



## 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@df.t.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:transportplanning@df.t.gsi.gov.uk).

**Signature:** 

**Date:** 7 August 2019

**Name:** Adrian Chadha

**Position:** Assistant Asset Manager

**Highways England:**

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

[Adrian.Chadha@highwaysengland.co.uk](mailto:Adrian.Chadha@highwaysengland.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 the above referenced planning application and has been prepared by Adrian Chadha, Assistant Asset Manager for Highways England.

Highways England have previously issued formal holding responses in relation to this application, most recently in May 2019. Nevertheless, it is still apparent that some concerns remain outstanding regarding Drawing no. 2163-F01 Rev B and Road Safety Audit (RSA) and Departure from Standard these are summarised below:

### **SRA**

The latest version of the SRA, it has been developed to a satisfactory level. The document will need to be formally considered by the Overseeing Organisation’s Activity Manager.

### **Drawing no. 2163-F01 Rev B**

The commentary for the latest drawing has been noted and the design philosophy is agreed in principle. However, the proposed introduction of the bollard at the existing uncontrolled crossing is likely to be struck on occasions, leading to a maintenance liability. Whilst the reason for its inclusion is understood, the inclusion of the bollard will be raised during the RSA.

### **RSA Audit Brief**

1. Terms of Reference – this should be a short statement, requiring the Audit Team to follow the procedural requirements of DMRB GG119 together with the content of the RSA Audit Brief.
2. Design Speed – should be presented in kph (as per DMRB TD9/93).
3. Existing Traffic Flows – whilst it is acknowledged data is appended to the RSA Audit Brief, it would be helpful if the flows could be summarised under this heading.

4. Forecast Traffic Flows - whilst it is acknowledged data is appended to the RSA Audit Brief, it would be helpful if the flows could be summarised under this heading.
5. Pedestrian, cyclist and equestrian desire lines - whilst it is acknowledged data is appended to the RSA Audit Brief, it would be helpful if the desire lines could be summarised under this heading.
6. Description of Locality – is rather brief, suggest additional context is provided.
7. General Description – is rather brief, suggest additional context is provided.
8. Strategic Decisions – the statement implies a Departure from Standard for the form of junction (existing sub-standard) has been agreed, which is not the case.
9. Checklist – this is missing from the Audit Brief.

#### **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 the Departure.

**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.**