



**CD211 - Proposals for revised policies for HSE advice on development control around large-scale petrol storage sites**

**Amicus is the UK's second largest trade union with 1.2 million members across the private and public sectors. Our members work in a range of industries including manufacturing, financial services, print, media, construction and not for profit sectors, local government, education and the NHS.**

**Amicus has significant membership in the oil refinery, oil storage and chemical sector and has been actively involved in post-Buncefield work.**

**Executive Summary**

Amicus is seeking

- a change to HSE's land use planning advice to planning authorities
- an extension of consultation distances in line with the damage experienced in the Buncefield explosion
- a change to our assumptions about the vulnerability of individuals likely to be affected by such an incident
- the adoption of Option 3 in the consultation document

## **The Amicus case in detail**

Amicus favours a change to the HSE's land use planning advice to take full account of the explosion at the Buncefield oil storage depot and subsequent events. This needs to involve an extension of the consultation distances in line with the damage experienced as a result of the Buncefield explosion.

In particular Amicus is seeking a complete re-appraisal of the assumptions that were previously made about the vulnerability of individuals likely to be affected by such an incident. We are particularly concerned about the risks that exist to people who are working on and around large scale petrol storage sites.

Therefore, we believe that new planning rules must take full account of the safety of people at work, as well as protecting the public. We favour Option 3 as this option takes most account of protecting people within large scale petrol storage sites.

Although this may create greater work for the HSE and planning authorities, we believe it is essential that the planning rules pay due regard to those who are most at risk, ie people who are at work on the site.

**Roger Jeary**

**Director of Research**

Response prepared by Bud Hudspith, Amicus National Health and Safety

Contact at: 33-37 Moreland Street, London EC1V 8HA

Email: [bud.hudspith@amicustheunion.org](mailto:bud.hudspith@amicustheunion.org)

## Health and Safety Executive

### Proposals for revised policies for HSE advice on development control around large-scale petrol storage sites

#### Reply Form

#### Completing this Questionnaire

You can move between questions by pressing the 'Tab' / 'Shift-Tab' or 'Page Up' / 'Page Down' keys or by clicking on the grey boxes with a mouse. Please type your replies within the rectangular grey boxes, or click on the square grey boxes to select an answer (e.g. 'Yes' or 'No').

#### Part 1: Your details:

<b>Name:</b>	Bud Hudspith
<b>Job title:</b>	Amicus National Health and Safety Officer
<b>Organisation:</b>	Amicus the Union
<b>Street address:</b>	33-37 Moreland Street
<b>Town / City:</b>	London
<b>Postcode:</b>	EC1V 8HA
<b>Telephone:</b>	07881 588917
<b>Fax:</b>	020 7780 4151
<b>Email:</b>	bud.hudspith@amicustheunion

**Are you a safety representative?**

Choose one option

Yes

No

**Number of employees in your organisation:**

Choose one option:

Not Applicable

1 to 9

10 to 49

50 to 249

250 to 1000

1000+

Self employed

**Business sector:**

Choose one option:

Agriculture Hunting and Forestry

Charity

Computer Software; Hardware  
and Consultancy

Construction

Education

Electricity, Gas and Water  
supply

Finance

Fishing

Health and Social Work

Hotels and Restaurants

Manufacturing

Mining and Quarrying

Property

Public Administration and  
Defence

Research and Development

Refuse; Sewage and Sanitation

Transport, Storage and  
Communication

Wholesale and Retail Trade

Leisure Sport and Recreation

Other Business Activities

Other Service Activities

Other

Not Applicable

**Representation - Are you responding as:**

Choose one option:

A member of the public

A representative of an industry association

An employer

A representative of a trade union

A local authority employee / councillor

A representative of a charitable / voluntary organisation

Other (please specify)

**If you chose 'Other' please specify:**

**Confidentiality**

Please indicate below if you do not wish details of your comments to be available to the public. (NB if you do not put a cross in the box they will be made public. This takes precedence over any automatic notes on e-mails that indicate that the contents are confidential.)



**Q3** Should we change our assumptions about the vulnerability of individuals likely to be affected by such an incident?

Choose one option

Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-----	-------------------------------------

No	<input type="checkbox"/>
----	--------------------------

**Q3A** Comments:

--

**Q4** Which option best strikes the right balance between reducing the risk of harm to individuals and allowing economic and social development in the vicinity of these sites?

Choose one option:

Option 1 - No change to LUP advice	<input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------	--------------------------

Option 2 - Change size of CD and zones, based on hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------

Option 3 - Change size of CD (as Option 2) and development sensitivity levels	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	-------------------------------------

Option 4 - Change size of CD informed by risk, and adopt new Development Proximity Zone to give more restrictive advice	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------

**4A** Any additional comments on your choice of option:

We believe that new planning rules need to take more account of the safety of people at work, as well as protecting the public. This option takes most account of protecting people within large scale petrol storage sites.
--

- 5      **We would particularly like views on Option 3, which gives the greatest level of protection to individuals and the greatest amount of land use control; and Option 4, which gives greater public safety protection than at present but allows more development than Option 3.**

We support Option 3 and have commented above. Although this may create greater work for the HSE and planning authorities, we believe it is essential that the planning rules pay due regard to those who are most at risk, ie people who are at work on the site.

**Please provide any additional comments that you may have on these proposals**

**Responses should be sent by 22 May 2007 to:**

Consultation Administrator  
Health and Safety Executive  
Redgrave Court  
Merton Road  
Bootle  
Merseyside L20 7HS  
Fax: 0151 951 3418

e-mail: [sandra.ashcroft.lupqueries@hse.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:sandra.ashcroft.lupqueries@hse.gsi.gov.uk)