



## **Annex 3 - Consultation report**

1	Executive Summary .....	2
2	Context .....	3
3	Methodology .....	3
4	Analysis .....	5
4.1	Survey.....	5
4.2	Equality & Diversity sections .....	9
4.3	Public meeting.....	11
4.4	Neighbourhood Panel.....	11
4.5	Banstead library event.....	12
4.6	Meeting with Representatives of Reigate and Banstead Residents Associations ..	12
4.7	Staff meetings / feedback .....	12
4.8	Union response .....	13
4.9	Councils and Committees.....	13
4.10	Other feedback.....	14
4.11	Media coverage.....	15
5	Key findings .....	16
6	Next steps.....	17

### Appendix

- A. Equality and Diversity analysis
- B. Consultation and communications summary
- C. Data analysis



## 1 Executive Summary

Surrey Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS) intends to relocate a fire engine from Epsom into the north of Reigate and Banstead, to create a chain of four mutually supportive single fire engine stations throughout the boroughs of Reigate and Banstead (R&B) and Epsom and Ewell (Epsom, north R&B, Reigate and Salfords). This is to improve the balance of service provision across Surrey and improve the provision and use of property, in accordance with the Public Safety Plan (PSP).

Since Surrey County Council Cabinet's approval of these plans (March 2013), SFRS have been looking to expand the search area for a suitable location outside of the Burgh Heath area. This consultation gathered stakeholders' feedback on extending the search area to within a three miles radius of the Burgh Heath area including the Banstead area.

Consultation on this proposal ran from 16 December 2013 to 27 January 2014 and members of the public, staff, councillors, MPs, community groups, businesses and partners were invited to provide us with their feedback.

Over 310 responses were received from numerous channels including public meeting, surveys and questionnaires, email feedback and formal responses, staff briefing, Police neighbourhood panel, and a library event.

Having had more nuanced and detailed feedback at meetings and through letters, we found that in this case it was not sound to collate data on support levels from all strands to produce an overall result. However, the survey's support levels were as follows:

- Supportive: 61%
- Unsure: 22%
- Opposed: 14%
- No opinion: 3%

Reigate and Banstead residents and community groups tended to support the proposal, however with the caveat that a suitable long-term solution is to be found, because a potential site in Banstead High Street would suffer from traffic congestion which would impede the quick passage of a fire engine. There were also some concerns about the safety of young children (and residents in general) in the Banstead area and disruption through noise pollution. Groups that did not support the proposal mirrored the concerns, but were not satisfied with having a temporary scenario for fear that it might be in place longer than planned. They asked SFRS to continue to the search for an ideal site in the original Burgh Heath area.

Epsom and Ewell stakeholders were less positive about the move, indicating their unease about the increase in incident response times for their borough, which already has areas to the north where response times are relatively high. Most sought to revisit the decision to move a second pump, move a pump closer to north Epsom and Ewell, or again to extend the search to find a location in the ideal area.

The most frequently mentioned suggestions for sites by residents and community groups were the Ambulance Station (Horseshoe) and Bosnor Drive, areas which have quick access to the A217 and are not set in a residential area.



## 2 Context

In 2011 Surrey Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS) created their Public Safety Plan (PSP) outlining 12 outcomes to be achieved by 2020. These include improving the balance of service provision across Surrey and improving the provision and use of property.

In order to create a more balanced service provision across the Epsom and Ewell and Reigate and Banstead areas, as well as addressing the relocation of the West Sussex fire engine from Horley, Surrey County Council (SCC) Cabinet approved *“the proposals for the improved deployment of single fire engine fire stations running through the boroughs of Epsom & Ewell and Reigate & Banstead, including the delivery of two new fire stations in Salfords and the Burgh Heath area”* on 26 March 2013.<sup>1</sup>

The outcome should result in the first fire engine reaching emergencies more quickly on average than they do now and should minimise the impact on the Surrey response standard. Also, it reduces the impact of the refurbishment work at Purley Fire Station to start from September 2014.

The proposals were based on numerous pieces of evidence including costing, response time modelling, an Equality Impact Assessment and public consultation feedback, where 42% supported the plan and 32% opposed it (see Annexes of Cabinet Report for more details).<sup>1</sup>

Since the Cabinet’s decision SFRS have been exploring options outside of the Burgh Heath area, including in Banstead (two miles away from the optimal location).

This consultation explored stakeholders’ views on this approach, making it clear that the decision to relocate a fire engine from Epsom was not being reviewed. It asked if stakeholders supported the extension of the search area by three miles including Banstead as a possible location. The consultation material included a map and an amended emergency response time table (using a Banstead scenario for illustration).

This report summarises the results of the six-week consultation undertaken between December 2013 and January 2014.

## 3 Methodology

The decision to move a fire engine out of Epsom into the north of Reigate and Banstead Borough had already been approved in March 2013. The change in the approved location meant that this consultation mainly emulated the original consultation undertaken earlier 2012/13 in terms of stakeholders and consultation methods (for original consultation report, see Annex 2 of Cabinet Report)<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> <http://mycouncil.surreycc.gov.uk/documents/s5024/item%2013%20-%20Emergency%20Cover%20EE%20RB.pdf>;  
<http://mycouncil.surreycc.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=120&MId=2695&Ver=4> (see 59/13)



The scope of the consultation issue (change in location of the new fire station by around three miles), as well as the time pressures associated with property acquisition and service plan, meant that this consultation ran from 16 December 2013 to 27 January 2014. While the timescale of this consultation (six weeks) falls within the government's current guidance of 2-12 weeks,<sup>2</sup> we were aware that this did not match our usual standard of 12 weeks. However, we believe that this is proportionate to the issue we were consulting about and are mindful that the overall decision to move a fire engine out of Epsom into a new fire station located in the wider area of Burgh Heath had already been approved by SCC Cabinet in March 2013.

As previously, all nine protected characteristics, as stipulated in the Equality Act 2010, had been considered in the consultation plan. We refreshed the stakeholder plan and sought advice and support from the directorate's Equality and Cohesion Officer. As a result, a comprehensive consultation and communications plan was established to target those who are likely to be most affected by the proposals, such as Resident Associations in north Reigate and Banstead and care homes. We used a mix of quantitative and qualitative research methods, as well as a range of communication channels to gather the views of our stakeholders (see Appendix B for consultation summary). This included:

Direct contact:

- Presentation at Tadworth neighbourhood panel meeting (through Surrey Police)
- Pop-up stand at Banstead library
- Public meeting in Ewell's Bourne Hall
- Face to face briefings for staff at Reigate and Epsom fire stations
- Informal meeting of Reigate & Banstead Local Committee
- Meeting with Epsom and Ewell Borough Council Chief Executive
- Meeting with representatives of Reigate and Banstead Residents Associations
- Meeting with Fire Brigades Union

Print:

- Postal questionnaires to 128 care homes in Epsom and Ewell and Reigate and Banstead
- Letters and emails to approx 250 stakeholders, including partner agencies (e.g. Police, NHS, Ambulance), Voluntary Community Faith Sector (VCFS) organisations, Resident Associations, ORS Resident Panel members, Surrey Members of Parliament and County Council, Borough Council and Parish Council Elected Members including all Surrey Local Committees.
- Distribution of consultation material through the External Equality Advisory Group, borough councils' community officers' mailing lists and business associations.
- Informal brief for Communities Select Committee and Reigate and Banstead Local Committee
- Advertisement of our consultation through posters sent to 206 outlets including libraries, community centres, the Hubs in Redhill and Epsom, Citizens Advice Bureaux, schools, churches, fire stations and post offices

---

<sup>2</sup> [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/255180/Consultation-Principles-Oct-2013.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/255180/Consultation-Principles-Oct-2013.pdf)



- Consultation featured in Communities Select Committee bulletin and SFRS staff magazine
- Advertisement of consultation through SCC central News and Media team, R&B and E&E Borough Council communications officers which featured in local papers (see 4.11 Media coverage)

On-line:

- On-line survey for residents, businesses, partner agencies, staff and Members (using email invites to ORS panel<sup>3</sup>, R&B and E&E mailing lists, Business mailing list, EEAG member mailing list<sup>4</sup>)
- Consultation featured on SCC website and SFRS website, social media (SFRS Twitter / Facebook feeds, Surrey Police Twitter, Surrey Libraries Twitter) and eMembers Room in R&B Borough Council

#### 4 Analysis

The consultation received feedback items from 312 individuals and representative groups, through surveys, workshops, emails and calls, formal responses from Local Committees.

	Survey		PSP email / calls / letters / formal responses		Meetings		TOTAL	
Residents / businesses	202	87.1%	3	1.3%	27	11.6%	232	74.4%
Councillors / MPs	4	44.4%	3	33.3%	2	22.2%	9	2.9%
SFRS Staff	11	57.9%	0	0.0%	8	42.1%	19	6.1%
Community group representatives	9	21.4%	6	14.3%	27	64.3%	42	13.5%
Partners	6	85.7%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	7	2.2%
Other	3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	1.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>75.3%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>4.2%</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>20.5%</b>	<b>312</b>	

See Appendix C for full listing and analysis.

#### 4.1 Survey

- There were 235 responses, of which 24 were postal returns and 211 surveys were answered on-line. Response rate is hard to gauge, because invites were distributed to an unknown number of people from various partner agencies' mailing lists.
- The respondent groups were distributed as follows:

Member of the public	182	77%
Representative of a business	20	9%
Member of Surrey Fire and Rescue Service staff	11	5%

<sup>3</sup> ORS – external research organisation used for previous consultation on Public Safety Plan in 2011.

<sup>4</sup> EEAG – External Equalities Advisory Group (Surrey-wide network of organisations representing people with protected characteristics)



Member of Surrey County Council staff other than Surrey Fire and Rescue Service	3	1%
Partner agency, for example NHS, Police, other FRS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leonard Cheshire Disability</li> <li>Ex London Fire Brigade Officer (34 years) stationed at Sutton and Mitcham</li> <li>Surrey Fire Volunteer</li> <li>Three did not state what partner agency they belong to</li> </ul>	6	3%
Representative of a community group: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chairman, Chipstead Residents' Association</li> <li>Banstead Residents Association. Committee Member.</li> <li>Banstead District Federation of Residents' Associations</li> <li>2 members of College Ward Residents Association</li> <li>Tattenhams Residents' Association</li> <li>Woodmansterne Green Belt &amp; Residents Association</li> <li>Save Our Services in Surrey</li> <li>Epsom and Ewell Liberal Democrat</li> </ul>	9	4%
Elected Members: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EEBC Cuddington Ward</li> <li>Ewell Court, Auriol and Cuddington</li> <li>Borough Councillor, Nork Ward</li> <li>Nork &amp; Tattenhams, Surrey CC Tattenhams, Reigate &amp; Banstead BC</li> </ul>	4	2%
	<b>235</b>	

- 79% of respondents came from Reigate and Banstead and 15% from Epsom and Ewell. 5% came from outside the two boroughs, but in close proximity (Mole Valley, Sutton).
- 95% of respondents value or strongly value the SFRS. Only 3% stated that they were unsure, and 2% did not value the service (all residents from Reigate and Banstead). This high regard was mirrored in the general comments section at the end.
- 19 respondents said that they had contact with the SFRS because of a fire incident in the last three years (6%), and 21 respondents had a Home Fire Safety visit (7%). The main contact point, as staff and partners also completed the survey, was in a professional capacity (10%). 64% of residents had not had any contact with the service.
- Out of the 216 respondents that provided an answer, 61% agreed with the proposal. 22% were not sure and 14% rejected the proposal. Only 3% stated that they held no opinion. The level of support for this proposal, by respondent group, was:

	SFRS staff		Public (residents and businesses)					
			R&B		E&E		Total	
Yes	5	45%	106	71%	8	31%	116	63%
Not sure	5	45%	26	17%	6	23%	35	19%
No	1	9%	14	9%	11	42%	27	15%
No opinion	0	0%	4	3%	1	4%	6	3%



	Community Representatives / Councillors					
	R&B		E&E		Total	
Yes	3	43%	2	40%	5	38%
Not sure	3	43%	1	20%	5	38%
No	1	14%	2	40%	3	23%
No opinion	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

	Partners		SCC staff		TOTAL – All respondents	
Yes	3	60%	2	67%	131	61%
Not sure	1	20%	1	33%	47	22%
No	0	0%	0	0%	31	14%
No opinion	1	20%	0	0%	7	3%

Summary:

	SFRS staff		Residents, community representatives and councillors						Others		TOTAL	
			R&B		E&E		Other					
Yes	5	45.5%	109	69.4%	10	32.3%	2	22.2%	5	62.5%	131	60.6%
Not sure	5	45.5%	29	18.5%	7	22.6%	4	44.4%	2	25.0%	47	21.8%
No	1	9.1%	15	9.6%	13	41.9%	2	22.2%	0	0.0%	31	14.4%
No opinion	0	0.0%	4	2.5%	1	3.2%	1	11.1%	1	12.5%	7	3.2%

- Councillors, community representatives and residents from Epsom and Ewell were the strongest **opponents** of the proposal (42%). The main points of objection were as follows (the percentage signifies the occurrence of the theme amongst the 54 comments received to that question):
  1. Increase in response times for some residents (refers to original decision to move Epsom appliance) (37%)
  2. Traffic congestion on Banstead High Street (four schools, two supermarkets), higher risk of road traffic accidents would make this a less suitable area for a potential new fire station (20%)
  3. Site with better access to A217 must be secured (20%)
  4. Cost of move / justification for moving relatively short distance between Epsom and north Reigate and Banstead (15%)
  5. Questions about the exact location (7%)
- The strongest **supporters** of the proposals were Reigate and Banstead residents and business owners (69% support), who mainly endorsed the plan to move a fire station into the north of their borough, as response times in the area would improve. However, amongst supporters of the proposal, concerns were raised about not being told the exact location and congestion around a potential site in Banstead.
- Some verbatim to reflect the conflicting views (please note that the survey did not explicitly ask why respondents supported this proposal):



"Good idea as locally we have no immediate access to fire engines."  
"As a resident in Woodmansterne it would be more reassuring knowing there is a fire station near by"  
"I think this is a great idea."  
"This proposal seems eminently sensible to achieve a better and more even response time for all residents in the area."



"There have been numerous call-outs to the northern parts of Epsom and Ewell and there has recently been a big fire in this area. To increase the response time of a second vehicle by so many minutes is irresponsible."  
"I dont think the high traffic levels and frequent congestion problems caused, make the high street in banstead a suitable location for a fire station. The congetnsion is very often so bad there would not be any room for vehicles to move out of the way of a fire engine."  
"Not sure the residents of Epsom and Ewell will like this, bit of a raw deal seeing as Banstead is a quiet village."

- There were four mentions of specific location suggestions throughout the survey: the old Ambulance Station (Horseshoe) (2) and Bonsor Drive (2), Other suggestions included: reversing the original decision to move a pump from Epsom (5 mentions), keep two pumps in Epsom while securing a new station in north R&B (2 mentions), raise council tax to keep current service level (one mention).
- 8 in 10 respondents said that we explained the proposals clearly. Of those 42 respondents that requested more clarification, the main demand was for more details on the actual location of a new fire station (52%). Other comments revolved around a more interactive map (10%) and questions about crewing and operation of the new station (10%). Further investigation into a possible link between lack of understanding and any protected characteristics (old age, disability, ethnicity (language)) produced no significant findings. 22% of those that said to have a disability, 9% of those with other than White British origin and 23% of over 65 year olds said that the proposal was not clearly explained, compared to an overall figure of 19%. There were no explanations on why the proposal was unclear that linked explicitly to any of the protected characteristics, confirming the conclusion that the perceived lack of clarity was mainly caused by a lack of specific information.
- 35% of respondents heard about the consultation through Facebook and Twitter (for residents it was 40%). The other major channel for residents was through a local group or forum (20%), direct contact from SFRS (16%) and through the local media (11%). Councillors and staff mainly found out about the consultation through direct contact.
- There were 49 general comments at the end of the survey, which mainly included support for proposal (22%), praise for the SFRS as a valued and essential service provider (18%), and comments about poor publicity of the consultation (10%).





## 4.2 Equality & Diversity sections

### E&D survey results

Overall 193 respondents gave at least one answer to questions listed in the Equality and Diversity section (82%). Resident respondents were slightly more middle-aged, white and female than the population make up of Epsom and Ewell and Reigate and Banstead. Looking at the responses from the individual sub-groups, no difference in attitude could be discerned, either because they reflected the average result or because the sample size was too small to be statistically representative.

See detailed tables for section below in Appendix A

### **Age:**

The distribution of age groups amongst the survey's residents sample is slightly more centred on the age groups of 25-44 and 45-64, and is not representative of the overall spread of the population that was eligible for consultation participation (15+ years old).

Looking at the level of support from older age groups (those of 65+ of age are at higher risk of fire death/injury), there was no significant difference (15% opposed the proposal as supposed to 14% generally).

Some issues were raised about children in terms of road safety and noise disruption:

*"Putting a fire Station in Banstead itself as opposed to Burgh Heath is a bad idea as traffic will reduce response times and be a danger to high concentration of pedestrians especially children. [..]"* Member of the public, R&B

*"Added noise impact with young children in house."* Member of the public, R&B

Also, we received 16 completed questionnaires from care home managers. The majority of those (75%) supported the proposal and made no comment in relation to their vulnerable residents, other than:

*"They [SFRS] are very important to us in the caring area - fire audits to keep our service users safe"*

### **Disability:**

Mobility issues and mental health issues are known to be fire risk factors. Looking at the 18 respondents stating to have a disability, we can say that their level of support is not significantly deviates from non-disabled support levels (12% opposed the proposal, compared to 14% overall).

### **Gender:**

Females are more at risk of injury or death by fire.<sup>5</sup> The survey was completed by more women than men, which is roughly representative of the boroughs. In terms of support, men seemed less negative of the proposal (10%). Women had a slightly higher objection rate, but without making any reference to their sex (13%)

<sup>5</sup> Community Risk Profile, 2011-12



### **Ethnicity:**

We know that the majority of those suffering injuries or death through fire are White British. In the survey, 92% of those that stated their ethnicity was White British (which is above the average for R&B and E&E population, 81%). Thirteen respondents stated they were not White British, including Irish, other White background, Black / Black British, Asian / Asian British, Chinese, Sri Lankan and Mauritian. This group had no objection to the proposal at all.

### **Religion:**

The majority of respondents classed themselves as Christian (65%, average for R&B and E&E is 62%). 31% said they had no religion (average for E&E & R&B is 25%). Two respondents were Buddhist, two Jewish, one Muslim, one Humanist and one Hindu. There were no Sikh respondents amongst the sample. It was a small sub-group, so while 29% of the non-Christian faith group objected the proposal, it was only two respondents and no religious-specific comments were made.

### **Marital status:**

Single occupancy is known to be a fire risk factor. Hence, looking at the 22 respondents stating to be single, divorced, separated and widowed, we can say that their level of support does not deviate significantly from the overall results (9%).

### **LGB:**

Five of 153 respondents giving an answer to this question stated to be lesbian, gay or bisexual. The level of support split into 60% supportive and 20% unsupportive (20% held no opinion). However, it was only a very small sample, which makes this data non-conclusive. The verbatim had no reference to sexuality or any other lifestyle choice associated with this protected characteristic (single occupancy, risk of crime hate, etc).

### **Pregnancy / maternity:**

Six respondents stated that they had had a baby in the last 12 months or were pregnant. 4 of those support the proposal (67%), there were no comments by the maternity sub-group that referred to their protected status particularly.

### **Gender reassignment:**

Three respondents (2% of those that replied to this question) stated that they had undergone gender reassignment, which is well above the national average of 0.1% (GIREs). There were no particular comments that referred to their transgender status or associated risks.

### Other feedback relating to vulnerable adults and high risk groups

The Empowerment Board Mid Surrey and External Equalities Advisory Group were invited to comment on the proposal but submitted no response.



### 4.3 Public meeting

The SFRS organised a public meeting on 9 January 2014 and was publicised, along the consultation website, in 200 outlets, including libraries, community centres, churches, schools, post offices. The event was also publicised in the survey and through social media sites, Twitter and Facebook. County and local Members were also briefed on the event so that they could raise it with their constituents. Overall, 17 people confirmed their attendance and 35 wanted to 'maybe' come. On the evening, 11 people attended, amongst them 2 local councillors, one representative of the Banstead Village Residents Association, one representative of the Federation of Banstead Residents Associations. The SFRS gave a presentation, collected feedback and replied to questions. Points that were discussed included:

- Purley's temporary removal of the fire appliance from September 2014 and its impact on north R&B as a factor for the timescales
- Timescales between Cabinet approval and move in date are tight (new location might be a temporary solution)
- Partnership work with the London Fire Brigade (process and cost of securing support)
- Reason for extending search from optimal location in Burgh Heath to Banstead area
- Previous commitment to a fire station requiring access to the A217
- Traffic congestion in Banstead High Street as a major delaying factor. Doubts that modelling times are therefore realistic.
- Costing of a new station (extra costing for crewing; assurance that funds are available; imbalance of capital and revenue budget)
- Impact of an incident on the M25
- Criticism around the publicity, the location of the venue

While some attendees generally supported a move of the fire appliance into north R&B, participants from Epsom and Ewell were less positive, raising their concerns about the increase in response times, especially for the second appliance.

A transcript of the meeting, alongside responses to questions raised, was shared with all attendees that left their contact details.

### 4.4 Neighbourhood Panel

As part of the consultation, a SFRS officer presented the proposal at a Tadworth Neighbourhood Panel meeting, organised by Surrey Police, in December 2013. Fifteen members of the public attended and the general points raised were:

- Where will it be?
- Do you have enough money to build a new fire station (i.e. have the capital costs been accounted for?)
- Won't staffing be more difficult at two locations compared to one location?
- What about the traffic congestion in the area? Makes it more difficult for your attendance times?
- Parking in the area is a problem, how will fire engines be able to get through?
- When will it be built by / when will you move in?
- What will you do with the site at Epsom, its too big for one fire engine?



#### **4.5 Banstead library event**

In January 2014, a SFRS officer presented the proposal and answered questions at a pop-up stand in Banstead library. Around 20 to 25 people, mostly from Residents Associations, attended and raised following points:

- Most people were aware that the Police Station in Banstead was a possible option for the location of the new fire station
- Most people accepted the rationale of moving a pump from Epsom due to LFB vacating Purley, but still would object to a fire station in Banstead
- All those who attended without exception expressed that they thought the High Street would be a wrong location due to traffic congestion, this was a very strongly made point by all.
- The High Street was described as a 'wet road' which would be susceptible to pot holes due to LGVs
- Many had suggestions for the location of a new fire station, the most popular being the Ambulance Station site on the Horseshoe which has access onto the A217

#### **4.6 Meeting with Representatives of Reigate and Banstead Residents Associations**

A SFRS officer met with five representatives of Residents Associations (Tadworth & Walton RA, Burgh Heath RA, Chipstead RA, Banstead Village RA, Banstead District Federation of RAs), on 24 January 2014 to present the proposal and discuss it in more detail.

- Overall, there was split between those who thought that a potential move to Banstead would be an improvement against the current configuration with two fire engines at Epsom and those who thought that the High Street would be the wrong site.
- Sites suggested by RA representatives principally included the SECamb Ambulance Station at "Horseshoe, Banstead".
- They were slightly more reassured that, should it be necessary to create a temporary solution, SFRS would be still seeking to move to the optimum location in due course, subject to sites becoming available.
- They felt that the High Street would be the wrong location for a new fire station for a number of reasons including traffic, size of vehicles we have, noise and movements and that the conversion of a premises into a fire station would not fit with the council's development framework for Banstead.

#### **4.7 Staff meetings / feedback**

The consultation was advertised in the staff magazine in December and a direct email went out to affected crews. The consultation was further highlighted at team briefings at the beginning of December and again on 12 January 2014, which was attended by 8 Epsom staff. Feedback at that meeting was that:

- Banstead would be the wrong location; there wasn't the risk present in Banstead.
- The ORH modelling didn't accurately reflect the travel times on the ground in terms of getting to Banstead or Burgh Heath.
- However, Burgh Heath would be the right location and that it was worth pursuing.



#### Survey responses:

11 SFRS staff responded to the survey. The support for their service was strong with only 10% not being sure about valuing the service. Judging the proposed option, 45.5% of staff supported the approach, 45.5% were unsure and 9% rejected the proposal.

The key points for those that were unsure were:

- “My concern is that Espom's second appliance routinely covers training and gaps in fire cover due to incidents. Therefore for a significant portion of the time it will not be at its base location, Is it therefore still a **good investment of money** as it seems like a small gain for a large lay-out?”
- “My concern is one of **appliance crewing**. It is common practice for each appliance to have a crew of four. [...] **Single pump stations crewing with four does, I believe, make them vulnerable** where they are the first attendance to an RTC, house fire etc. Whilst the crew might be able to carry out some initial operations it places them in a more vulnerable position because their resources become stretched to the limit. [...] While I think that **moving Service resources to provide a more equitable level of cover to the community is a logical approach that is long overdue**, I am concerned at our front line crews are becoming far more vulnerable in the initial stages of 'working jobs'.”

All staff respondents said that we had explained the proposals clearly.

Of the 63% that were willing to submit at least one answer on their demographic background, all were of working age so fell into the 25-44 or 45-64 age groups. Two staff stated that s/he had a disability (29%), which is above with the general make up of the SFRS (1%). 83% of staff respondents that completed the E&D section were male, which is slightly below the makeup of the SFRS (91%) and all were White British (above average, as 2% of SFRS staff are from a BME background).

#### **4.8 Union response**

A SFRS officer met with a representative of the Fire Brigades Union (FBU) to consult on the issue. However, no formal response was submitted by the FBU.

#### **4.9 Councils and Committees**

The E&E and R&B Local Committees and R&B and E&E Borough Council Members and were written to as part of the consultation process and the proposals were presented to the Local Committee of Reigate and Banstead at an informal meeting on 20 January 2014. Invites to meetings with SFRS officers and the Cabinet Associate for Fire and Police Services, Kay Hammond were distributed to Chairmen of R&B and E&E Local Committees and the Chief Executives of the Borough Councils.

#### Survey responses from Members:

There were four responses from councillors in the survey (two councillors from Reigate and Banstead and two from Epsom and Ewell). While one R&B councillor and one E&E councillor supported the proposal, the other R&B councillor was uncertain on the grounds that no specific location was stated. Another E&E councillor objected because incident response times would increase at the detriment to his community, which already experiences response times over 10 minutes (north E&E).



#### Communities Select Committee (Scrutiny role):

In light of the short consultation period and the scope of the proposal, the Chairman of the Communities Select Committee decided to circulate an informal brief amongst Committee Members, to which no response was received.

#### Reigate and Banstead Local Committee:

At its private meeting on 20 January 2014, the Local Committee noted the proposal to extend the search area to locate a new fire station in the Banstead area, and that Banstead Police Station had been identified as a potential suitable location to meet the service's needs in the short term.

The Committee was minded to **support** this proposal as an acceptable solution *pro tem*; but would like to **request that alternative long term solutions be explored** urgently.

#### Epsom and Ewell Local Committee:

The item was discussed at an informal meeting in January 2014, and a formal response from the Local Committee stated:

- The Committee remains concerned at the implications of removing a fire engine from Epsom Fire Station and **requests that the decision be revisited** as the original consultation process was flawed. That, if the decision is not to be revisited, there should be **proper consideration to finding a more appropriate new site** than the potential site in Banstead High Street and a decision should not be rushed simply because the Purley Fire Station is to close temporarily. It would be preferable to delay the removal of the fire engine from Epsom than to choose the wrong site.
- A site in Banstead would delay the arrival of both the first and second pumps to fires in the Borough of Epsom and Ewell. Whilst the additional delay for the first pump is minimal there is a **considerable increase in the time** it will take for the **second pump** to arrive. Since two pumps are required before any rescue attempt from a building can take place the delay in arrival of the second pump could be critical.
- Times taken to attend fires in the **North of the Borough (E&E)** are already poor and **over 10 minutes** for much of the area. The siting of the engine in Banstead would not improve response times to much of this area and in some areas it will actually make it worse.

#### Reigate and Banstead Borough Council / Epsom and Ewell Borough Council:

The consultation was distributed and advertised through the R&B and E&E Borough Councils internal communication channels. Outside the survey, no feedback was received from any Borough Councillors.

### **4.10 Other feedback**

#### Email and letters:

We received three emails from residents, one from the MP for Reigate and six from Residents Association (RA) representatives (Ewell Village RA, Woodmansterne Green Belt & RA, Chipstead RA, Banstead Village RA, 2 x Burgh Heath RA).

While most Residents Associations were supportive of a fire station in the north of R&B, they also voiced concerns around the suitability of Banstead as a potential site for a new fire



station, and the short timeframe of the consultation. While the Chairman of Chipstead RA accepted that Banstead might accommodate a temporary site and thus agreed with the proposal, the Banstead Village RA Vice-Chairman did not support a temporary option for fear that finding a long term solution might not happen in the end.

Particular concerns were:

- Lack of specific location information means that no meaningful comments could be made
- Burgh Heath area with A217 access is preferable to Banstead High Street:
  - High volume of traffic / congestion would add to response times
  - Disruption to 200 residents in that area – road safety and noise pollution
  - Banstead High Street is due for commercial and residential development, a fire station would have planning issues
- Rushed consultation and poor publicity, venue of public meeting not in Banstead
- Unclear financial justification for moving not far away from Epsom
- Suggested sites: Horsehoe Ambulance Station, Bonsor Drive, Builders Merchants

BVRA representatives and MP Blunt asked specifically to extend the consultation period to facilitate more engagement with Banstead residents.

In addition, the Highway Agency confirmed that it had no further comments on this consultation.

#### 4.11 Media coverage

As part of the consultation, several press releases were published. From 16 December 2013 – 27 January 2014, the proposal featured in 5 media items:

Date	Title	Outlet	Circulation
19/12/13	Epsom's fire engine could move to Banstead, not Burgh Heath	epsomguardian.co.uk	929
		thisislocallondon.co.uk	68,243
		surreycomet.co.uk	26,738
		yourlocalguardian.co.uk	42,699
19/12/13	Public have their say on plans to relocate fire crew	GetSurrey.co.uk	
14/01/14	A former police station in Banstead could reopen as a fire station, according to the Fire Brigades Union (FBU)	Epsom Guardian	



## 5 Key findings

Despite running communication campaigns in both Epsom & Ewell and Reigate & Banstead, a majority of respondents came from R&B (79%), particularly the north of R&B <sup>6</sup> (64%), which is appropriate as the proposal concerns the Banstead and Burgh Heath areas.

The survey had 216 respondents submit a view on the proposal, showed following level of support for the proposal:

	SFRS staff		Residents, community reps and councillors						Others		TOTAL	
			R&B		E&E		Other					
Yes	5	45.5%	109	69.4%	10	32.3%	2	22.2%	5	62.5%	131	60.6%
Not sure	5	45.5%	29	18.5%	7	22.6%	4	44.4%	2	25.0%	47	21.8%
No	1	9.1%	15	9.6%	13	41.9%	2	22.2%	0	0.0%	31	14.4%
No opinion	0	0.0%	4	2.5%	1	3.2%	1	11.1%	1	12.5%	7	3.2%

Overall, people from Reigate and Banstead tended to support the proposal, whereas respondents from Epsom and Ewell were more negative. Staff were mainly supportive or unsure of the proposal.

Feedback from conversations with Residents Associations from R&B and SFRS staff in Epsom, however, was more nuanced, as most, in principle, approved of the plan to locate a fire station in the north of Reigate and Banstead, but did not support a potential site on Banstead High Street for reasons outlined below. Feedback from councillors of E&E was mainly negative to the overall plan to locate a fire engine from Epsom station to the north of R&B, as the incident response times would increase in their borough beyond a level that they deemed acceptable.

All consultation data including formal responses, survey comments, emails, and meeting notes were coded to determine the most frequently raised concerns around the proposal:

1. Banstead High Street would not be a suitable location for a fire station, due to heavy traffic and congestion and disruption and potential danger to residents in the area.
2. Increase in response times for residents in Epsom and Ewell (refers to original decision to move Epsom appliance)
3. Cost of move and justification for moving relatively short distance between Epsom and north Reigate and Banstead
4. Epsom fire station is at a more advantageous location (more populated area, closer to likely incidents)
5. A fire station in Banstead would not be in line with the Borough Council's plans to develop the High Street as a commercial and residential area.
6. A single fire engine station is less resilient and crew will be more stretched. This could affect staff morale.
7. Concerns that Banstead High Street could be pursued as a temporary option, but that in the long-term no other location would be found.

<sup>6</sup> Nork and Tattenhams; Banstead, Woodmansterne and Chipstead; Tadworth, Walton and Kingswood





Suggestions on what the SFRS should do next included to continue to search for a more suitable location in Burgh Heath area with access to the A217, to reverse the original decision to relocate the second pump from Epsom, to keep two pumps in Epsom and build an additional fire station in north R&B, and to raise council tax to avoid having to make savings.

While no specific location was stated in the consultation material for commercial reasons and because no site had been secured, some groups and residents, during the course of the consultation, identified the old Police Station in Banstead as a potential option that SFRS could be pursuing, which was mostly thought of as an unsuitable location. Specific sites suggested as suitable for a new fire station were:

1. Ambulance Station, Horeshoe, Banstead
2. Bonsor Drive
3. Builders Merchant, A217

On the other side, individuals that completed the survey as supporters of the proposal mentioned the following reasons (please note that the survey did not explicitly ask for their motives to support the proposal):

1. Fairer more balanced response times
2. Feel safer with a station close by
3. Good use of the old Police Station

Also, Residents Associations and the R&B Local Committee who supported the proposal made it clear that their support was on the condition that should a site in Banstead High Street be secured, it would be on a temporary basis.

The consultation process was deemed unsatisfactory by many Residents Associations and MP Blunt. The main criticism revolved around:

1. Not having the exact location of the proposed new fire stations meant people could not give their views on particular sites.
2. Poor publicity for the public meeting and consultation in general
3. Short time-frame, which omitted meaningful engagement and might lead to a rushed decision
4. It needed to be clearer in the material that a potential fire station in Banstead could be a temporary solution
5. Difficult to read map and unclear figures in the material

For full analysis, see Appendix C.

## **6 Next steps**

Following the analysis of the consultation feedback, the key themes will be included as evidence in the paper outlining the proposal to Cabinet in February 2014.

If the proposal is approved, the Action Plan will be implemented. Equally, actions outlined in the EIA will start to be implemented.



### Appendix A – Equality section survey results

**Age:** The distribution of age groups for the population of R&B and E&E and the age distribution for the survey is as follows:

Age	R&B	E&E	Applied to sample (15-85+)	Actual sample (residents)	
15-24	11%	12%	13%	1%	1
25-44	28%	26%	33%	40%	63
45-64	26%	26%	32%	41%	64
65-84	14%	15%	18%	17%	26
85+	3%	2%	3%	1%	2

Age	Sample size		Yes		Not sure		No		No opinion	
up to 24	1	1%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
25-44	71	38%	41	58%	17	24%	9	13%	4	6%
45-64	73	39%	51	70%	12	16%	9	12%	1	1%
65+	40	22%	25	63%	8	20%	6	15%	1	3%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3%</b>

#### Disability

Disability	Sample size		Yes		Not sure		No		No opinion	
Yes	18	10%	11	61%	4	22%	1	6%	2	11%
No	162	90%	105	65%	33	20%	20	12%	4	2%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3%</b>

#### Gender

Gender	Sample size		Yes		Not sure		No		No opinion	
Female	95	53%	60	63%	19	20%	12	13%	4	4%
Male	84	47%	59	70%	17	20%	8	10%	0	0%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2%</b>

#### Marital Status

Status	Sample size		Yes		Not sure		No		No opinion	
Married, co-habiting, civil partnership	157	88%	104	66%	31	20%	18	11%	4	3%
Single, widowed, separated, divorced	22	12%	14	64%	5	23%	2	9%	1	5%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3%</b>



Sexual orientation

Status	Sample size		Yes		Not sure		No		No opinion	
Heterosexual	148	97%	99	67%	30	20%	15	10%	4	3%
LGB	5	3%	3	60%	0	0%	1	20%	1	20%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3%</b>

Religion/faith

Religion	Sample size		Yes		Not sure		No		No opinion	
Christian	100	65%	68	68%	21	21%	7	7%	4	4%
Other faiths (Buddhist, Hindu)	7	5%	4	57%	1	14%	2	29%	0	0%
No religious / faith group	48	31%	34	71%	8	17%	5	10%	1	2%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3%</b>

Ethnicity

Ethnicity	Sample size		Yes		Not sure		No		No opinion	
White British	156	92%	100	64%	32	21%	19	12%	5	3%
Not White British	13	8%	10	77%	2	15%	0	0%	1	8%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4%</b>



**Appendix B – Consultation and Communications summary**

<b>Date</b>	<b>What</b>
16 and 17 December 13	Posters and questionnaires sent out Consultation on SFRS social media and website; Media brief distributed to central News and Media team (SCC) and Surrey Police Emails and letters to all stakeholders
18 December 13	Tadworth Neighbourhood Panel meeting
19 December 13	Consultation featured in Communities Select Committee Bulletin
19 December 13	Consultation featured in Vulcan staff magazine
19 December 13	Consultation featured on: GetSurrey website Epsom Guardian website This is Local London website Surrey Comet website Your Local Guardian website
20 December 13	Consultation featured on 'News from Epsom and Ewell' SCC website
December 13	Consultation featured on BVRA and WGBRA websites
6 January 14	Consultation and Banstead library event promoted via Surrey libraries Twitter Reminder on SFRS Twitter
7 January 14	Banstead library event
9 January 14	Public meeting at Bourne Hall, Ewell
9 January 14	Consultation raised at Cuddington Residents Association meeting
10 January 14	Circulated informal briefing with Communities Select Committee
12 January 14	Staff briefing at Epsom
13 January 14	Email sent to previous consultees
14 January 14	Consultation featured on Epsom Guardian website
15 January 14	Reminder to community groups and Committees about closing date Media brief and up-dated poster sent to R&B BC comms officer
16 January 14	Meeting with FBU
20 January 14	Informal meeting for Reigate and Banstead Local Committee
23 January 14	Meeting with E&E Chief Executive
24 January 14	Meeting with representatives of R&B Residents Associations
27 January 14	Consultation closed

**Direct contact:**

- Emails to Members of the SCC Communities Select Committee
- Emails to SCC E&E and R&B members
- Emails to Mayors of E&E and R&B
- Emails to Borough Council Leaders of E&E and R&B
- Email to R&B BC Portfolio holder (Community Safety Partnership)
- Emails to Chief Executives of R&B and E&E BC
- Emails to Mole Valley and Tandridge Council Leaders and LC Chairmen



- Emails to R&B Town and Parish Councils (Horley, Salfords & Sidlow)
- Letters to four MPs (Reigate, East Surrey, Mole Valley, Epsom and Ewell)
- Informal brief to Community Select Committee
- Emails to SFRS staff from Epsom and Reigate
- Staff briefing at Epsom
- Consultation leaflet in Epsom fire station
- Meeting with FBU
- Public meeting at Bourne Hall, Ewell – invited through emails to SCC Members and E&E and R&B LC Chairmen, posters, survey, social media
- Meeting with R&B Residents Association Chairmen
- Presentation at Banstead library
- Presentation to R&B Local Committee (LC) at informal meeting
- Presentation at Police Neighbourhood Panel meeting in Tadworth
- Emails to 68 ORS panel members (E&E and R&B residents)
- Emails to previous consultees
- Emails to businesses from our Economy team
- Letters / emails to local groups (Association of Ewell Downs Residents; College Ward Residents Association; Cuddington Residents Association; Ewell Court Residents Association; Ewell Village Residents Association; Howell Hill Residents Association; Nonsuch Park & District Residents Association; Stamford Ward Residents Association; Stoneleigh and Auriol Residents Association; Town Ward (Epsom) Residents Association; West Ewell and Ruxley Residents Association; Woodcote (Epsom) Residents Society; Nork RA; Banstead District Federation of RAs; Banstead Village RA; Burgh Heath RA; Chipstead RA; Hooley RA; Kingswood RA; Lower Kingswood RA; Merstham RA; Netherne on the Hill; Outwood Lane; Park Road; Preston; Tadworth & Walton; Tattenhams RA; Woodmansterne Green Belt and RA)
- Letters to 13 partner agencies (including MoD, British Red Cross, St Johns Ambulance, etc)
- Letters to 9 surrounding Fire and Rescue Authorities (including Bucks, Berks, Hants, London, Kent, Oxs, West Sussex)
- Emails to Neighbourhood Officers in R&B and E&E (Police)
- Emails to 21 internal SCC officers (including comms, Trading Standards, Environment and Infrastructure, Council Leadership Team)
- Questionnaires to 128 care homes in E&E and R&B
- Letters to 5 health / carers groups (Reigate Stepping Stones, East Surrey Carers Support, Carers Epsom, SAVI)

**Distributors (to forward to their contacts):**

- Email to Business Link, Tourism SE, Federation of small businesses
- Email to Community and Engagement Officers in R&B and E&E BCs
- Email to Community Safety Officers in R&B and E&E BCs
- Email to Community Partnership Officers for R&B and E&E for Local Committees
- Email to Democratic Services in R&B and E&E BC for Borough Councillors
- Email to 3 GP clusters (East Surrey Doc, Mid Surrey, Epsom)
- Email to External Equalities Advisory Group (Action for Carers Surrey, Age UK, Bridging the Gap, Diocese of Guildford, Farnham Humanists, GIRES, MIND, Outline Surrey, Social Information on Disability, Surrey Coalition of disabled people, Surrey Community Action, Surrey Community Health, Surrey County Association of Parish



and Town Councils, Surrey Independent Living, Surrey Minority Ethnic Forum, Surrey Rural Partnership, Surrey Youth Focus)

- Email to FBU and Unison
- Email to Empowerment Board Mid Surrey

**Posters:**

- 4 Citizens Advice Bureaux (Banstead, Horley, Redhill, Epsom and Ewell)
- 37 Community Centres and Day Centres and 2 Hubs
- 29 churches in R&B and E&E
- 9 libraries / plasma screens (Banstead, Horley, Merstham, Redhill, Reigate, Tattenhams, Epsom, Ewell, Ewell Court)
- 15 Post Offices in Banstead, Chipstead, Tadworth, Kingswood, Betchworth, Epsom, Ewell, Horley, Reigate, Redhill, Ashted
- 88 schools in R&B and E&E



**Appendix C – Collated data analysis**

	Survey		PSP email / calls / letters / formal responses		Meetings		TOTAL	
	Residents / businesses	202	87.1%	3	1.3%	27	11.6%	232
Councillors / MPs	4	44.4%	3	33.3%	2	22.2%	9	2.9%
SFRS Staff	11	57.9%	0	0.0%	8	42.1%	19	6.1%
Community group representatives	9	21.4%	6	14.3%	27	64.3%	42	13.5%
Partners	6	85.7%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	7	2.2%
Other	3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	1.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>75.3%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>4.2%</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>20.5%</b>	<b>312</b>	

	Members of the public	SFRS staff	Councillors	Community group rep	Partners	Others	TOTAL
<b>Grouped feedback</b>							
E&E LC response			1				1
R&B LC response			1				1
<b>Individual feedback</b>							
Banstead library meeting	5			20			25
Tadworth police panel	15						15
Public meeting	7		2	2			11
RA meeting				5			5
Staff briefing		8					8
Email / letter feedback	3	0	1	6	1	0	11
Survey responses	202	11	4	9	6	3	235

\* Grouped feedback was counted as 1, as scope of representation could not be determined.

	Individual items of feedback											Grouped							
	Survey											Meetings						Formal responses	
	Q5 - Reasons for objection / uncertainty	Q 6 - clarification on proposal	Q7 - general comments	TOTAL	Letters / emails	Tadworth Panel meeting	Banstead library	Public meeting	RA Meeting	Staff briefing	E&E LC	R&B LC	TOTAL						
	54	42	49	145	11														
10	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0	0						
11	0	0	5	5	1	10.2%	5	3.4%	1	3.4%	1	2	2						
12	0	4	0	4	0	9.5%	4	2.8%	0	2.8%	0	0	0						
13	0	2	1	3	0	4.8%	2	2.1%	0	2.1%	0	0	0						
14	0	1	0	1	0	2.4%	0	0.7%	0	0.7%	0	0	0						
15	0	0	3	3	3	6.1%	3	2.1%	1	2.1%	1	1	1						
16	0	0	1	1	0	2.0%	1	0.7%	0	0.7%	0	0	0						
17	0	2	0	2	1	4.8%	0	1.4%	1	1.4%	1	2	2						
18	0	0	1	1	1	0.0%	1	0.7%	1	0.7%	1	1	1						
19	4	22	2	28	5	52.4%	2	19.3%	1	19.3%	1	3	3						
20	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0	0						
21	20	1	1	22	1	37.0%	1	15.2%	1	15.2%	1	2	2						
22	2	0	1	3	0	3.7%	1	2.1%	0	2.1%	0	0	0						
23	8	1	0	9	1	14.8%	0	6.2%	1	6.2%	1	2	2						
24	1	0	0	1	0	1.9%	0	0.7%	0	0.7%	0	0	0						
25	11	2	2	15	4	20.4%	2	10.3%	1	10.3%	1	5	5						
26	2	0	0	2	0	3.7%	0	1.4%	0	1.4%	0	1	1						
27	1	0	1	2	0	1.9%	1	1.4%	0	1.4%	0	0	0						
28	3	2	1	6	0	5.6%	1	4.1%	0	4.1%	1	1	1						
29	0	0	2	2	0	0.0%	2	1.4%	0	1.4%	0	0	0						
30	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0	0						
31	0	0	1	1	0	0.0%	1	0.7%	1	0.7%	1	1	1						
32	0	0	0	0	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	1	2	2						
40	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0	0						
41	4	0	1	5	0	7.4%	1	3.4%	0	3.4%	1	1	1						
42	11	1	2	14	5	20.4%	2	9.7%	1	9.7%	1	3	3						
43	2	0	0	2	2	3.7%	0	1.4%	1	1.4%	1	2	2						
44	0	0	2	2	0	0.0%	2	1.4%	0	1.4%	0	0	0						
45	1	0	1	2	2	1.9%	1	1.4%	0	1.4%	0	0	0						
46	0	0	1	1	0	0.0%	1	0.7%	0	0.7%	0	0	0						
48	0	0	0	0	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0	0						
50	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0	0						
51	1	0	0	1	0	1.9%	0	0.7%	0	0.7%	0	0	0						
52	1	4	0	5	0	9.5%	0	3.4%	0	3.4%	0	0	0						



	(wholtime, crewing)																			
53	Question: move or reduction?	1	1.9%	3	7.1%	1	2.0%	5	3.4%	0										0
54	Question: costing	0	0.0%	2	4.8%	0	0.0%	2	1.4%	0										0
55	Praise for SFRS	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9	18.4%	9	6.2%	0										0
56	Question: to do with Reigate losing one engine?	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	2.0%	1	0.7%	0										0
57	Question: resilience?	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	2.0%	1	0.7%	0		1								1
58	Question: timescales?	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	2.0%	1	0.7%	0		1								1
59	Question: What happens to Epsom fire station?	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0		1								1
80	<b>Support</b>	1	1.9%	2	4.8%	4	8.2%	7	4.8%	1										1
81	Banstead is more built up than Burgh Heath	1	1.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.7%	0										0
82	Feel safer with fire station close by	2	3.7%	0	0.0%	2	4.1%	4	2.8%	0										0
83	Fairer more balanced response times	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	8.2%	4	2.8%	0										0
84	Good use of Police Station	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	2.0%	1	0.7%	0										0
85	Generally supportive of move to NR&B but not Banstead High Street	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2			1							4
98	Nothing	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	10.2%	5	3.4%	1										0
99	Other	5	9.3%	1	2.4%	5	10.2%	11	7.6%	0		1								1

This page is intentionally left blank