

Agenda Item No. 974A

EAST SUSSEX FIRE AUTHORITY

Date: **19 January 2006**

Title: **Integrated Risk Management Plan**

By: **Chief Fire Officer & Chief Executive**

Purpose of report: **To advise the Fire Authority of the outcome of the consultation process regarding the Annual Integrated Risk Management Plan 2006/07.**

RECOMMENDATION: The Fire Authority is asked to:

- a) note the attached report; and
- b) approve the draft Integrated Risk Management Plan 2006/07 for adoption with effect from 1 April 2006.

MAIN ISSUES

1. The Fire Authority received its draft Integrated Risk Management Plan (IRMP) 2006/07 at its meeting on 15 September 2005 (Agenda Item 924).
2. The Fire Authority has completed a public consultation exercise with regard to its draft IRMP 2006/07.
3. Overall, respondents are in favour of the draft Plan.
4. The Fire Authority is required to formally approve the 2006/07 Integrated Risk Management Plan for adoption with effect from 1 April 2006.

DES PRICHARD
CHIEF FIRE OFFICER & CHIEF EXECUTIVE
16 January 2006

Background Papers

Fire Authority - 15 September 2005; Modernisation & Improvement Panel – 5 January 2006.

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The ODPM issued guidance to all Fire Authorities in England and Wales with regard to the Integrated Risk Management process within Fire Service Circular 7/2003. This guidance has since been supplemented and clarified by a series of IRM Guidance Notes, following a consultation exercise by ODPM.
- 1.2 FSC 7/2003 advises each Authority to carry out the following steps:
- Appoint an IRM Practitioner, and nominate a Principal Officer to oversee the IRM process
 - To prepare an Annual Action Plan each year, by the end of October
 - To prepare a Strategic Plan
 - To commence a public consultation exercise on the contents of each Plan
 - To consider the response to the public consultation, to adjust the Plans as they see fit in the light of comments received, and adopt each Plan
 - To implement the Plans, commencing in April

2. MAIN MESSAGE FROM THE IRMP 2006/07

- 2.1 This IRMP continues the themes set in previous years – more focus on prevention, working with partners, considering more effective ways of providing a response to emergencies. It extends the previous work by setting a clear focus on risk from fires in the home, and road traffic collisions (RTCs), as these two categories account for the overwhelming majority of deaths and injuries (see P7 – 12 of the draft Plan as previously circulated – copies available on request from the Clerk).
- 2.2 The main focus is to, for the first time, use data to identify those people most at risk from fires in their homes. This information will be used to proactively target those most at risk, then assist those in the next lowest risk categories, and so on, until all groups have been addressed (see P13 and 14).
- 2.3 The Plan also considers speed of attendance.
- 2.3.1 It is proposed to attend 50% of dwelling fires within 8 minutes, and 90% within 13 minutes. This is the same as current times for RTCs (see P17).
- 2.3.2 Attendances to other incidents such as fire detection system activations and small fires such as rubbish alight will aim to be attended within 15 minutes (see P17).
- 2.4 Weight of attendance (the number of firefighters sent) is also considered.
- 2.4.1 As a result of a robust risk assessment, it has been decided that 7 firefighters are *sufficient* to implement a safe and effective system of work at both an RTC and a dwelling fire. We can only send 7 firefighters where they can arrive together (i.e. on a Maxicab), so we will send 2 pumps with at least 4 firefighters per vehicle.
- 2.4.2 Where we know at the time of call that there are persons trapped in a fire, we will send at least 8 personnel (see P18).
- 2.5 Cross-border working – we will respond to West Sussex proposals to change the crewing system at Shoreham, to ensure that community safety is maintained.
- 2.6 Heavy Rescue and Technical Rescue capabilities – we are investigating the best way of providing these services, as we review the costs and benefits of replacing the existing specialist vehicles that have come to the end of their planned life.

3. CONSULTATION

- 3.1 The Authority has conducted an extensive programme of consultation with regard to the draft IRMP. Some has been conducted in-house with Member and officer involvement, and some by an independent research company (Opinion Research Services, or ORS).
- 3.2 For the purpose of this report, the results will be divided into results provided by ORS, and feedback gathered from in-house activities. It is fair to say that generally, the responses received have ranged from neutral to positive – although there are a minority of staff with strongly held opposing views to some of the changes proposed within the draft IRMP.
- 3.3 The full text of the reports provided by ORS are attached as appendices to this report. They outline the results of the focus groups and the online questionnaire, and they give a good picture of both an in-depth subjective analysis, as well as a simplified objective questionnaire.
- 3.4 Focus Groups mentored by ORS
- 3.4.1 Opinion Research Services (ORS) organised and mentored four focus groups. A meeting was held in Crowborough, Eastbourne, Hastings and Hove using panel members invited by ORS. About two thirds of the panel members had been through this process in previous years, and about a third were new members.
- 3.4.2 For each of the questions posed by ORS (which correspond to the questionnaire within the draft IRMP) the panels were either neutral or expressed support. There was some specific concern at Hove about the implications of cross-border working.
- 3.5 Questionnaire analysed by ORS
- 3.5.1 ORS have distributed 5,000 questionnaires to a representative cross-section of residents and businesses in East Sussex and Brighton & Hove. They have also hosted an online version of the questionnaire.
- 3.5.2 The numerical analysis of the questionnaire results shows good support for the proposals within the IRMP.
- 3.6 Questionnaire responses received from partners / stakeholders (excluding staff)
- 3.6.1 Of the 441 questionnaires sent out, we received replies from 17 organisations / individuals who clearly identified themselves as non-employees. The consensus of these responses was supportive of the proposals within the IRMP.
- 3.7 Questionnaire responses received from staff
- 3.7.1 A total of 888 staff were sent a copy of the draft IRMP, and invited to respond. A total of 8 responses were received as either identifying themselves as employees, or it is reasonable to assume from the terminology within their response that they are employees. The average result from these responses is a neutral response, although there are a small number who appear actively opposed to any of the changes. Note that the FBU have submitted a single response on behalf of their membership this year (attached), rather than previous years when they have encouraged their membership to submit individual responses.

3.8 Staff meetings held at 4 sites

3.8.1 The Deputy Chief Fire Officer conducted a series of four staff meetings to both receive comments on, and discuss the contents of, the draft IRMP. A total of 66 staff attended, and a number of points were discussed and clarified at these meetings. These meetings were intended to encourage and facilitate informed debate, rather than seeking firm opinions on the proposals.

3.9 Specific station-based visits at 2 fire stations

3.9.1 Members of the IRM Team visited the two stations (Roedean and Eastbourne) who accepted the offer to attend any workplace and discuss the contents of the draft IRMP in more depth. At both visits, there were some initial reservations that the proposals were the 'thin end of the wedge', and that a hidden agenda exists no matter what appears within the IRMP. The Team were able to reassure the majority of members of staff, to varying degrees. Again, these meetings were intended to encourage and facilitate informed debate, rather than seeking firm opinions on the proposals.

3.10 Public meetings at 4 venues

3.10.1 It is fair to say that public turnout at these meetings was particularly low. This may represent lack of awareness of the meetings, general contentment with the service that we provide, or a more general lack of public engagement in consultations.

3.11 Media campaign

3.11.1 Press releases were sent to all of the usual media outlets that we use. Paid adverts inviting stakeholders to attend the Public Meetings were placed in the Evening Argus, Eastbourne Herald & Gazette, Brighton and Uckfield editions of the Leader, and the Hastings, St Leonards, Bexhill, Rye and Battle editions of the Observer.

The following appendices are attached -

Appendix A – Opinion Research Services (ORS) – Report of public focus groups held in December 2005

Appendix B – ORS – Cross-tabulations for ESFRS (*Report of survey / questionnaire responses*)

Appendix C – ORS – Text Responses for ESFRS (*Comments made as part of the survey / questionnaire responses*)

Appendix D – FBU response to draft IRMP

Appendix E – Summary of responses returned to ESFRS (*These are comments that were sent to ESFRS HQ by the stated deadline, not those returned to ORS*).

Opinion Research Services (ORS) – Report of public focus groups held in December 2005

SUMMARY

ORS was commissioned by ESFRS to facilitate and report four public focus group discussions about the draft IRMP Action Plan during December 2005.

ORS understood the key question being asked by the Fire Authority as being:

If stakeholders are made fully aware of the background to and arguments for the proposals, how convincing do they find them?

Focus groups were held with invited members of the public in:

Crowborough (7 participants)	Hove (10 participants)
Hastings (8 participants)	Eastbourne (10 participants)

Each of the four meetings had a diverse range of people – in terms of gender, age, social backgrounds, housing tenure and many other criteria.

Community Fire Safety

Overall it was generally agreed in all the group discussions that resources have to be directed to higher risk areas, providing specific local needs are recognised in the lower risk areas. i.e. where fires/incidents occur, vulnerable people are and where response times are typically slower.

Life and Non Life risk incidents

All discussion groups accepted that ESFRS should differentiate between life-risk and non life-risk incidents in order to to apply appropriate standards for speed and weight of response.

Speed of Response

Overall the response in all the groups was favourable to both the principle of distinguishing life and non life risk incidents and the actual response times proposed. Some however stressed there should be no complacency.

Weight of response

Regarding the weight of response to life-risk incidents, none of the groups objected to this proposal and ORS went on to state, “It is not an exaggeration to say that it was seen as a non-controversial operational decision.”

When participants were informed that ESFRS is proposing no longer to send extended rescue pumps to low-risk incidents, but to send standard appliances (unless they have to come from a more distant station), all the groups readily accepted the proposal as a reasonable use of limited resources.

Cross Border Working

The overall conclusion drawn by ORS was that the balance of opinion was marginally in favour of the proposals – though some of those directly affected (Hove) or who thought they might be affected in future (Crowborough) were distinctly unfavourable.

Opinion Research Services – Cross-tabulations for ESFRS
(Report of survey / questionnaire responses)

SUMMARY

<i>Do you agree or disagree with Proposal A to target community safety work in areas of highest risk?</i>		
	Agree	89%
	Neither agree nor disagree	6%
	Disagree	5%
<i>Do you agree or disagree with Proposal B to focus on dwelling fires and road traffic collisions?</i>		
	Agree	92%
	Neither agree nor disagree	5%
	Disagree	2%
<i>Do you agree or disagree with Proposal C to set new standards for the number of personnel attending dwelling fires and road traffic collision incidents?</i>		
	Agree	71%
	Neither agree nor disagree	15%
	Disagree	14%
<i>Do you agree or disagree with Proposal D to set new standards for the times in which a fire engine will arrive at dwelling fires?</i>		
	Agree	82%
	Neither agree nor disagree	12%
	Disagree	6%
<i>Overall, how well or poorly informed do you feel you are about East Sussex Fire Authority's Integrated Risk Management Plan (IRMP)?</i>		
	Well informed	37%
	Neither well nor poorly informed	26%
	Poorly informed	37%
<i>Would you like to have received any additional information regarding our IRMP?</i>		
	Yes	46%
	No	54%

N.B. 95% of respondents answered as residents of East Sussex or Brighton & Hove

Opinion Research Services – Text Responses for ESFRS
(Comments made as part of the survey / questionnaire responses)

FBU response to draft IRMP



FIRE BRIGADES UNION
South East Region
KENT SURREY EAST SUSSEX WEST SUSSEX

FBU Office,
Bohemia Road Fire Station,
Bohemia Road,
Hastings,
East Sussex.
TN34 1EX
Tel: 01323 462155
Fax: 01424 447700
Mobile: 07720 894677
E mail: steve.huggins@esfrs.org
steve.huggins@fbu.org.uk

20th December 2005

Brigade Secretary: Steve Huggins Brigade Chair: Mark Mitchell

Dear Combined Fire Authority Members,

Thank you for the 2006/2007 IRM Plan. The FBU would like to raise a number of initial comments as part of the consultation process, which will obviously continue through the agreed procedure for consultation and negotiation after the plan has been amended/adopted by the Fire Authority.

This year the FBU has not actively encouraged our members to reply individually to the plan, so could you accept these comments on behalf of our 520 members. We hope this will be given the weight it merits and is not dismissed as lightly as last years staff returns.

The language used within the document makes it difficult for us to follow, never mind a member of the public. The diagrams and charts should make it simpler to understand but the flow chart on page 12 is extremely hard to follow.

As the current position regarding speed and weight of response are not included in the document it is impossible for the general public to make a comparison let alone a reasoned judgement.

The biggest concerns for our members are the proposals relating to type, speed and weight of response.

Weight of Response

The first paragraph is misleading as it implies ESFRS sends the same resources to a rubbish fire on waste ground as a fire in a high rise residential building. This is patently not the case, the two extremes attract 4-6 firefighters (1 appliance) and 14-20 (3 appliances + 1 aerial appliance) respectively. ESFRS already use their resources effectively and efficiently.

The plan states that a crew of eight firefighters is sufficient to form a safe system of work for a dwelling fire with 'persons reported' inside. National good practice states that a crew of eight is an insufficient resource to deploy a second breathing apparatus team, which are frequently needed when searching and firefighting is required. In the case of an emergency or a larger premise when a second BA team was needed, it would not be possible to implement a safe system of work with less than nine firefighters.

The FBU are concerned with the situation of two appliances being sent to an incident where there is a significant interval between the arrival of the first and second appliance. In this scenario it is not safe to affect rescues, deal with the fire or start the extrication of a casualty as there often would be only 4 crew members available at the time. At incidents where there will be a significant time lag (over 3 minutes) there will be a situation where 4 crew members could be trying to undertake the roles of 5 or 6 personnel.

For example the pump operator would have to

1. Operate the pump and observe the gauges and users for safety.
2. Ensure the supply of water to the appliance and if necessary locate a hydrant and connect by hose to the appliance.
3. Send and receive radio messages.
4. Annotate the Breathing Apparatus Entry Control board and related calculations. National good practice recommends this as the sole responsibility of a designated person.
5. Administer first aid or resuscitation to any casualty rescued from the incident.
6. Control members of public who may hinder operational action.

We do not feel that this is realistic within a safe system of work, and although it is accepted that these may not all occur together 1-4 will happen regularly.

The FBU can provide evidence from a firefighting crew that were placed in that situation. Due to professional pride and the societal pressure and expectation of the on-looking members of the public the crew deliberately went against the accepted norms to try and affect a rescue. There were only four crew members available and a significant delay until the second appliance arrived. There is no specific guidance as to what can and cannot be achieved safely by a crew of four; this is left to the individual Officer to decide. The FBU have been raising this concern for some time and we hope that ESFRS will start work on defining the safe actions possible with a crew of four.

Speed of Response

The FBU are concerned that these targets are not challenging. We accept that a starting point has got to be made but would like an assurance that this is going to be monitored closely and adjustments made quickly if we are meeting the target comfortably.

There is no mention within the plan that for a significant number of residents that their speed or response is being reduced by three minutes. It is accepted that there will be an improvement for others but for consultation purposes you should give the public the existing standards. It is impossible to make a reasoned judgement without both sides of the story.

The FBU were surprised that there is not a clear standard for automatic fire detection calls to premises with a sleeping risk. It appears, after checking, that these will be treated as life threatening calls and attract the faster attendance target. We feel that this should have been made clear in the document.

Type of Response

The FBU agree with the principle of sending the appropriate appliance to non-life threatening incidents, indeed this already happens on the majority of fire stations. There are a number of anomalies within East Sussex, for example Hastings (which has two Extended Rescue Pumps and one Water Tender) and Roedean (one ERP) which do not fit in with these proposals. If the plan said that 'the Service would send a Water Tender to non life threatening incidents where there was a choice, but it would always be the closest appliance' it would be clear in what it meant. Our concern is that any move away from sending the nearest appliance would result in delays and even 'stacking' of non life threatening calls. This seems to be implied in the final paragraph, albeit in the future. We do not believe this would be what the public want or a good use of your/our resources.

ESFRS states in this plan that 'we can mobilise our fleet of 35 front-line appliances'. It doesn't mention that a significant number of these appliances are unavailable at any time. There are still big gaps in the availability of retained appliances with often 6 to 10 appliances without sufficient crews to respond during the day.

The footnote to the page is also misleading as although there the standards originated in the 1930s they were reviewed in 1985.

Prioritising of CFS Initiatives

The FBU support these risk based proposals.

Cross County Working

The FBU have concerns about the area that Hove will be asked to cover if the West Sussex Fire and Rescue Service IRMP is implemented as proposed. It will have a significant impact on fire cover within the City, and we have seen no contingency plan if this were to come into force. We appreciate that until the WSFRS plan is decided there is nothing concrete that can be done, but we feel there should have been a review of the impact of such a change. This should include fire cover arrangements for the City, cost to the tax payers and should be debated by the CFA so representation can be made to West Sussex FRS.

Community Fire Safety Activities

The FBU supports the activities but would raise concerns over the costs some may incur, especially in times of such financial restraint.

There is much in this plan that FBU members endorse and support, but we would ask that you consider the points we have raised above. The Health and Safety of FRS personnel is critical to us and we're sure to the Officers and CFA Members. As professionals we consider that eight firefighters attending a dwelling fire or road traffic collision will be limited to its actions if it is to maintain a safe system of work, especially in the early stages when only four will be available.

If there is any more information you require please feel free to contact us.

Yours sincerely,

Steve Huggins – Brigade FBU Secretary 07720 984677

Mark Mitchell – Brigade FBU Chair 07905 866024

Summary of responses returned to ESFRS

(These are comments that were sent to ESFRS HQ by the stated deadline, not those returned to ORS).

The full text of each of the responses returned to ESFRS are included below. They have been grouped by Organisations, and Employees or Not Stated. An average score for each group is given, using the following scale -

- 5 – Strongly Agree
- 4 – Agree
- 3 – Neither Agree nor Disagree
- 2 – Disagree
- 1 – Strongly Disagree

The average response from Organisations was Agree to all 3 questions, and from those who are employees (or did not state) was Neither Agree nor Disagree

Note that postcodes have been truncated to the first 4 digits for those who did not declare themselves as representing an organisation, to help preserve anonymity.

Serial No.	Employee/ Non E	Town	Postcode	M /F	Pri/ Org	Name of Org	Q 1	Q 2	Q 3	Comments Q1	Comments Q2	Comments Q3	Other Comments Q4
1	N	Burgess Hill	RH15 9DS		O	Sussex Enterprise	4	4	4				Strongly endorse focus on safety of business premises, including response times and assistance with staff knowledge of fire safety to aid in security of business sites and premises
6	N	Lewes		M	O	ESCC Childcare Services	5	4	4	Very informative			The plan could further develop the amount of proactive education work done
8	N	Uckfield	TN22 3SP	M	O	Fletching PC	4	4	4				You provide an excellent service within the funding at your disposal.

9	N	Sedlescombe		F	O	Sedlescombe PC	5	4	4				There is some concern that the use of regionally-based urban search and rescue capability could put some areas at greater risk because of their greater distance from the facility. However, if this is a facility that is not often used, it is probably not cost-effective to have more local capability. Is there sufficient capability if simultaneous terrorist attacks were made on several towns across the region?
11	N	South Chailey			O	Chailey PC	5	5	5				We understand 1) that response to 'border' areas such as Chailey may be from East or West Sussex as circumstances dictate. 2) that South Chailey is seen as the greater focus for Community Fire Safety but that any household or institution may request a Home Safety Visit. 3) We shall inform the Trustees of the Village Hall in case they wish to have a survey before they begin their programme of refurbishment.
12	N	Herstmonceux	BN27 4JX	M	O	Herstmonceux PC	4	5	5		To deploy your firefighters where statistically they are most needed makes complete sense (really comments to Q3)		
13	N	Firle	BN8 6LI	M	O	Firle PC	4	4	4				
14	N	Ringmer	BN8 5QH		O	Ringmer PC	4	3	4	Found the action plan somewhat long.	I feel I cannot answer this question as there is no information about previous response times. Is it improving or deteriorating?		The report is very nicely produced which I applaud. I wonder whether the same clarity could have been achieved at less expense.

16	N	Bells Yew Green	TN3 9AT	M	O	Bells Yew Green Society	3	3	3	The plan is clearly presented but is difficult to appraise in the absence of skilled professional knowledge and experience of a reader. We lack that professional knowledge and skills.	The proposal appears reasonable in principle but the actual times are a matter for professional judgement of firefighters. We would be concerned if the proposed speed of response were longer than the existing speed of response for this area - see our covering letter dated 6th Dec 05 (inserted into other comments box)	This is also a matter for professional judgement of firefighters.	I am returning the completed questionnaire. Our treasurer and myself have studied the consultation document. Whilst the content is relatively easy to follow, we found the detail difficult to be appraised by laymen with no professional knowledge of firefighters' duties - e.g. how many people are required for a callout? What length of time is required for them to get to an incident? Consequently we can neither agree nor disagree and ticked that box. We suggest it is unfair and unreasonable to expect the public to be able to respond with yes or no. In view of this we ask that you remove the Bells Yew Green Society from your list of consultees. Bells Yew green is located in the Northern part of east Sussex. We are just three miles from Tunbridge Wells, Kent. We have heard that the number of firefighters at Tunbridge Wells may be reduced by 40%. This is alarming to us because we have also been led to believe that the cover we enjoy from Kent may well be withdrawn. We greatly appreciate the service you both provide.
17	N	Crowborough	TN6 1DY	M	O	Barcombe PC	4	4	3	Section on 'Weight of Response' (page 18, paragraphs 3-7) is confusing and unclear.	Arrangements appear adequate including provision for 'doubtful' cases.	We find the statements in this Section to be confusing and lacking clarity. Is the Fire Authority saying that 90% of dwelling fires and RTCs can be coped with using only their 3 maxicabs? Are these located uniformly	As stated in the past, we have a particular interest in the Retained Station at Barcombe Cross and would be concerned over the implementation of any proposal that would affect that present fully operational Station. In 2004 we forwarded our reservations over the high level of use of the Barcombe crew to support other stations and indicated our particular

													throughout the county ? What is the role of the non-maxicab appliances ?	concern that such use could lead to a diminution of Fire Service cover in this part of the Lewes District. As the data in the ESFA Best Value Performance Plan 2005/06 show continuation of the same level of this type of support by the Barcombe Station, we repeat our concerns. Furthermore, we would be obliged if the Fire Authority gave consideration to this point and responded to the Parish Council.
18	N	Piltdown	TN22 3XB	F	O	Soroptimist International	2	4	3	Too many abbreviations are used requiring glossary referral. An inside knowledge of the emergency services helped but members of the general public may find it hard going.	Providing that safeguards are in place to ensure that each incident is not life threatening.	Only fire service personnel can effectively judge this, lay persons do not have sufficient data or experience to give a reasoned answer.	We support prevention & education proposals. However, if all members of the public know that they could request a home inspection your costs would steeply incline. This is obviously a cost cutting exercise not only relating to staff but also equipment. No details of figures for staff level overall are given nor detailed savings mentioned. e.g. non-replacement of HRU in Uckfield only improved Extended Rescue Pumps.	
21	N	Worthing		F	O	Environment Agency	4	4	4	Document and website are excellent, very user friendly and easy to navigate around.	This makes good sense although reliant on initial assessment being accurate.		None	
Average score for Organisations							<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>					
							<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>					
2	E	Peacehaven	BN10 7	M			1	3	3	Have no faith in what you plan because they are purely cost driven	Have no faith in what you plan because they are purely cost driven		What is the point of asking me as a firefighter when you ignore our opinions and I have been banned from writing to councillor Murphy regarding IRMPs because he has no credible answers to the points I raise	

3	E	Falmer	BN1 9	F			5	4	5				Consideration of response times/access to my address. Considerable student parking makes my property inaccessible to emergency vehicles. Parking scheme refused which could assist. If football stadium is given permission this will be worsened (decision expected 31/10/05). Officers may need to consider for emergency response purposes.
4	E	Hove	BN3 5	M			2	2	2	Sounded more like a solicitors letter with all the abbreviations etc. a lot of words = cutbacks. Why was every firefighter issued with one of these glossy drafts? Surely one or two per watch was sufficient, what a waste of money (tax payers)	Very dangerous to differentiate between types of calls. 15 mins for an AFD! That 0.5% when firefighting is required could be critical again cutbacks, lives at risk.	Again cutting down on crew strength. Surely the more firefighters available at the initial stages of a fire the better, less FFs, the more risks they will have to take, working with %s and fires don't work, less FFs more danger to them and the public.	P 36 Progress items. Is it really modernisation to get rid of a turntable ladder when there are more and more high rise buildings being built and proposed builds in the Brighton/Hove district? Eight jobs saved? 8 jibs gone, one aerial ladder gone, cutbacks, savings again lives of FFs and public at risk. Bank Holiday & night time working. How many people do you know would like a smoke detector fitted on Xmas Day at 1.00AM etc. Shift pattern review. What is wrong with the current pattern, it is by far the most family friendly pattern there is, ask any FF. Change for changes sake.
5	E	Seaford	BN25 2	F			5	4	4				
10	E	Lewes	BN7 1	M			4	1	1	I understand that an IRMP needs to be done but with more houses being built and more traffic on the road we are eventually going to be going to more incidents. People do have misfortunes resulting in having to	It has been proved time and again that AFAs can be life threatening (Grand & Royal Albion Hotels) for example. Both calls were AFAs. Also been to a number of calls which turned out to be persons reported.	Totally disagree. Agree in part that it don't take many to extinguish rubbish fires but if redeployed to a larger incident do you intend to return to station first to collect increased manpower? Any RTC/house fire requires at least 2-3 appliances to	Looks very good on paper but in reality more pressure & stress on fire fighters & crew commanders at incidents. No two fire calls/RTCs are the same. Why change something that works well only to see if things get worse? Who will be accountable when things go wrong & firefighters get killed or badly injured?

									call out the fire service.		deal with all the different jobs required. By the time made up and awaiting on coming crews to attend people will die/badly injured & increased pressures on fire fighters.	
7	Not stated					2	3	1	There is a lot of political jargon meant to confuse. How much money did it cost to produce this document?		Sending 1 fire appliance to fire alarm commercial calls is ridiculous. Also the ALP should be included on initial calls, having to wait for such a vehicle in an emergency will cost lives.	Reducing the number of firefighters going to certain calls will put greater strain on firefighters in stressful situations. This could put the public at risk. ESFA I believe are after cuts, cuts & more cuts in the fire service.
15	Not stated					4	4	4	The general public are not made aware enough of the existence of this document & are therefore unable to give their opinion on the matter	Providing that (if in any doubt then it will be assumed that the incident IS life-threatening) this ruling is strictly adhered to	Because further backup can be made available if required	I strongly disagree with the intention to change the call centres as operated at present, to a county control centre, I believe local knowledge is of the utmost value & that response time will be at risk. I also disagree with the proposed changes for Shoreham Station, it is an area of some high risk industrial sites, together with residential properties & this could put the people of Shoreham & the people of Hove at risk by not having 24 hour cover and I would ask why should E Sussex subsidise W Sussex? In short why change a good fire & rescue service that already works well ?

19	Not stated	Wadhurst	TN5 6	M		2	3	4	It would have been clear if plain English had been used to produce the 40 page document. While free use has been made of the words ' evaluate, commitment and consider outcome' no positive undertaking is made to take action and do anything.	Page 18 Paragraph 1 (one) deserves re-writing
20	Not stated	Wadhurst	TN5 6	M		3	3	4		
Average score for Non-Organisations						<u>3.</u>	<u>3.</u>	<u>3.</u>		
						<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>		

