

Examination of the Enfield Local Plan 2019-2041 Matters, Issues and Questions (MIQs)

Matter 5 (Covering Strategic Transport Issues) National Highways' Statement

Statement Introduction

1. National Highways has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as a strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the Strategic Road Network (SRN). In respect of the Enfield Local Plan, the SRN consists of the M25.
2. National Highways have been involved with the ongoing development of the 2019-2041 Local Plan evidence base since 2021.
3. National Highways prime concern is the continued safety of those that use our network. Congestion is also a concern, but we recognise that on its own this results in inconvenience to the road user and as set out in NPPF, unless the effects of development are severe, small increases in congestion would not be a reason to prevent development.
4. It should be borne in mind that the Local Plan is required only to address the impacts on road safety and congestion which are caused by the plan. The plan is not required to also address pre-existing issues.
5. Against this background, we have provided below, brief responses to those questions relating to matter 5 which are directly relevant to our position.

Strategic Transport Issues

Q5.8: Have the cumulative effects on the transport network been robustly assessed?

We are content that the cumulative effects have been adequately assessed. A robust methodology was established to examine cumulative impacts on the strategic road network, namely the M25 at and around Junctions 24 and 25.

Q5.9: What strategic transport issues have been identified that would require mitigation to enable the scale of growth envisaged to be delivered?

From the strategic transport modelling undertaken a potential issue was noted at M25 Junction 24 where the eastbound off slip was noted as having unacceptable additional delay by the end of the Plan period upon what would already be a congested network. Therefore, based upon the evidence supplied from the strategic modelling and in the absence of more detailed junction modelling a mitigation scheme was required to demonstrate that the potential issue could be overcome.

Q5.10: What transport infrastructure, or other mitigation schemes, have been identified that would address these transport issues? Has the likely effectiveness of proposed transport mitigation schemes been assessed?

To overcome this forecast increase in delay at Junction 24, a mitigation proposal has been put forward. This comprises a minor revision to the lane designation on the M25 eastbound off slip to allow two lanes onto the downstream circulatory section of the roundabout. This will involve similar revisions to the existing downstream circulatory carriageway after the A111 Southgate Road exit.

Q5.11: Are there any outstanding concerns on transport matters from Transport

for London, National Highways or any other relevant transport authorities?

Other than the mitigation requirement above National Highways are content with the Local Plan in terms of cumulative impacts and compliance with national planning policy from a strategic transport perspective. A Statement of Common Ground is currently being updated and we will keep the examination informed of any changes to this position.