GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
Ministry of Road Transport & Highways
(Planning Zone)

No. NH-14019/05/2012-P&M

Dated the 22nd October, 2012

OFFICE MEMORANDUM

Sub: Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee to consider minor deviation in respect of retail outlets held on 09.10.2012 - reg.

The Minutes of the Meeting of Committee to consider minor deviation in respect of retail outlets held on 09.10.2012 are enclosed herewith for information and necessary follow up action.

2. Compliance report wherever required may kindly be forwarded to this Ministry.

Encl. - As above.

(R. K. Pandey)
Chief Engineer (Planning)
Tele-fax: 011-23739085

To,

1. The Chairman, National Highways Authority of India, G-5&6, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi-110075, Fax No. – 25093505.
2. CE(P-1)/CE(P-2)/CE(P-3)/CE(P-4)/CE(P-5)/CE(P-6)/CE(P-7)/CE(NER)/CE[SRT(R)]
3. Joint Secretary (M), M/o Petroleum & Natural Gas, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi-110001, Fax No.- 23383100.

Copy to the representatives of Oil Companies:

2. Director (M) – M/s Indian Oil Corporation, Ltd., Indian Oil Bhawan, G-9, Ali Yavar Jung Marg, Bandra (East), Mumbai-400 051, Fax No. -022-26449975.

Copy for information & necessary action to:-

1. PS to Minister (RT&H)
2. PS to MOS(J) (RT&H)
3. PS to MOS(T) (RT&H)
4. PPS to Secretary (RT&H)
5. PPS to DG(RD)&SS
6. PS to ADG
7. PPS to JS&FA
8. NIC – with the request to upload the minutes on the Ministry's website under the link Roads & Highways → Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee to Consider Minor Deviation in Respect of Retail Outlets → Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee to Consider Minor Deviation in Respect of Retail Outlets During the Year of 2012

The minutes may not be considered as an approval and it is requested that the individual case may be put up in the respective file dealing with the case for the approval of the Competent Authority.

(R. K. Pandey)
Chief Engineer (Planning)
Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee held on 09.10.2012 at 3:00 P.M. in Conference Hall (Ground Floor) in Transport Bhawan, New Delhi to discuss the cases of minor deviations for the Retail Outlets.

List of participants is at Annexure-I.

2. At the outset, Secretary (RT&H) welcomed the participants. He desired that, it has to be ensured that all the provisions as per Ministry’s norms including the conditions specified while recommending cases involving minor deviation(s) by the Committee for setting up of petroleum retail outlets / service stations along the National Highways (NHs) are strictly enforced. He also desired that before issuing formal approval the concerned RO/ELO of the Ministry or NHAI, whichever the case may be shall inspect the site personally to ensure that all the site conditions have been fulfilled. Further, no retail outlet / service station shall be allowed to operationalize until it fulfills all the conditions.

[Action: All Project CEs and Oil Companies]

3. The minutes of the meeting held on 02.07.2012, circulated vide this Ministry’s OM No. NH-14019/13/2006-P&M (Part-I), dated 06.07.2012, were confirmed.

4. The cases recommended for relaxation of the deviation from the prescribed norms were taken up one by one. The Ministry’s officers concerned presented these cases along with the deviations as well as the justification for proposing the relaxations. These were discussed in detail. A statement showing the locations of these retail outlets, name of the Oil Company, the deviations, justification for relaxation, if recommended, and the decisions taken on these cases are at Annexure-II.

[Action: Concerned Project Zone CEs and concerned Oil Companies]

5. The relaxations recommended and the reasons for recommending the relaxations are not to be cited as precedents for future and other cases.

The meeting ended with a Vote of Thanks to the Chair.
Annexure-I

List of Participants in the Meeting of the Committee held on 09.10.2012 at 3:00 P.M. in Conference Hall (Ground Floor) in Parivahan Bhawan, New Delhi to discuss the cases of minor deviations for Retail Outlets.

I. Officers from Ministry of Road Transport & Highways:-

1. Shri A. K. Upadhyay - Secretary (RT&H) In Chair
2. Shri C. Kandasamy - DG(RD)&SS
3. Shri V. L. Patankar - ADG
4. Shri Arun Kr. Sharma - CE [SR&T(R)]
5. Shri A. K. Shrivastava - CE (P-1)
6. Shri K. C. Varkeyachan - CE (P-4/P-3)
7. Shri P. Haldar - CE (P-5)
8. Shri Verinder Kaul - CE (P-6)
9. Shri Y. Balakrishna - CE (P-7)
10. Shri R. K. Pandey - CE (Pl.)
11. Shri Rohit Kumar - Dir. (Fin.)
12. Shri T. T. Negi - SE (P-2)
13. Ms. Richa Nigam - SE (P-3)
14. Shri Samiran Saha - EE (Planning)

II. Representatives from the Oil Companies:-

1. Shri R. Agarwal, Chief Manager (RS-NH Coord.) - M/s IOCL, New Delhi
2. Shri P. S. Ravi, DGM (Highway Retailing) - M/s BPCL, Mumbai
3. Shri S. Mahakh - M/s BPCL
4. Shri Sandeep Goyal Sr. Manager (Highway Retailing) - M/s HPCL, Mumbai
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SL No</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Name of the Company</th>
<th>Area Code</th>
<th>Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>NH Office</td>
<td>227148</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Held on 09.10.2012**

**List of Cases (Retail Outlets) Involving Minor Deviations Considered In The Meeting**

Appendix-II
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Reason of Requirement</th>
<th>Deviation</th>
<th>Justifications &amp; Decisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suitable for Planning</td>
<td>45 m²</td>
<td>The plot size is 62 m x 23.50 m (ave) and the land owner was in possession of the measuring facts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitable for Planning</td>
<td>45 m²</td>
<td>The plot size is 62 m x 23.50 m (ave) and the land owner was in possession of the measuring facts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitable for Planning</td>
<td>14.47.727</td>
<td>The plot size is 62 m x 23.50 m (ave) and the land owner was in possession of the measuring facts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitable for Planning</td>
<td>14.47.727</td>
<td>The plot size is 62 m x 23.50 m (ave) and the land owner was in possession of the measuring facts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitable for Planning</td>
<td>14.47.727</td>
<td>The plot size is 62 m x 23.50 m (ave) and the land owner was in possession of the measuring facts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitable for Planning</td>
<td>14.47.727</td>
<td>The plot size is 62 m x 23.50 m (ave) and the land owner was in possession of the measuring facts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitable for Planning</td>
<td>14.47.727</td>
<td>The plot size is 62 m x 23.50 m (ave) and the land owner was in possession of the measuring facts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitable for Planning</td>
<td>14.47.727</td>
<td>The plot size is 62 m x 23.50 m (ave) and the land owner was in possession of the measuring facts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitable for Planning</td>
<td>14.47.727</td>
<td>The plot size is 62 m x 23.50 m (ave) and the land owner was in possession of the measuring facts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitable for Planning</td>
<td>14.47.727</td>
<td>The plot size is 62 m x 23.50 m (ave) and the land owner was in possession of the measuring facts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitable for Planning</td>
<td>14.47.727</td>
<td>The plot size is 62 m x 23.50 m (ave) and the land owner was in possession of the measuring facts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitable for Planning</td>
<td>14.47.727</td>
<td>The plot size is 62 m x 23.50 m (ave) and the land owner was in possession of the measuring facts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitable for Planning</td>
<td>14.47.727</td>
<td>The plot size is 62 m x 23.50 m (ave) and the land owner was in possession of the measuring facts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitable for Planning</td>
<td>14.47.727</td>
<td>The plot size is 62 m x 23.50 m (ave) and the land owner was in possession of the measuring facts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitable for Planning</td>
<td>14.47.727</td>
<td>The plot size is 62 m x 23.50 m (ave) and the land owner was in possession of the measuring facts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitable for Planning</td>
<td>14.47.727</td>
<td>The plot size is 62 m x 23.50 m (ave) and the land owner was in possession of the measuring facts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitable for Planning</td>
<td>14.47.727</td>
<td>The plot size is 62 m x 23.50 m (ave) and the land owner was in possession of the measuring facts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitable for Planning</td>
<td>14.47.727</td>
<td>The plot size is 62 m x 23.50 m (ave) and the land owner was in possession of the measuring facts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitable for Planning</td>
<td>14.47.727</td>
<td>The plot size is 62 m x 23.50 m (ave) and the land owner was in possession of the measuring facts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitable for Planning</td>
<td>14.47.727</td>
<td>The plot size is 62 m x 23.50 m (ave) and the land owner was in possession of the measuring facts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitable for Planning</td>
<td>14.47.727</td>
<td>The plot size is 62 m x 23.50 m (ave) and the land owner was in possession of the measuring facts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitable for Planning</td>
<td>14.47.727</td>
<td>The plot size is 62 m x 23.50 m (ave) and the land owner was in possession of the measuring facts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitable for Planning</td>
<td>14.47.727</td>
<td>The plot size is 62 m x 23.50 m (ave) and the land owner was in possession of the measuring facts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitable for Planning</td>
<td>14.47.727</td>
<td>The plot size is 62 m x 23.50 m (ave) and the land owner was in possession of the measuring facts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitable for Planning</td>
<td>14.47.727</td>
<td>The plot size is 62 m x 23.50 m (ave) and the land owner was in possession of the measuring facts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitable for Planning</td>
<td>14.47.727</td>
<td>The plot size is 62 m x 23.50 m (ave) and the land owner was in possession of the measuring facts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitable for Planning</td>
<td>14.47.727</td>
<td>The plot size is 62 m x 23.50 m (ave) and the land owner was in possession of the measuring facts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relocation

The case was discussed during the meeting held on...

Existence of an intersection with a radius

R/Th (Kuppur) 277904

N/S HPC

MH/SR at a distance of 279 m or greater minimum

M/S Loka

277 47 12 10

NH-227

minimum requirement of 1,000 m

Existence of an intersection with a radius

Existence of an intersection with a radius

Junctions & Decisions

Development

10

6

8

No.

Challange

State

Ref.

Direct

(Primary)

47 875 (LHS)

47 18 12 (LHS)

77

77

227

227

227

227

227

227

227

227

227
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SL No.</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>NPS HPCCL</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Emperor</td>
<td>130.947</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Family Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mathurin</td>
<td>37.66010</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommending for Relocation

1. Requirement of 1000 m
2. Distance of 72 m as required of minimum
3. Occupation in view of the minor deviation the case was
4. Distance of another plot situated in the vicinity of the case was
5. The plot is skewed in the direction of flow of the case was determined.
6. Requirement of 300 m and also the shape of the existing medium opening and also the possibility of existence of a medium opening at a point where the committee decided to know the reason for providing

Justifications & Decisions

Deviation

Name of the company

State

NH (km)