

**From:** Sansoy, Priya <[Priya.Sansoy@highwaysengland.co.uk](mailto:Priya.Sansoy@highwaysengland.co.uk)>  
**Sent:** 07 February 2020 13:11  
**To:** Atkins, Charlotte <[Charlotte.Atkins@herefordshire.gov.uk](mailto:Charlotte.Atkins@herefordshire.gov.uk)>  
**Cc:** Planning Enquiries <[planning\\_enquiries@herefordshire.gov.uk](mailto:planning_enquiries@herefordshire.gov.uk)>; Chadha, Adrian <[Adrian.Chadha@highwaysengland.co.uk](mailto:Adrian.Chadha@highwaysengland.co.uk)>; Cowling, Heather <[Heather.Cowling@highwaysengland.co.uk](mailto:Heather.Cowling@highwaysengland.co.uk)>; HE instructions <[Midlandsspa.europe@aecom.com](mailto:Midlandsspa.europe@aecom.com)>; Rogers, Keith <[Keith.Rogers@aecom.com](mailto:Keith.Rogers@aecom.com)>  
**Subject:** 181599 - Co-operative Store and Petrol Station - Holmer Road - Hereford - HR4 9RX

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Charlotte,

Further to the above referenced planning application, please see the attached letter.

Thank you

Kind Regards,

**Priya Sansoy**  
**Assistant Spatial Planner**  
**Shropshire, Telford, Herefordshire & Worcestershire - Operations Directorate**  
Highways England | The Cube | 199 Wharfside Street | Birmingham | B1 1RN  
Web: [www.highwaysengland.co.uk](http://www.highwaysengland.co.uk)  
☎: 0300 470 8130    📠: 07923 382903  
✉: [Priya.Sansoy@highwaysengland.co.uk](mailto:Priya.Sansoy@highwaysengland.co.uk)

*This email may contain information which is confidential and is intended only for use of the recipient/s named above. If you are not an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any copying, distribution, disclosure, reliance upon or other use of the contents of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender and destroy it.*

**Highways England Company Limited | General enquiries: 0300 123 5000**  
**|National Traffic Operations Centre, 3 Ridgeway, Quinton Business Park,**  
**Birmingham B32 1AF | [https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/highways-](https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/highways-england)**  
**[england](http://www.highwaysengland.co.uk) | [info@highwaysengland.co.uk](mailto:info@highwaysengland.co.uk)**

*Registered in England and Wales no 9346363 | Registered Office: Bridge House, 1 Walnut Tree Close, Guildford, Surrey GU1 4LZ*

Consider the environment. Please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to.



## Developments Affecting Trunk Roads and Special Roads

### Highways England Planning Response (HEPR 16-01)

### Formal Recommendation to an Application for Planning Permission

From: Catherine Brookes (Divisional Director)  
Operations Directorate  
Midlands Region  
Highways England  
[planningm@highwaysengland.co.uk](mailto:planningm@highwaysengland.co.uk)

To: Herefordshire Council – FAO Charlotte Atkins

CC: [transportplanning@dft.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:transportplanning@dft.gsi.gov.uk)  
[growthandplanning@highwaysengland.co.uk](mailto:growthandplanning@highwaysengland.co.uk)

Council's Reference: P181599/F

Referring to the planning application referenced above, consultation dated 13 July 2018, **PROPOSED DEMOLITION OF EXISTING RETAIL STORE/KIOSK AND CAR WASH FACILITY. ERECTION OF REPLACEMENT RETAIL STORE/KIOSK. REMOVAL AND REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING PETROL PUMPS AND CANOPY, REPLACEMENT OF FUEL TANKS, RE-CONFIGURATION OF CAR PARKING LAYOUT AND INSTALLATION OF PLANT WITHIN ENCLOSURE**, Co-operative Store and Petrol Filling Station, Holmer Road, Hereford, HR4 9RX, notice is hereby given that Highways England's formal recommendation is that we:

- a) ~~offer no objection;~~
- b) ~~recommend that conditions should be attached to any planning permission that may be granted (see Annex A – Highways England recommended Planning Conditions);~~
- c) recommend that planning permission not be granted for a specified period (see Annex A – further assessment required);
- d) ~~recommend that the application be refused (see Annex A – Reasons for recommending Refusal).~~

Highways Act Section 175B is not relevant to this application.<sup>1</sup>

This represents Highways England's formal recommendation and is copied to the Department for Transport as per the terms of our Licence.

Should you disagree with this recommendation you should consult the Secretary of State for Transport, as per the Town and Country Planning (Development Affecting Trunk Roads) Direction 2018, via [transportplanning@dft.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:transportplanning@dft.gsi.gov.uk).

**Signature:**



**Date:** 7 February 2020

**Name:** Priya Sansoy

**Position:** Assistant Spatial Planner

**Highways England:**

Highways England | The Cube | 199 Wharfside Street | Birmingham | B1 1RN

[Priya.Sansoy@highwayengland.co.uk](mailto:Priya.Sansoy@highwayengland.co.uk)

---

<sup>1</sup> Where relevant, further information will be provided within Annex A.

## **Annex A    Highways England recommended further assessment required.**

HIGHWAYS ENGLAND (“we”) has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as 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). The SRN is a critical national asset and as such we work to ensure that it operates and is managed in the public interest, both in respect of current activities and needs as well as in providing effective stewardship of its long-term operation and integrity.

This response represents our formal recommendations with regard to the above referenced planning application and has been prepared by Priya Sansoy, Assistant Spatial Planner for Highways England.

Highways England have previously issued formal holding responses in relation to this application, most recently in November 2019. No new information regarding the proposal has been uploaded to the Local Planning Authority’s website since March 2019. Our position on the proposal therefore remains as previous. The below summarises the outstanding issues:

### **Safety Risk Assessment**

The Safety Risk Assessment (SRA) has been accepted, although it is noted that there are several issues with the manner in which the document has been compiled, which have been addressed in previous responses. The Overseeing Organisation Activity Manager is content with the Casualty Evaluation and Safety Objective. Therefore, the SRA has been useful in channelling the Design Organisation’s consideration of the issues and associated risks towards a potentially achievable targeted solution.

### **Road Safety Audit Report Response**

Highways England provided comments on the Road Safety Audit Report Response (RSARR) in September 2019 related to the problems 2.1 and 2.2 in the RSA. For this response Highways England are listed as the Overseeing Organisation (OO).

With regards to RSA Problem 2.1, we stated:

*“At this time, drawing 2163-SP05 does not illustrate the proposed location of a bollard that will prevent overrunning of the tactile paving – as such the OO is not convinced the Problem and Recommendation have been addressed. We would agree that the details of the bollard can be dealt with at detailed design stage.”*

With regards to RSA Problem 2.2, we stated:

*“The OO agree the issue of signage and carriageway markings can be agreed during the detailed design stage; however please note that prohibition signs will require the making of a PTRO.”*

Based on our review of the RSARR, we were not entirely satisfied with the Design Organisation's Response (DOR) to problem 2.1. From reviewing drawing 2163-SP05, the location of the bollard would not prevent an HGV overrunning the pedestrian crossing point.

Highways England would suggest that the source of the HGVs isn't relevant in addressing the safety issue and the same argument could be used for anyone using the A49 who is not a customer of the development.

The proposed highway scheme (and development) interacts with the highway and its users. Therefore, the question is whether, as a result of the scheme, pedestrians would be at risk of being struck by an HGV overrunning the crossing landing (note DMRB GG 119 para. 2.1 below):

*"2.1 Where there are physical changes to the highway impacting on road user behaviour or resulting in a change to the outcome of a collision on the trunk road and motorway network, road safety audit (RSA) shall apply, regardless of the procurement method."*

The RSA has raised this outcome as a possibility; therefore appropriate mitigation is required, which is suggested to be in the form of an appropriately located bollard (as per the RSA Recommendation). The location is to be determined by swept path analysis.

Following the above, if this leads to the need for a bollard to be located in an area where it would impede pedestrians, Highways England would suggest such implications are investigated further. For instance, does the scheme need to be amended slightly to address both issues? Is there an alternative solution to a bollard?

However, if there are no viable solutions to the location of the bollard, then we would advise that you will need to consider which is the greatest risk to pedestrians – being struck by an HGV or colliding with the bollard? Is the resultant risk 'tolerable'?

### **Departure from Standard**

As referred to in the RSA Audit Brief, as the development materially increases flows through a sub-standard junction layout, a Departure from Standard is required to retain the layout. An Approval in Principle (AiP) will need to be sought from HE SES in due course. The SRA, proposed mitigation scheme and RSA will be relevant in support of Departure.

Also, to obtain a provisional agreement to a Departure from Standard, I have previously been advised by colleagues in our SES division that all relevant documents supporting the Departures will need to be uploaded and submitted via the DAS 3.0 system. Access to this system can be provided by emailing

[departures@highwaysengland.co.uk](mailto:departures@highwaysengland.co.uk) – access will be granted after the proposer has been cleared through the Nuns process, i.e. HE IT security.

**On the basis of the above, Highways England recommends that permission not be granted for a further period of up to three months from the date of this response to allow time for further discussions with the applicant to address these matters.**