

Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from National Highways		Version Number: 1 Submitted at: 23 June 2023	
Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
Protective Provisions not agreed, include land and maintenance funding issues and ongoing NH costs	NH not confident it is adequately protected from safety and commercial perspectives	Protective Provisions must be agreed and included in the DCO, including land access, commuted lump sum and funding of NH costs.	Medium
The Transport Assessment has been produced with reference to DfT Circular 02/2013.	The Circular was updated in November 2022 and significant changes were made to how scheme developers must treat the SRN.	A review of the proposals and their assessment must be undertaken against the updated Circular 01/2022	High
Effective operation of circulatory carriageway at M1 Junction 10, with five lanes on the western side	There will not be a balanced utilisation of lanes on the western side of the circulatory and that there will be resultant weaving, congestion / safety issues.	Design for M1 Junction 10 to incorporate sufficient signing, including gantries and agreed in the DCO in principle.	Medium-high



<p>Safety and congestion concern on M1 Junction 10 Southbound on-slip merge and Northbound off-slip diverge</p>	<p>Residual safety and congestion issues at the merge/diverge on the south facing slips and adverse impacts on the M1 mainline.</p>	<p>Design for M1 Junction 10 to be modified to incorporate improvements to the south-facing slip roads and incorporated into the DCO.</p>	<p>Low-medium</p>
<p>Operational impact at M1 Junctions 9, 11 and 11a are not fully understood</p>	<p>In the absence of All Lane Running (or similar), more traffic will use M1 Junction 9 as an alternative to Junction 10, which may lead to congestion and safety issues. Through traffic may also divert onto the A5 via Junction 9 and either Junction 11 or 11a.</p>	<p>Vissim modelling undertaken on Junction 9, with no ALR in place to understand the impact, with mitigations agreed and included in the DCO if required. Saturn modelling to understand the scale of diversion onto the A5 and VISSIM modelling/mitigation if necessary.</p>	<p>Low – medium</p>
<p>Replacement maintenance bay at M1 Junction 10 not provided in the design</p>	<p>Inadequate access to technology assets if replacement maintenance parking facility not provided, with safety implications for staff.</p>	<p>Maintenance parking bay incorporated into the design and included in the DCO. This may require land-take outside the highway boundary.</p>	<p>Low-Medium</p>



<p>Lack of detail available concerning the traffic monitoring regime for determining when interventions at M1 Junction 10 are required</p>	<p>Inadequate protection for National Highways in respect of how the timing/trigger points for the requirement for implementation of mitigation works will be managed.</p>	<p>Agreement by all parties to a detailed Monitoring regime for the M1 Junction 10 works, which is then incorporated into the DCO.</p>	<p>Medium</p>
<p>Construction impacts on the SRN are not yet fully understood and the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan and Construction Workers Travel Plan provide insufficient information as to how it will be managed</p>	<p>Risk to National Highways that it will not be able to operate M1 Junction 10 safely during construction of the Airport and Highways works.</p>	<p>Agreement to a more detailed Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan and Construction Workers Travel Plan, which is then incorporated into the DCO.</p>	<p>Low-Medium</p>

