

Northshore Veterinary – Risk Assessment


21-137 – Brisbane Pet Surgery

Prepared for: Brisbane Pet Surgery

PLANS AND DOCUMENTS
referred to in the PDA
DEVELOPMENT APPROVAL

Approval no: DEV2021/1188

Date: 13/08/2021



icubed consulting

21-137 56 Theodore St PHA.Docx	
Prepared By	Justin Harvey
Reviewed By	Justin Harvey
Date	29 th April 2021
Job Number	21-137
Document Name	50 Theodore St PHA
Version	V 1.0

Document Revision History

Version	Revision History
1.0	Initial revision for client review



Dr. Justin Harvey
B.Sc.(Hons) M.T.M Ph.D.(Melb) MRACI C.Chem

29th April 2021

STATEMENT OF LIMITATION

Data and conclusions of this report are the findings and opinions of icubed consulting and are not an expressed or implied representation, warranty or guarantee. This report has been prepared for Brisbane Pet Surgery. icubed Consulting does not accept liability for any third party's use or reliance on this report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2	Introduction	5
3	Site Description	5
3.1	Proposed Development.....	5
4	Risk Assessment Methodology and Assessment Criteria.....	9
4.1	Assessment Criteria	10
4.2	Review of Major Incidents	11
4.3	Credible Incident Scenarios	11
4.4	Likelihood & Frequency Data	11
4.4.1	Bulk Fuel Storage	12
4.4.2	Asphalt Plants.....	12
4.4.3	Warehouse & Storage Fire	12
4.5	Consequences	12
4.5.1	Bulk Fuel Storage	12
4.5.2	Asphalt Plants.....	13
4.5.3	Warehouse & Storage Fire	14
4.6	Environmental Impacts.....	14
4.7	Risk Assessment.....	14
4.8	Existing Controls	14
4.8.1	Engineering & Design Controls.....	14
4.9	Proposed Mitigatory Controls	14
4.9.1	Emergency Plans and Procedures	14
5	Summary.....	17

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Proposed Development Site (north to top of page)	6
Figure 2: Proposed Site Development Plan	7
Figure 3: Showroom and Office Development.....	8
Figure 4: 4.7 kW/m ² Heat Flux contours for Petrol and Diesel Fires.	13

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Health & Safety Risk Assessment Matrix	9
Table 2: Environmental/Financial Risk Assessment Matrix	10
Table 3: Dangerous Dose Risk Criteria from State Code 21	10
Table 4: Individual Fatality Risk Criteria from State Code 21	11
Table 5: Off Site Impact Hazard Events for Proposed Development at 50Theodore StW, Eagle Farm	16

2 Introduction

icubed consulting have been commissioned by Brisbane Pet Surgery to prepare a Site Risk Assessment report for a proposed veterinary practice including theatres and consultation rooms to be located at 50 Theodore St (as part of Lot 700 on SP239801), Eagle Farm, QLD. The purpose of the report is to assess and demonstrate that the risk posed by existing neighbouring industries will not adversely affect the proposed development, and that any risk or operations from the proposed facility will not adversely impact on existing industrial operations in accordance with the general principles from the Queensland State Planning Policy—*State Interest Guideline - Emissions and Hazardous Activities 2016*.

Existing operations in the area that could potentially impact on the proposed development include asphalt and concrete batching plants as well as the Puma fuel storage and distribution site.

The approach taken by this report will be to identify the potential adverse impacts (hazards) from existing operations and to assess the likely frequency and consequences of these hazards to determine the overall level of risk. The hazards identified will be broadly classed into environmental, safety and operational/financial risks.

The risk assessment approach taken will be semi-quantitative in that where frequencies and consequences for hazards to be realised are available then quantitative estimates will be made. It is noted that obtaining estimates of risks that will externally impinge on a site can be difficult.

3 Site Description

The proposed development is at 50 Theodore St, Eagle Farm. The area is generally light industrial with some higher impact industries such as fuel storage and asphalt/bitumen plants in the near vicinity.

Figure 1 (below) shows the general neighbourhood of the site and some of the industries identified as potentially impacting the proposed development site. The Puma fuels and distribution facility to the northwest of the site is the closest proximity hazardous industry to the site.

3.1 Proposed Development

The proposed development is shown in Figures 2 and 3 and consists of a single story building with associated car parking. The site will house a veterinary surgery and practice. The development consists of renovations to the existing buildings. The nature of the site use is being modified to a commercial use. The reconfiguration of the building will mean that at peak periods of the site occupation, there would be a similar number of people in the overall buildings. The main difference in occupation profile is that a larger proportion of people occupying the space will be transient in nature (veterinary customers) with an upper estimate that at most there would be 15-20 customers in the waiting and consulting rooms.

The development will not introduce any other significant levels of hazardous materials. Small storages of materials associated with the practice as well as very minor storages of gases (eg anaesthetics, air or oxygen) will be stored on site. The volumes of these materials will not pose any off-site risk.




Figure 1: Proposed Development Site (north to top of page)




Figure 2: Proposed Site Development Plan

4 Risk Assessment Methodology and Assessment Criteria

The approach taken in this risk assessment has been to review the nature and type of the existing operations and conduct an historical review of the hazards and environmental impacts from the existing industries in the immediate vicinity of the site. From this review a series of credible incident scenarios that could potentially impact on the site was developed.

The consequences from these scenarios on the proposed development site have then been estimated. Depending on their nature, the credible scenarios are categorised as either environmental/miscellaneous/financial or health and safety related. The frequency of these events has been estimated and an overall assessment of risk has been made using one of the two risk assessment matrices below (Table 1 & Table 2) (depending on the type of consequences).

These risk assessment matrices are based on those used to evaluate risk at high risk facilities – such as a major hazard facility – and incorporate a greater range of high consequence, low frequency events than is typically found in risk assessment matrices. These additional spaces are included as the most likely impacts from an external source or property will or could occur from high consequence events.

Note that this assessment does not consider any hazards that may or could exist on the proposed development.

Table 1: Health & Safety Risk Assessment Matrix

Likelihood	Highly Improbable (once Every 100,000 years)	0.0000001	0.000001	0.00001	0.0001	0.001	0.01	0.1
	Very Improbable (once every 10,000 years)	0.00001	0.0001	0.001	0.01	0.1	1	10
	Very Rare (once every 1,000 years)	0.0001	0.001	0.01	0.1	1	10	100
	Rare (once every 100 years)	0.001	0.01	0.1	1	10	100	1000
	Unlikely (every 10 years)	0.01	0.1	1	10	100	1000	10000
	Likely (once a year)	0.1	1	10	100	1000	10000	100000
	Frequent (every month)	1	10	100	1000	10000	100000	1000000
		Near Miss	Minor Injury	First Aid Injury	Medical Treatment Injury	Lost Time Injury	Serious/ Permanent Injury	Fatality/ Multiple Fatalities
Consequences								

Table 2: Environmental/Financial Risk Assessment Matrix

Likelihood	Highly Improbable (once Every 100,000 years)	0.000001	0.00001	0.0001	0.001	0.01	0.1	1
	Very Improbable (once every 10,000 years)	0.00001	0.0001	0.001	0.01	0.1	1	10
	Very Rare (once every 1,000 years)	0.0001	0.001	0.01	0.1	1	10	100
	Rare (once every 100 years)	0.001	0.01	0.1	1	10	100	1000
	Unlikely (every 10 years)	0.01	0.1	1	10	100	1000	10000
	Likely (once a year)	0.1	1	10	100	1000	10000	100000
	Frequent (every month)	1	10	100	1000	10000	100000	1000000
		Internal Repair/Management only	Minor Property Damage/\$1	Property Damage \$10	Significant Cost/Clean Up/Damage ~\$100	Major Damage ~\$1,000	Business Critical ~\$10,000	Major Community Damage \$100,000+
Consequences x \$1,000								

Risks are rated as acceptable in the green area, requiring attention or further action in the orange section and unacceptable in the red zone

4.1 Assessment Criteria

The Queensland Government has published a State Planning Code (State Code 21) that provides a reference source for determining acceptable levels of risk for Hazardous Goods Facilities such as Large Dangerous Goods locations and Major Hazard Facilities (MHFs).

In this instance we are considering the impacts of neighbouring Large Dangerous Goods Locations (LDGLs) on the proposed site at 50 Theodore St.

Table 3: Dangerous Dose Risk Criteria from State Code 21

Land Use	Dangerous Dose for Fire and Explosion Events (risk in a million per year)
Vulnerable and sensitive land uses : Health care service hospital, schools, child-care facilities, retirement facility, residential	4.7 kW/m ² thermal radiation 7 kPa overpressure
Commercial or community activity use land zone retail centres, shops, offices, entertainment buildings, market, showroom, convention centres, sporting stadiums, tourist attraction, nightclub, building for religious worship, community hall, theatres and art galleries Commercial developments including retail centres, offices and entertainment centres	4.7 kW/m ² thermal radiation 7 kPa overpressure
Industrial Land Use Zones	12.6 kW/m ² thermal radiation 14 kPa overpressure

Table 4: Individual Fatality Risk Criteria from State Code 21

Land Use	Individual Fatality for Fire and Explosion Events (risk in a million per year)
Vulnerable and sensitive land uses Health care service hospital, schools, child-care facilities, retirement facility, residential	0.5
Commercial or community activity use land zone retail centres, shops, offices, entertainment buildings, market, showroom, convention centres, sporting stadiums, tourist attraction, nightclub, building for religious worship, community hall, theatres and art galleries Commercial developments including retail centres, offices and entertainment centres	5
Parks, sporting fields and active open space ¹	10
Industrial Land Use Zones	50

As the proposed use is primarily industrial in nature the injury risk criteria will only be used as a guide in this instance.

4.2 Review of Major Incidents

A review of major incidents reported in media and publicly available databases including fire and explosions from fuel storage facilities and asphalt was undertaken. From a dataset of primarily United States facilities, 132 significant incidents or events have been recorded over a 10 year period. A review of these events showed that there was mix of fires and explosions.

The majority of the data indicated that the consequences of these events were primarily localised and most likely contained to the site. No significant off-site impacts were reported.

A significant number of localised explosions were reported, meaning that offsite overpressures could be encountered. Heat flux radiation from a fire at the adjacent Boral Asphalt plant and exploding projectiles could also be encountered.

4.3 Credible Incident Scenarios

The following credible major incident scenarios were identified:

1. A pool fire from either a petrol or diesel spill at the adjacent Puma Site with potential for heat flux impacts on the development site.
2. A tank top fire from either a petrol or diesel spill at the adjacent Puma Site with potential for heat flux impacts on the development site.
3. A jet fire from a product transfer line within the Puma Site with potential for heat flux impacts on the development site.
4. Fires at the neighbouring Mobil Lube Site or the nearby Asphalt plant.
5. Impingement of toxic smoke plumes on the site.
6. Sundry fires or warehouse fires from nearby sites.

4.4 Likelihood & Frequency Data

Estimating the likelihood of events occurring at sites not controlled by the proponent is difficult; in this instance available data and accepted failure rates have been used to provide likelihood estimates. It is

¹ Criteria taken from NSW HIPAP 4 guidelines.

assumed that good management practises are observed at high hazard industries and that in general the likelihood of major incidents from these establishments is lower than less regulated industries.

4.4.1 Bulk Fuel Storage

In recent years there have been 2 notable large fires and explosions from fuel storage locations, the Buncefield explosion and fire in 2005, and the Coode Island Fire. The Buncefield fire and explosion was notable in that the overpressures from the explosive ignition of a fuel leak significantly exceeded those previously experienced from an unconfined vapour explosion. Both these events had off-site impacts. The Coode Island fire was responsible for a potentially toxic smoke plume. Of note, impacts from the smoke plume were not in the immediate vicinity of the fire but many kilometres away when the buoyant smoke plume began to fall.

In general, fuel storage facilities will need to be operating at or close to a level of risk that meets the regulatory requirements where off-site impacts meet the State Code 21 values detailed in Tables 1 and 2. For the purposes of this report the off-site fatality consequence from the neighbouring fuel storages is estimated as $50 \times 10^{-6}/\text{yr}$ and the offsite irritation/minor injury from heat flux or a toxic smoke plume frequency is estimated at $50 \times 10^{-6}/\text{yr}$.

4.4.2 Asphalt Plants

In order to assess the likelihood of a major incident at an asphalt plant the following assumptions have been made; there are approximately 5 asphalt plants per million people of population. On this basis there have been 132 reported major events over a ten year period in the US with a population of approximately 280 million people – this gives an approximate frequency of occurrence for a major incident of $1 \times 10^{-2}/\text{yr}$.

There are a range of consequences from these major incidents that range from localised fires that have resulted in injuries and fatalities. The development site is adjacent to an asphalt plant where heat fluxes from a fire could be expected, noting the distance from any potential fire source is still in excess of ~150 m. Potential impacts from toxic smoke plumes cannot be excluded.

4.4.3 Warehouse & Storage Fire

The United Kingdom Health and Safety Executive (UK HSE) stipulates that the average frequency for warehouse fires across all industries is $1 \times 10^{-2}/\text{yr}$. Using the conservative estimate that 1 in 10 warehouses are used for chemical storage then the frequency estimate for a fire in a chemical warehouse is $1 \times 10^{-3}/\text{yr}$. It is noted that chemical storage warehouses are usually designed, constructed and operated to a higher standard also resulting in an overall lower frequency of fires. Chemical Warehouses on the adjacent Puma site are sufficiently separated from the proposed development. No other high hazard warehouses have been identified within the vicinity of the development that would impact on the risk posed either to or by the development.

4.5 Consequences

The Consequences of the incident scenarios are discussed below.

4.5.1 Bulk Fuel Storage

The range of consequences from fire or explosion from fuel storage depots are considered to be;

- a minor fire contained to site (no off-site impacts)
- a major tank fire or pool fire with possible resultant heat flux effects and potential toxic fume generation
- general vapour cloud explosion
- a jet fire from a product transfer line within the facility




Figure 4: 4.7 kW/m² Heat Flux contours for Petrol and Diesel Fires.

Figure 3 shows estimated 4.7 kW/m² heat flux radiation contours for fires associated with the storage tanks closest to the proposed site and indicate the area where a person if exposed to the heat from a fire would be injured if they failed to immediately exit the area. These impacts are limited to regions of the site where there are no permanent office structures or permanent workforce or client/visitors. The likelihood of there being a fire and that simultaneously there were significant numbers of staff engaged in storing or inspecting is considered very low. Based on estimated time to store a piece of equipment (5 minutes) and exit (5 minutes) from the yard and the estimated equipment storage period (7 days) staff would only be in a hazard zone for approximately 0.1% of the time the site is operating. Equipment inspections maybe undertaken on a periodic basis and prior to auctions. An estimate is made that low levels (2-5 people) may be located in these areas for 2-3 hours per week (~2% of the time). Combined with the already low likelihood of a major fire event from the neighbouring site the risk is assessed as very low and tolerable. It should also be noted that any fire in a tank farm is unlikely to develop rapidly, providing sufficient time for persons in the storage yard area to be able to safely evacuate. No allowance has been made for shielding from bund walls or any equipment that would further reduce the impact radius of any event.

4.5.2 Asphalt Plants

The range of consequences from an asphalt plant major incident are considered to be;

- a minor fire contained to site with minimal off-site impacts
- a major tank fire or pool fire with possible resultant heat flux effects and toxic fume generation
- projectile drum/vessel

The asphalt plant is located adjacent the development site with the operational areas >150m from the site, heat flux impacts from a fire are unlikely to extend to this distance, with staff and customers afforded cover from being located indoors.

4.5.3 Warehouse & Storage Fire

The range of consequences from warehouse fire or explosion are considered to be;

- a minor fire contained to site with minimal off-site impacts
- a major fire or pool fire with possible resultant heat flux effects and toxic fume generation
- projectile drum/vessel from a warehouse fire.

A burning pool fire from a warehouse fire plant would be expected to have heat flux radii of approximately 40-60m at the 4.7 kW/m² level. This would not impact on the proposed development. The nearest storage identified is on site (Mobil); this warehouse is more than 50m from the development and no significant threat is identified from this facility, noting that visitors and staff are afforded protection by virtue of being inside a structure.

4.6 Environmental Impacts

A review of existing environmental hazards was undertaken with the results detailed in Table 5. Of note there were no significant hazards or risks identified.

It is recognised that the neighbouring asphalt plant will emit Volatile Organic Compounds, Sulfur Dioxide (SO₂), Nitrogen Oxides (NO_x) and poly aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH). The great majority of the SO₂ and PAH emissions are from a point source stack and should be emitted and dispersed without resulting in any significant ground level concentrations that would pose a threat to health.

4.7 Risk Assessment

The outcomes from the risk assessment including the hazards identified, likelihood and consequence estimates, and final risk ratings are presented in Table 3.

While there exists very low frequency events that could impact on the site in terms of heat fluxes from a fire or pressure impacts from vapour cloud explosions, the very sparse human occupation levels on the site reduces the risk of fatality or injury to levels that are acceptable. A comparable level of risk would exist walking along the footpath outside the Theodore St entrance to the Puma Site.

4.8 Existing Controls

4.8.1 Engineering & Design Controls

There are a number of features of the proposed design and site layout that will reduce the overall level of risk on the site. These are summarised below:

1. Separation Distances – The main office buildings are located as far as possible from the sources of off-site hazard. Heat Flux from fire on an adjacent site is unlikely to exceed 23 kW/m² at distances of 40m and 4.7 kW/m² at 60m. On this basis the office building area is sufficiently distant from neighbouring stores that heat flux from a fire will not pose a significant risk. The impacts of heat flux would be felt in the car park area. These areas are sparsely populated and staff and any visitors would be able to safely evacuate to the front of the site or shelter indoors.
2. Occupancy Levels
The occupancy levels of the proposed facility will be similar to that of the existing approved use, meaning that there is no significant intensification of risk.

4.9 Proposed Mitigatory Controls

4.9.1 Emergency Plans and Procedures

It is recommended that Site Emergency Plans and Procedures be developed that include responses to the following scenarios:

1. Off Site fire that generates toxic smoke plume and requires an evacuation procedure where all staff and visitors to the site are relocated to safe area (consideration of shelter indoors).
2. Education for staff that fires in the adjacent Mobil oils area/asphalt plant or Puma facility could have minor impacts on the site and that the preferred emergency action will be to remain in shelter until advise to evacuate by emergency services.

Table 5: Off Site Impact Hazard Events for Proposed Development at 50Theodore St, Eagle Farm

Hazard/Event	Likelihood (per annum)	Consequences	Risk Rating ²
Safety			
Minor Fire - neighbour site	0.01	No Impact/minor business interruption	0.001
Office/Admin Fire – neighbouring site	0.01	No Impact/minor business interruption	0.001
Warehouse Drum Store Fire	0.001	Potential for Projectiles with escalation potential - fire - Damage to equipment/office - Fire Brigades will be in attendance and should be able to control spot fires	1
Vehicle Rollover-Spill	0.01	No Impact/minor business interruption	0.001
Vehicle Rollover-Fire	0.001	No Impact/minor business interruption	0.001
Toxic Smoke from Major Fire (warehouse/asphalt)	0.01	Toxic Plume from incomplete combustion as a result of fire or combustion of toxic materials. - Business Interruption	1
Toxic Smoke from Major Fire (warehouse/asphalt)	0.01	Toxic Plume from incomplete combustion as a result of fire or combustion of toxic materials. - Minor Irritation - potential medical treatment	1
Toxic Smoke from Major Fire Puma/Whinstanes	0.00001	Toxic Plume from incomplete combustion as a result of fire or combustion of toxic materials. - Minor Irritation - potential medical treatment	0.1
Major Fire	0.01	Smoke Impacts from fire, area evacuated - Business Interruption - One week in duration	0.1
Major Fire	0.000005	Heat Flux From adjacent site fire-Puma- will not cause property damage	0.00001
Major Fire	0.001	Heat Flux From adjacent site - Puma - property damage equipment in yard	0.1
Major Fire	0.000005	Heat Flux From adjacent site fire Mobil – property damage equipment in yard	0.01
Major Fire – Jet Fire	0.000005	Heat Flux From adjacent site - Puma - property damage equipment in yard	0.1
Environmental			
Dust	0.1	Nuisance/minor property damage	0.1
Filter Bag House Leak/Breakthrough	0.1	Nuisance/minor property damage & clean up	0.1
Petroleum/Fuel Odour	1	Nuisance	1
Toxic Gas Plume	0.001	Nuisance/illness possible irritation, medical assessment	0.1
Contaminated Overland Water Flow	0.001	Nuisance/minor property damage & clean up	0.001
Odour	0.1	Nuisance/minor property damage & clean up	0.1
Light	0.1	Nuisance/minor property damage & clean up	0.1
Noise	0.1	Nuisance/minor property damage & clean up	0.1
Groundwater Contamination	0.001	Nuisance/minor property damage & clean up	

² See Risk Matrices for Risk Acceptability – generally values less than 1 are considered tolerable.

5 Summary

This report has reviewed the overall risk posed on the proposed development. No significant risks were identified from existing neighbouring industries that would adversely impact on the operations of this site.

The design, location and orientation of the proposed development will assist in minimising any impacts if there was a major event such as a fire or explosion.

No credible hazard scenarios were identified that would adversely affect the proposed development and the development in itself will not impact on existing industries, and as such will comply with the general principles from the Queensland State Planning Policy—*State Interest Guideline - Emissions and Hazardous Activities*.