which would have been involved if the apparatus placed had been of the existing type, capacity or dimensions, or at the existing depth, as the case may be, the amount which apart from this sub-paragraph would be payable to Cadent by virtue of sub-paragraph (1) will be reduced by the amount of that excess save to the extent that it is not possible in the circumstances (or it would be unlawful due to a statutory or regulatory change) to obtain the existing type of apparatus at the same capacity and dimensions or place at the existing depth in which case full costs will be borne by the undertaker.*~~

~~*(4) For the purposes of sub-paragraph (3)— (a) an extension of apparatus to a length greater than the length of existing apparatus will not be treated as a placing of apparatus of greater dimensions than those of the existing apparatus; and (b)*~~

~~where the provision of a joint in a pipe or cable is agreed, or is determined to be necessary, the consequential provision of a jointing chamber or of a manhole will be treated as if it also had been agreed or had been so determined.~~

(5)(2) An amount which apart from this sub-paragraph would be payable to Cadent in respect of works by virtue of sub-paragraph (1) will, if the works include the placing of apparatus provided in substitution for apparatus placed more than 7 years and 6 months earlier so as to confer on Cadent any financial benefit by deferment of the time for renewal of the apparatus in the ordinary course, be reduced by the amount which represents that benefit.