GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF ROAD TRANSPORT & HIGHWAYS
[S, R&T (R) Zone]

Parivahan Bhavan
1, Sansad Marg
New Delhi-110001

No. RW/NH-35075/02/2015-S&R (R) Dated: the 11th June, 2015

OFFICE MEMORANDUM

Subject: Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee to consider minor deviations in respect of retail outlets - reg.

The Minutes of the Meeting of Committee to consider minor deviations in respect of retail outlets held on 29th April, 2015 and 28th May, 2015 in the Ground Floor, Conference Hall, Transport Bhawan, New Delhi are enclosed herewith for information and necessary follow up action.

2. The minutes may not be considered as an approval and it is requested that the individual cases may be put up in the respective file dealing with the case for the approval of the competent authority. Compliance report wherever required may kindly be forwarded to this Ministry.

Encl: As above

(Sharad Varshney)
Superintending Engineer (S, R&T) (Roads)
Telefax: 23716645

To,

1. Chairman, National Highways Authority of India, G-5 &6, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075
2. Joint Secretary (M), Ministry of Petroleum & Natural Gas, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi – 110001 (Fax No. 011-23383100)
3. CE (P-1)/ CE (P-2)/ CE (P-3)/ CE (P-4)/ CE (P-5)/ CE (P-6)/ CE (P-7) / CE (NER)/ CE (S, R&T)(R)

Copy to the representatives of Oil Companies:

(i). Shri. R. K. Batra - Manager, BPCL
(ii). Shri. S. C. Jha - Manager, BPCL
(iii). Shri. Sandeep Goyal - Chief Manager, HPCL
(iv). Shri. Sandeep Makkar - DGM(RS), IOC

Contd…2/-
No. RW/NH-35075/02/2015-S&R (R)  

Copy for kind information to:-  
1. PS to Minister (RTH&S)  
2. PS to MOS (RTH&S)  
3. Sr. PPS to Secretary (RTH)  
4. PPS to DG (RD) & SS  
5. PS to ADG (I)/II/Coordinators II/III  
6. 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 Deviations in respect of Retail Outlets→ Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee to consider Minor Deviations in the respect of Retail Outlets during the year 2015

(Sharad Varshney)  
Superintending Engineer (S, R&T) (Roads)
Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee held on 29.04.2015 and 28.05.2015 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, DG (RD) & SS welcomed the participants. Thereafter, the concerned Project zone Chief Engineers of P-3, P-4 & P-5 zone were requested to present the cases pertaining to the States of Bihar, Rajasthan & Madhya Pradesh respectively. Chief Engineer (P-3) zone informed that details from Oil Companies are not available. As such, the cases of Bihar may be taken up in the next meeting. The case of Rajasthan was discussed in detail. A statement showing the locations of the retail outlets, name of the Oil Company, the deviations, justifications for relaxation, if recommended, and the decisions taken on these cases, including the cases recommended in the meeting held on 29th April, 2015 are at Annexure II.

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

3. During the deliberations, the Committee decided that henceforth, all the cases of deviation should be forwarded with proper justifications and clear recommendations of the concerned Project zone Chief Engineers. The concerned ADGs/Co-ordinators should also attend the meetings of the Relaxation Committee for presenting the cases. The representatives of the Oil Companies were also directed to appraise the concerned Project zone Chief Engineers, well in advance, about the cases involving minor deviations which are to be discussed by the Committee.

[Action: All ADGs/Co-ordinators/Project Zone CEs and concerned Oil Companies]

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

5. The meeting ended with a Vote of Thanks to the Chair.

****
List of participants in the Meeting of the "Examination of proposals involving minor deviations from the prescribed guidelines for grant of permission of approach road access to Fuel Stations" on 28.05.2015 at 15:00 hrs in the Conference Hall (Ground Floor), Transport Bhawan, New Delhi

### I. Officers from Ministry of Road Transport & Highways

1. Shri. S.N. Das  
2. Shri. R.K. Singh  
3. Shri. D. O. Tawade  
4. Shri. R.K. Pandey  
5. Shri. Akhtarul Hanif  
6. Shri. Sharad Varshney  
7. Shri. Virender Kaul  
8. Shri. P. Halder  
9. Shri. Ravi Prasad  
10. Shri. U. C. Katare  
11. Shri. Pankaj Agarwal  

- DG(RD)&SS In Chair  
- CE(S&R)( R)  
- Co-ordinator-II  
- CE(Planning)  
- DS(F), IFD  
- SE(S&R)(R)  
- CE (P-4/6)  
- CE (P-5)  
- CE (P-3)  
- SE (P-5)  
- SE(P-4)

### II. Representatives of the Oil Companies:

1. Shri. R. K. Batra  
2. Shri. S. C. Jha  
3. Shri. Sandeep Goyal  
4. Shri. Sandeep Makkar  

- Manager, BPCL  
- Manager, BPCL  
- Chief Manager, HPCL  
- DGM(RS), IOC
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>The QH No.</th>
<th>The OL Designation</th>
<th>Project Company</th>
<th>Project Cost (LHS)</th>
<th>Proposed Real Order in LHS</th>
<th>Distance From Check</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bihar</td>
<td>19174.55</td>
<td>HPC</td>
<td>1000m</td>
<td>Proposed Real Order, First Floor, Intersection is 125 m as per Project Requirement as per guidance is 1400 m. Distance from Check is 1000 m.</td>
<td>1000m from the proposed real order at 650m from toll plaza, NH 100m on the other side. No other existence of toll plaza. No additional existence of toll plaza.</td>
<td>0.5km from toll plaza, NH 100m on the other side. No other existence of toll plaza. No additional existence of toll plaza.</td>
<td>350km</td>
<td>19174.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bihar</td>
<td>19372/5</td>
<td>LTC</td>
<td>75m in the proposal should be 100m whereas it is 75m in the proposal.</td>
<td>Proposed Real order at 75m from toll plaza.</td>
<td>Proposed Real order at 75m from toll plaza.</td>
<td>Proposed Real order at 75m from toll plaza.</td>
<td>0.5km from toll plaza, NH 100m on the other side. No other existence of toll plaza. No additional existence of toll plaza.</td>
<td>19372/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bihar</td>
<td>109375</td>
<td>BLTC</td>
<td>There is cross change of direction of traffic due to which the proposed real order within 300 m from the proposed direction of traffic due to which the proposed real order within 300 m from the proposed real order.</td>
<td>Proposed Real order at 300m from toll plaza.</td>
<td>Proposed Real order at 300m from toll plaza.</td>
<td>Proposed Real order at 300m from toll plaza.</td>
<td>0.5km from toll plaza, NH 100m on the other side. No other existence of toll plaza. No additional existence of toll plaza.</td>
<td>109375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**List of Cases (Retail Outlets) Involving Minor Deviations**

---

Annexure II
The recommendation:

Case was not recommended for implementation.

In view of the safety issues, the Ministry of Road Transport and Highways, Government of India, has decided to reconsider the case. The Ministry has also received a number of objections from various stakeholders.

However, the Committee was of the view that the proposed location of the zone is subject to removal of some objectionable structures. The zone is also subject to removal of the same.

The Committee therefore recommends the following:

1. The zone is subject to removal of some objectionable structures.
2. The zone is also subject to removal of the same.
3. The zone is subject to removal of the same.
4. The zone is subject to removal of the same.

Recommendation of the Committee:

Concentrated Project Zone

Justification as submitted by the Ministry:

There is a difference of opinion in the Ministry regarding the concentration of projects in the zone. The Ministry has also received objections from various stakeholders.

The Ministry has decided to reconsider the case. The Ministry has also received a number of objections from various stakeholders.

However, the Committee was of the view that the proposed location of the zone is subject to removal of some objectionable structures. The zone is also subject to removal of the same.

The Committee therefore recommends the following:

1. The zone is subject to removal of some objectionable structures.
2. The zone is also subject to removal of the same.
3. The zone is subject to removal of the same.
4. The zone is subject to removal of the same.

Recommendation of the Committee:

Concentrated Project Zone

Justification as submitted by the Ministry:

There is a difference of opinion in the Ministry regarding the concentration of projects in the zone. The Ministry has also received objections from various stakeholders.

The Ministry has decided to reconsider the case. The Ministry has also received a number of objections from various stakeholders.

However, the Committee was of the view that the proposed location of the zone is subject to removal of some objectionable structures. The zone is also subject to removal of the same.

The Committee therefore recommends the following:

1. The zone is subject to removal of some objectionable structures.
2. The zone is also subject to removal of the same.
3. The zone is subject to removal of the same.
4. The zone is subject to removal of the same.

Recommendation of the Committee:

Concentrated Project Zone

Justification as submitted by the Ministry:

There is a difference of opinion in the Ministry regarding the concentration of projects in the zone. The Ministry has also received objections from various stakeholders.

The Ministry has decided to reconsider the case. The Ministry has also received a number of objections from various stakeholders.

However, the Committee was of the view that the proposed location of the zone is subject to removal of some objectionable structures. The zone is also subject to removal of the same.

The Committee therefore recommends the following:

1. The zone is subject to removal of some objectionable structures.
2. The zone is also subject to removal of the same.
3. The zone is subject to removal of the same.
4. The zone is subject to removal of the same.

Recommendation of the Committee:

Concentrated Project Zone

Justification as submitted by the Ministry:

There is a difference of opinion in the Ministry regarding the concentration of projects in the zone. The Ministry has also received objections from various stakeholders.

The Ministry has decided to reconsider the case. The Ministry has also received a number of objections from various stakeholders.

However, the Committee was of the view that the proposed location of the zone is subject to removal of some objectionable structures. The zone is also subject to removal of the same.

The Committee therefore recommends the following:

1. The zone is subject to removal of some objectionable structures.
2. The zone is also subject to removal of the same.
3. The zone is subject to removal of the same.
4. The zone is subject to removal of the same.

Recommendation of the Committee:

Concentrated Project Zone

Justification as submitted by the Ministry:

There is a difference of opinion in the Ministry regarding the concentration of projects in the zone. The Ministry has also received objections from various stakeholders.

The Ministry has decided to reconsider the case. The Ministry has also received a number of objections from various stakeholders.

However, the Committee was of the view that the proposed location of the zone is subject to removal of some objectionable structures. The zone is also subject to removal of the same.

The Committee therefore recommends the following:

1. The zone is subject to removal of some objectionable structures.
2. The zone is also subject to removal of the same.
3. The zone is subject to removal of the same.
4. The zone is subject to removal of the same.

Recommendation of the Committee:

Concentrated Project Zone

Justification as submitted by the Ministry:

There is a difference of opinion in the Ministry regarding the concentration of projects in the zone. The Ministry has also received objections from various stakeholders.

The Ministry has decided to reconsider the case. The Ministry has also received a number of objections from various stakeholders.

However, the Committee was of the view that the proposed location of the zone is subject to removal of some objectionable structures. The zone is also subject to removal of the same.

The Committee therefore recommends the following:

1. The zone is subject to removal of some objectionable structures.
2. The zone is also subject to removal of the same.
3. The zone is subject to removal of the same.
4. The zone is subject to removal of the same.

Recommendation of the Committee:

Concentrated Project Zone

Justification as submitted by the Ministry:

There is a difference of opinion in the Ministry regarding the concentration of projects in the zone. The Ministry has also received objections from various stakeholders.

The Ministry has decided to reconsider the case. The Ministry has also received a number of objections from various stakeholders.

However, the Committee was of the view that the proposed location of the zone is subject to removal of some objectionable structures. The zone is also subject to removal of the same.

The Committee therefore recommends the following:

1. The zone is subject to removal of some objectionable structures.
2. The zone is also subject to removal of the same.
3. The zone is subject to removal of the same.
4. The zone is subject to removal of the same.


List of cases (re-tail outlets) involving minor developments recommended by the Committee in the meeting held on 29th April 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Proposed by P. S. Jone for development of a small retail store in the existing market area. The proposal was submitted to the committee on 29th April 2015. Ref: 123456.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The application was referred to the local body for further action.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation of the Committee:

Consent to Recommended for development of retail outlet. |

Deviations as furnished by the parent body.

Name of NH

Chamber No. (in/Provisional)

Area of the Oil

Location: 66.99 (HPS)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Location (from/destination)</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13/7/49</td>
<td>Waigal Pass</td>
<td>1374/13</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.6.2012</td>
<td>RNCL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation for Relocation**

- The proposal to relocate the 1374/13 project site is considered in light of the existing NH 46 to NH 4 road. The new site for the project will be approximately 10 km away from the existing site.

**Conclusion**

The case was recommended for relocation.

---

**NH 46 by NH 4**

NH 46 starts from the south end of NH 4 and runs parallel to it. The new site for the project will be approximately 10 km away from the existing site. The proposed NOC was granted by the concerned authority.
The case was recommended for rejection.

The case was rejected for the following reasons:

1. The minimum distance from the nearest point of the proposed outlet to the nearest point on the nearest existing outlet is 300m. However, 300m is too far, especially when a full highway or divided highway is present between the two outlets.

2. The minimum distance from the nearest point of the proposed outlet to the nearest point on the nearest existing outlet is 300m. However, 300m is too far, especially when a full highway or divided highway is present between the two outlets.

3. The proposed outlet is located at a distance of 87.4m from the nearest point of the proposed outlet to the nearest point on the nearest existing outlet.

4. The proposed outlet is located at a distance of 87.4m from the nearest point of the proposed outlet to the nearest point on the nearest existing outlet.

5. The proposed outlet is located at a distance of 87.4m from the nearest point of the proposed outlet to the nearest point on the nearest existing outlet.

6. The proposed outlet is located at a distance of 87.4m from the nearest point of the proposed outlet to the nearest point on the nearest existing outlet.

7. The proposed outlet is located at a distance of 87.4m from the nearest point of the proposed outlet to the nearest point on the nearest existing outlet.

8. The proposed outlet is located at a distance of 87.4m from the nearest point of the proposed outlet to the nearest point on the nearest existing outlet.

9. The proposed outlet is located at a distance of 87.4m from the nearest point of the proposed outlet to the nearest point on the nearest existing outlet.

10. The proposed outlet is located at a distance of 87.4m from the nearest point of the proposed outlet to the nearest point on the nearest existing outlet.

11. The proposed outlet is located at a distance of 87.4m from the nearest point of the proposed outlet to the nearest point on the nearest existing outlet.

12. The proposed outlet is located at a distance of 87.4m from the nearest point of the proposed outlet to the nearest point on the nearest existing outlet.

13. The proposed outlet is located at a distance of 87.4m from the nearest point of the proposed outlet to the nearest point on the nearest existing outlet.

14. The proposed outlet is located at a distance of 87.4m from the nearest point of the proposed outlet to the nearest point on the nearest existing outlet.

15. The proposed outlet is located at a distance of 87.4m from the nearest point of the proposed outlet to the nearest point on the nearest existing outlet.

16. The proposed outlet is located at a distance of 87.4m from the nearest point of the proposed outlet to the nearest point on the nearest existing outlet.

17. The proposed outlet is located at a distance of 87.4m from the nearest point of the proposed outlet to the nearest point on the nearest existing outlet.

18. The proposed outlet is located at a distance of 87.4m from the nearest point of the proposed outlet to the nearest point on the nearest existing outlet.

19. The proposed outlet is located at a distance of 87.4m from the nearest point of the proposed outlet to the nearest point on the nearest existing outlet.

20. The proposed outlet is located at a distance of 87.4m from the nearest point of the proposed outlet to the nearest point on the nearest existing outlet.