

Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from <b>National Highways</b>		Version Number: 2 Submitted at: 23 January 2024	
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 yet finalised, include land and maintenance funding issues and ongoing NH costs	NH is not adequately protected from safety and commercial perspectives otherwise there is the likelihood of a serious detriment to National Highways undertaking	Protective Provisions must be finalised, agreed and included in the DCO, including land access, commuted lump sum and funding of NH costs. Mitigation must be properly secured via the OTRIMMA or DCO on a bespoke basis for NH	High
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. Paragraph 51 is of particular importance.	A review of the proposals and their assessment must be undertaken against the updated Circular 01/2022 and set out for the benefit of the ExA	High
Safety and congestion risk on M1 Junction 10 Southbound on-slip merge, Northbound mainline carriageway between Junction 9 and Junction 10 and at Junction 9 itself	NH considers that there remains an unmitigated risk of residual safety and congestion issues at the merge/diverge on the south facing slips and adverse impacts on the M1 mainline in both directions, as well as at Junction 9	NH considers that the modelling does not provide conclusive evidence that the growth in airport demand does not contribute to the forecast residual congestion.	Low

		<p>NH requires that these locations are included within a robust monitoring regime and that, if safety concerns materialise, appropriate mitigation is implemented before the next phase of development can be delivered.</p> <p>To facilitate this the phases require definition.</p>	
<p>National Highways is not invited to be a member of the Environmental Scrutiny Group within the Green Controlled Growth Framework</p>	<p>There is a concern that membership of the Technical Group that sits below the ESG will not afford National Highways sufficient ability to influence decisions which affect mode share. This is a critical issue for the safe and efficient operation of the SRN.</p>	<p>The Terms of Reference for the ESG need to be amended to include National Highways as a member.</p>	<p>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>