

A12 Chelmsford to A120 widening scheme

TR010060

9.59 National Highways and Essex County Council – Draft Requirements Matrix

Rule 8(1)(k)

Planning Act 2008
Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure)
Regulations 2010

Volume 9

June 2023

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning
(Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

A12 Chelmsford to A120 widening scheme
Development Consent Order 202[]

**National Highways and Essex County Council – Draft Requirements
Matrix**

Regulation Number	Rule 8(1)(k)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	TR010060
Application Document Reference	TR010060/EXAM/9.59
Author	A12 Project Team and National Highways

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev 1	10 May 2023	Final for Deadline 5
Rev 2	12 June 2023	Final for Deadline 6

CONTENTS

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Background.....	1
1.2	The Applicant’s comments on the Requirements Matrix	1
2	Requirements Matrix	3

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

- 1.1.1 The Applicant has undertaken extensive engagement with Essex County Council on various matters including local roads, de-trunking and walking, cycling and horse-riding provision and this is captured in the Statement of Common Ground with Essex County Council [TR010060/EXAM/8.12]. During Issue Specific Hearing 3, and as captured in sections 3.3, 3.10, 3.19 and 3.21 of the Applicant's Written Response to ISH 3 [REP5-020] the Applicant committed to providing wording for additional draft requirements.
- 1.1.2 The Applicant submitted the National Highways and Essex County Council – Draft Requirements Matrix [REP5-018] at Deadline 5. This deadline 6 submission provides an update to that matrix. It follows meetings with Essex County Council on 23 May and 1 June.
- 1.1.3 The table in Section 2 sets out draft requirement wording shared between the Applicant and Essex County Council on 3 May 2023. In this updated submission, the Applicant has provided an additional column (Key Differences at Deadline 6) to assist the Examining Authority. The contents of this new column have been agreed with Essex County Council so both the Council and the Applicant agree that this column paints a clear picture on the differences. The Table also includes red text where either the Applicant or the Council has revised their preferred requirement wording.

1.2 The Applicant's comments on the Requirements Matrix

- 1.2.1 Detailed comments on the Applicant's approach to the requirements listed below can be found in the Applicant's Response to the Examining Authority's commentary on the draft Development Consent Order [TR010060/EXAM/9.67]. As an overview, the draft DCO submitted at Deadline 6 will maintain the Requirements included within the Deadline 5 draft bar the following where changes have been made:
- Requirement 10: The Applicant has added the design principles to Requirement 10 in line with the Examining Authority's commentary on the draft Development Consent Order [PD-015].
 - De-trunking: As noted within the Applicant's Response to the Examining Authority's commentary on the draft Development Consent Order, the Applicant is willing for a Requirement on de-trunking to be included in the draft DCO but only the basis that the requirement wording is that proposed by the Applicant, as the ExA has set out in DCO-PC23 of the Examining Authority's commentary on the draft Development Consent Order [PD-015].
 - WCH: The Applicant has agreed to the approach suggested by the Council to create a WCH matrix. This matrix is found in appendix B of the Design Principles document, which is now secured by reference to Requirement 10.

As noted in the Applicant's response to DCO-PC16 above, the Applicant is content for the Design Principles to be secured by requirement 10 and included as a certified document under Schedule 12. As a result, the Applicant has deleted Requirement 14 from the Draft DCO as these matters are now secured via Requirement 10.

- Junction 21: As noted within the Applicant's Response to the Examining Authority's commentary on the draft Development Consent Order, the Applicant has continued discussions with ECC in relation to this requirement. The Applicant maintains that the wording proposed by the Examining Authority is appropriate and is happy to include this wording on the draft DCO on the basis of the drafting proposed.

2 Requirements Matrix

Table 2.1 Requirements Matrix

Topic	Requirement No.	Status of National Highways draft requirement	National Highways draft text	Essex County Council draft text	Key difference at Deadline 6
Monitoring	16	The Applicant is content for its draft requirement to be included in the draft DCO at this stage.	<p>Operation phase local traffic monitoring</p> <p>-(1) No part of the authorised development is to commence until a survey to assess baseline traffic levels has been undertaken at the following locations—</p> <p>(a) B1137 Main Road, Boreham</p> <p>(b) The Street/Maldon Road (Duke of Wellington) junction, Hatfield Peverel;</p> <p>(c) Little Braxted Lane, Little Braxted;</p> <p>(d) Braxted Road/Braxted Park Road;</p> <p>(e) B1023 Kelvedon Road, Inworth;</p> <p>(f) Kelvedon Road, Messing; and</p> <p>(g) B1023 Church Road, Tiptree</p> <p>(2) No part of the authorised development is to open to traffic until details of an operation phase local traffic monitoring scheme has been submitted to and approved by the Secretary of State, following consultation with the relevant highway authority, for the locations listed in sub-paragraph (1).</p> <p>(3) The operation phase local traffic monitoring scheme to be provided under sub-paragraph (2) must include—</p> <p>(a) a survey to assess baseline traffic levels at the locations listed in sub-paragraph (1), or confirmation that such survey has already been undertaken;</p> <p>(b) proposals for an operation traffic survey at the locations listed in sub-paragraph (1) to assess the changes in traffic from the baseline carried out —</p> <p>(i) within the first year; and</p> <p>(ii) prior to the expiry of the third year following the date on which the authorised development is fully completed and open for traffic;</p> <p>(c) details of the methodology to be used to collect the required data;</p> <p>(d) details of the periods over which operation traffic is to be monitored; and</p> <p>(e) proposals for the submission of the survey data collected and an interpretative report to be provided to the relevant local highway authority.</p> <p>(4) The scheme approved under sub-paragraph (2) must be implemented by the undertaker unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Secretary of State following consultation with the relevant highway authority.</p>	<p>Impact monitoring and mitigation</p> <p>X.—(1) No part of the authorised development is to commence until written details of an impact monitoring and mitigation scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local highway authority.</p> <p>(2) The impact monitoring and mitigation scheme must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i.a before and after survey to assess the changes in traffic; ii.the locations to be monitored and the methodology to be used to collect the required data; iii.the periods over which traffic is to be monitored; iv.the method of assessment of traffic data; v.control sites to monitor background growth; vi.the implementation of monitoring no less than 3 months before the implementation of traffic management on the existing A12; vii.agreement of baseline traffic levels; viii.the submission of survey data and interpretative report to the highway authority; and ix.a mechanism for the future agreement of mitigation measures. <p>(3) The scheme approved under sub-paragraph (1) must be implemented by the undertaker.</p>	<p>The key difference is threefold.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Applicant maintains that the SoS is a suitable decision maker, the Council maintains they are the appropriate approving authority for requirements which have a direct bearing on the local highway network. 2. The Applicant maintains that there is no workable plan for mitigation to be required if monitoring provides flows that are different to those projected in the TA. The Council maintains a workable plan is possible and that if there is a change to predicted flows then there should be “a mechanism for future agreement on mitigation measures” 3. The Council maintains the monitoring locations should not be limited to the initial 7 locations identified in its Local Impact Report and must instead now accord with the sites and methodology set out in the Council’s Technical Note submitted at Deadline 6.
Local road interventions	10 (Modified)	The Applicant is content for requirement 10 to be modified to include the	Detailed design	Detailed Design	

	<p>words “Subject to the provisions of this Order” in the draft DCO at this stage.</p>	<p>10.—(1) Subject to the provisions of this Order, the detailed design for the authorised development must accord with:</p> <p>(a) the preliminary scheme design shown on the works plans and the engineering drawings and sections;</p> <p>(b) the principles set out in the environmental masterplan; and</p> <p><u>(c) the design principles as set out in the scheme design principles,</u></p> <p>unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Secretary of State following consultation with the relevant planning authority and relevant highway authority on matters related to their functions, provided that the Secretary of State is satisfied that any amendments would not give rise to any materially new or materially different environmental effects in comparison with those reported in the environmental statement.</p> <p>(2) Where amended details are approved by the Secretary of State under paragraph (1), those details are deemed to be substituted for the corresponding plans sections and the undertaker must make those amended details available in electronic form for inspection by members of the public.</p>	<p>10.—(1) Subject to the provisions of this Order, the detailed design for the authorised development must accord with:</p> <p>(a) the preliminary scheme design shown on the works plans and the engineering drawings and sections; and</p> <p>(b) the principles set out in the environmental masterplan, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Secretary of State following consultation with the relevant planning authority and relevant highway authority on matters related to their functions, provided that the Secretary of State is satisfied that any amendments would not give rise to any materially new or materially different environmental effects in comparison with those reported in the environmental statement.</p> <p>(c) the design principles set out in the scheme design approach and design principles,</p> <p>(2) Where amended details are approved by the Secretary of State under paragraph (1), those details are deemed to be substituted for the corresponding plans sections and the undertaker must make those amended details available in electronic form for inspection by members of the public.</p> <p>(3) - No part of the authorised development is to commence until, for that part, a report has been submitted to-and approved by the Secretary of State, following consultation with the relevant local highway authority, demonstrating that—</p> <p>(a) the undertaker has engaged with the local highway authority, the local planning authority and other relevant stakeholders on refinements to detailed design for that part of the authorised development;</p> <p>(b) the undertaker has had regard to the local highway authority, the local planning authority and other relevant stakeholders’ comments; and</p> <p>(c) any refinements to the detailed design for that part of the authorised development arising as a result of that engagement accord with the scheme design approach and design principles.</p>	<p>The Applicant and Council would direct the Examining Authority to their respective responses to the Examining Authority’s commentary on the Draft DCO [PD-015]</p>
<p>14</p>	<p>The Applicant is content for its draft requirement to be included in the draft DCO at this stage.</p>	<p>Boreham operation phase traffic mitigation measures</p> <p>—(1) No part of the authorised development is to open to traffic until a scheme of operation phase traffic mitigation for the B1137 in Boreham has been submitted to and approved by the Secretary of State, following consultation with the relevant highway authority, provided that the Secretary of State is satisfied that any amendments would not give rise to any materially new or materially different environmental effects in comparison with those reported in the environmental statement.</p> <p>(2) The operation phase traffic mitigation scheme for Boreham must include provision for the following operational phase traffic mitigation –</p> <p>(a) A new controlled pedestrian crossing on the B1137 in the vicinity of Boreham Co-op (grid reference 575330, 210021);</p>	<p>B1137 Main Road mitigation</p> <p>X.—(1) No part of the authorised development is to commence use until a scheme for managing traffic on the B1137 between junction 19 and junction 21 of the A12 has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local highway authority.</p> <p>(2) The B1137 traffic management scheme must be agreed by the local highway authority and unless otherwise agreed include the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. an average speed camera system covering the stretch of the B1137 between the southern entry to Boreham Village and Hatfield Peverel; ii. a new signalised pedestrian crossing and associated road narrowing opposite the Co-op food store; 	<p>The key difference is threefold.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Applicant maintains that the SoS is a suitable decision making, the Council believes they are the appropriate approving authority for requirements which have a direct bearing on the local highway network. 2. The Council maintain narrowing is required at a number of locations, but the Applicant does not. 3. The Applicant has proposed a new ‘controlled’ pedestrian crossing in the vicinity of the Boreham Co-Op. The Council agrees with the need for a crossing but maintains this should be signalised with associated road narrowing.

		<p>(b) road safety posters in the vicinity of Orchard Cottages (grid reference 576394, 210658), Boreham Recreation Ground (grid reference 575848, 210309) and outside of the Little Hedgehogs Day nursery (grid reference 575444, 210081);</p> <p>(c) installation of average speed cameras on the B1137 (excluding ongoing operation, maintenance/calibration and enforcement) within Boreham as defined by the extent of 30mph speed limit shown between reference A.010 and A.011 on the traffic regulation measures speed limit plans; and</p> <p>(d) installation of average speed cameras (but not including provision for their ongoing operation, maintenance /calibration and enforcement) on the B1137 between Boreham and Hatfield Peveler defined by the extent of 40mph speed limit shown between reference A.011 and A.012 on the traffic regulation measures speed limit plans.</p> <p>(3) The scheme of operation phase traffic mitigation for the B1137 in Boreham must be provided in accordance with the approved details.</p>	<p>iii.minor road narrowing (similar to the existing provision at the southern entry to Boreham village) at three new locations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> the northern entry to Boreham village between the northern entry to Boreham village and Waltham Road In the vicinity of the pedestrian entrance to the recreation ground <p>iv.(iv) place-making / safety signs at an additional three locations within Boreham village to increase awareness of the speed limit changes</p> <p>(3) No part of the authorised development is to open for public use until the approved scheme has been implemented and delivered by the undertaker.</p>	
15	The Applicant is content for its draft requirement to be included in the draft DCO at this stage.	<p>Messing operation phase traffic mitigation measures</p> <p>—(1) No part of the authorised development is to open to traffic until a scheme of operation phase traffic mitigation for Messing has been submitted to and approved by the Secretary of State, following consultation with the relevant highway authority, provided that the Secretary of State is satisfied that any amendments would not give rise to any materially new or materially different environmental effects in comparison with those reported in the environmental statement.</p> <p>(2) The operation phase traffic mitigation scheme must include provision for the following operational phase traffic mitigation –</p> <p>(a) gateway features for signage in accordance with Traffic Signs Manual Chapter 3: Figure 8-21, and speed limit roundels in accordance with the 2016 Regulations and Directions diagram 1065 at Lodge Road (grid reference 589938, 219356), Kelvedon Road (grid reference 589511, 218861) and Harborough Hall Road (grid reference 590233, 218566) marking the extents of the existing 30mph speed limit; and</p> <p>(b) “Unsuitable for heavy goods vehicles” signage in accordance with the 2016 Regulations and Directions diagram 820 at the junction of the B1023 and Yewtree Farm Road (grid reference 587881, 218631), the junction of Harborough Hall Road and B1022 (grid reference 590573, 218228), the junction of the B1023 and Oak Road (grid reference 588820, 217131), and the junction of the B1022 and Oak Road (grid reference 589505, 217275).</p> <p>(3) The scheme of operation phase traffic mitigation for the B1137 for Messing must be provided in accordance with the approved details.</p>	<p>Junction 24 mitigation</p> <p>X.—(1) No part of the authorised development is to commence until a scheme for managing traffic on the approaches to junction 24 has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local highway authority.</p> <p>(2) The scheme must include an assessment of improvements to the B1023 or another suitable corridor for walking, cycling and horse riding users, to help off-set the impacts of increased traffic on this route.</p> <p>(3) The scheme in sub-paragraph (1) must include the following measures:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> an average speed camera system covering the B1023 between Inworth Road roundabout and the existing 30mph terminal on the northern approach to Tiptree, and a fixed speed camera covering the southbound carriageway north of the Inworth Road roundabout; widening of pinch points between Perrywood Garden Centre and the B1022 to a minimum carriageway width of 6.1m in line with the approach to other pinch point widening proposals; widening of Hinds Bridge to provide a minimum carriageway width of 7.3m, with provision for pedestrians and cyclists; measures to improve provision for walking, cycling and horse riding users, as identified in the assessment under sub-paragraph (2); village entry treatments at the entrance to Messing village; ‘Unsuitable for HGVs’ signage on Kelvedon Road and Harborough Hall Road; narrowing of the entries to Oak Road (both the eastern and western ends), through tightening of entry radii and appropriate landscaping. 	<p>There is two in principle difference between both parties</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Applicant maintains that the SoS is a suitable decision maker, the Council maintains they are the appropriate approving authority for requirements which have a direct bearing on the local highway network. The Applicant maintains that no part of the authorised development is to open to traffic until a scheme of operation phase traffic mitigation for Messing has been submitted to and approved by the Secretary of State. The Council maintains that no part of the authorised development is to open for public use until the approved scheme has been implemented by the undertaker <p>There are several additional measures ECC would like in the requirement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The scheme must include an assessment of improvements to the B1023 or another suitable corridor for walking, cycling and horse riding users, to help off-set the impacts of increased traffic on this route. An average speed camera system covering the B1023 between Inworth Road roundabout and the existing 30mph terminal on the northern approach to Tiptree, and a fixed speed camera covering the southbound carriageway north of the Inworth Road roundabout; Widening of pinch points between Perrywood Garden Centre and the B1022 to a minimum carriageway width of 6.1m in line with the approach to other pinch point widening proposals. Widening of Hinds Bridge to provide a minimum carriageway width of 7.3m, with provision for pedestrians and cyclists Measures to improve provision for walking, cycling and horse riding users, as identified in the assessment under sub-paragraph (2);

				<p>viii.priority narrowing measures on Oak Road; and ix.improved signage at either end of Oak Road to guide through traffic to the B1022/B1023 junction.</p> <p>(4) No part of the authorised development is to open for public use until the approved scheme has been implemented by the undertaker.</p>	<p>6. Narrowing of the entries to Oak Road (both the eastern and western ends), through tightening of entry radii and appropriate landscaping. 7. Priority narrowing measures on Oak Road;</p>
De-trunking	New 19	Please see Applicant's response to the Examining Authority's commentary on the Draft DCO document	<p>De-trunking (article)</p> <p>Delete Article 15(6) as drafted and replaced with:</p> <p>(6) On a date or dates to be determined by the undertaker, the roads described in Part 14 (roads to be de-trunked) of Schedule 3 are to cease to be trunk roads as if they had ceased to be trunk roads by virtue of an order made under section 10(2) of the 1980 Act specifying that date or date as the date or dates on which they were to cease to be trunk roads.</p> <p>(7) The undertaker must only make a determination for the purposes of paragraph (6) with the consent of the Secretary of State as to the date and as to whether the highway to be de-trunked is of a reasonably satisfactory standard for use as a local highway, following consultation with the relevant highway authority.</p> <p>(8) The application of paragraphs (1) to (7) may be varied or revoked by any instrument made under any enactment which provides for the variation or revocation of such matters.</p> <p>De-trunking (requirement)</p> <p>X.—(1) The consent of the Secretary of State pursuant to Article 15(7) must not be sought until written details of the proposals for the roads to be de-trunked as identified in Part 14 of Schedule 3¹ has been submitted and approved in writing by the Secretary of State following consultation with the relevant highway authority and relevant planning authority, such scheme to include:</p> <p>(a) drawings and plans showing the proposals;</p> <p>(b) demonstrating how the proposals maintain a safe and reliable highway network;</p> <p>(c) the provision made for non-car transport modes;</p> <p>(d) demonstrating how existing accesses will retain access to the de-trunked road;</p> <p>(e) demonstrating how existing utilities will be safeguarded;</p> <p>(f) landscaping and planting details;</p> <p>(g) drainage details; and</p> <p>(h) a timetable for implementation of the proposals.</p>	<p>De-trunking (article)</p> <p>Insert new article 15(7) between existing articles 15(6) and 15(7), as follows:</p> <p>“(7) The undertaker may only make a determination for the purposes of paragraph (6) with the consent of the Secretary of State, who must consult the local highway authority before deciding whether to give that consent.”</p> <p>De-trunking (requirement)</p> <p>X.—(1) No part of the authorised development is to open for public use until a written scheme for the de-trunking of the A12 between Witham and Rivenhall End (east) and also between Feering and Marks Tey has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local highway authority.</p> <p>(2) The scheme approved under sub-paragraph (1) must include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the conversion of one carriageway into an active travel corridor, not accessible to motorised traffic other than for access to local properties and maintenance; b. re-greening of part of this carriageway through breaking up of sections and covering them with earth/top soil, and provision of suitable planting to increase biodiversity; c. conversion of the other carriageway into a single carriageway road, with one lane in each direction; and d. measures to encourage compliance with the speed limit on the single carriageway road. <p>(3) The undertaker shall implement and deliver the approved de-trunking scheme at its own expense within 18 months of the first opening of the authorised development for public use. or, with the written agreement of the local highway authority, shall provide sufficient funds for the local highway authority to implement and deliver the approved de-trunking scheme.</p>	<p>There is no commonality on these requirements.</p>

			<p>(2) No application for approval of the scheme under sub-paragraph (1) may be made in respect of proposals which would give rise to any materially new or materially different environmental effects in comparison with those reported in the environmental statement.</p> <p>(3) The scheme approved under sub-paragraph (1) must be implemented by the undertaker and in accordance with the approved timetable for implementation, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Secretary of State following consultation with the relevant highway authority.</p>		
Walking, cycling and horse-riding	Deleted	Please see Applicant's response to the Examining Authority's commentary on the Draft DCO document	<p>Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding bridges</p> <p>—(1) Requirement 10 (detailed design) is to be read subject to the provisions of this requirement.</p> <p>(2) The detailed design for the works listed in this paragraph ("the relevant WCH bridge Works") must accord with the following design specifications (the "WCH bridge specifications") —</p> <p>(a) Work No. 5 (Paynes Lane Bridge) must be designed with minimum internal radii of 4 metres for any change in direction on its northern and southern ramps and no more than one switchback on its southern ramp;</p> <p>(b) Work No. 30 (Little Braxted Bridge) must be designed with a straightened northern ramp including provision for intermediate platforms and its southern ramp must be designed with a minimum external radius of 5 metres;</p> <p>(c) Work No. 53 (Snivellers Lane Bridge) must be designed with a minimum external radius of 5 metres for any change in direction on both its northern and southern approaches;</p> <p>(d) Work No. 100 (Potts Green Bridge) must be designed with a minimum external radius of 5 metres for any change in direction on both its northern and southern approaches; and</p> <p>(e) Work No. 112 (Marks Tey footbridge) must be designed with a 4 metre minimum internal radius for any change in direction on each ramp and on the single switchback.</p> <p>(3) The relevant WCH bridge works must accord with the WCH bridge specifications when constructed.</p>	<p>Walking, cycling and horse-riding provision</p> <p>X.—(1) No part of the authorised development is to commence until a scheme setting out written details of the provision for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders has been submitted to and approved in writing by the highway authority.</p> <p>(2) The written details under sub-paragraph (1) must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i.the provision for WCH users at new and existing overbridges of the A12; ii.the provision for WCH users at new and existing at-grade highway crossings that are affected by the scheme; and iii.unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local highway authority, accord with the WCH infrastructure specification as included in Appendix X of XXXXXX principles set out in the walking and cycling matrix (NOTE: ECC suggests that a simplified version of the walking and cycling matrix is created which sets out the key elements which are agreed, and that this document be certified by the DCO and referenced within this requirement). <p>(3) No part of the authorised development is to open for public use until the approved scheme has been implemented by the undertaker.</p>	<p>There are key difference between both parties:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Applicant has considered the proposed approach put forward by the Council. The Applicant has provided a table in Appendix B of the Design Principles. The Design Principles will be secured by requirement 10 and included as a certified document under Schedule 12. The Council considers the draft wording in its column to the left is still applicable to ensure WCH measures are adopted. 2. The Applicant maintains that the SoS is a suitable decision maker, the Council maintains they are the appropriate approving authority for requirements which have a direct bearing on the local highway network. 3. The Applicant's Appendix B of the design principles document provides commitments to WCH facilities. The Council's version of Appendix B "the WCH Infrastructure Specification Matrix" includes the following additional requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5.5m minimum width between parapets on Paynes Lane and Marks Tey WCH overbridges and associated ramps, rather 4m. • 5m minimum external radii at turns, rather than 4m on Gershwin Boulevard Bridge, subject to reasonable visual and physical constraints. • The Council maintains that where traffic modelling and/or optioneering plans demonstrate a shared-used single phase crossing would be overly detrimental, a separate one-stage cycle crossing should be provided in accordance with LTN1/20 para 10.4.22, rather than a shared-use two-phase non-staggered arrangement in accordance with Traffic Signs Manual Chapter 6 paragraph 11.17.4. • Rivenhall End cycle crossing to be designed to operate with a single stage, subject to reasonable visual and physical constraints • The Council maintains that existing WCH Links between Witham and Kelvedon and Feering and

					<p>Marks Tey, shall be upgraded to a minimum width of 3m</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the new A12 Junction 24, protection of a route for a footway/cycleway shall be provided, north-south from the southern extent of the red line boundary, passing through junction 24 under the A12, to the northern extent of the red line boundary.
Junction 21	New 18	Please see Applicant's response to the Examining Authority's commentary on the Draft DCO document	<p>(1) Requirement 10 (detailed design) is to be read subject to the provisions of this requirement.</p> <p>(2) The detailed design for junction 21 must contain the revised design detail specified in sub-paragraph (3) of this requirement and submitted to the Secretary of State following consultation with the local highway authority.</p> <p>(3) Subject to sub-paragraph (5) the detailed design for junction 21 must include a two-lane exit from both the junction 21 northern roundabout to the A12 northbound slip road and from the junction 21 southern roundabout to the A12 southern slip road.</p> <p>(4) Junction 21 must be constructed in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>(5) No application for approval of the scheme under sub-paragraph (2) may be made in respect of proposals which would give rise to any materially new or materially different environmental effects in comparison with those reported in the environmental statement.</p>	<p>Junction 21 design</p> <p>X.—(1) No part of the authorised development is to commence until an updated version of General Arrangement drawing HE551497-JAC-LDC-SCHW-DR-C-0026 showing the revised design of junction 21 has been submitted and approved in writing by the local highway authority.</p> <p>(2) The updated drawing and revised design must include a two-lane exit from both the junction 21 northern roundabout to the A12 northbound slip road and from the junction 21 southern roundabout to the A12 southern slip road.</p> <p>(3) The new junction must be constructed in accordance with the revised drawing referred to in sub-paragraph (1) from the point the authorised development is open for public use.</p>	<p>There are key differences are twofold:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Applicant maintains that the SoS is a suitable decision maker, the Council maintains they are the appropriate approving authority for requirements which have a direct bearing on the local highway network. The Council maintains the inclusion of a general arrangement drawing would provide further clarity that the Applicant has fulfilled their Letter of Intent [AS060] in relation to Junction 21.