

1	Executive Summary	2
2	Context	2
3	Survey Methodology	3
4	Analysis	5
4.1	Survey	6
4.2	Public meetings	9
4.3	Equality & Diversity survey results	10
4.4	Staff briefings	12
4.5	Fire Brigades Union (FBU)	12
4.6	Councils and Committees	12
4.7	Other feedback	13
4.8	Media coverage	13
5	Key findings	13
6	Next steps	14

Appendix

- Questionnaire
- Consultation & Communications plan
- Data response Summary
- Qualitative Comments

1 Executive Summary

Surrey Fire and Rescue Authority is required by the Government to produce an Integrated Risk Management Plan (IRMP) which considers all the fire and rescue related risks that could affect our communities. This planning process helps us to identify longer term priorities, to make sure we have an up to date assessment of risk, and how to mitigate it effectively.

We set out our IRMP in our Public Safety Plan (PSP), which is currently valid until 2020. However within a constantly changing environment, new threats and opportunities have emerged. The PSP refresh document covers the period 2016-2025 and outlines how we will respond and adapt to these changes and continue to deliver a high performing, valued, sustainable and cost-effective service.

This report summarises the results of the six-week public consultation on the PSP refresh document that was undertaken between 27 April 2016 and 7 June 2016.

2 Context

The refreshed PSP, currently in draft form, is our key planning document that describes how we will play our part in keeping Surrey residents, and those that work in or travel through the county, safe over the coming years. It outlines our understanding of the risks and challenges facing the county and how we will maintain, adapt and enhance our service accordingly.

Our current PSP was developed in 2011 and the context in which the plan was developed has changed. Drivers for change include:

- I. Fall in demand for traditional services
- II. Shift in population characteristics
- III. Redefined budget and need to make further savings and efficiencies
- IV. Reviews and changes to policy and legislation including emerging Government policy on collaboration between emergency services and the recent Government departmental move of Fire Service policy from DCLG to the Home Office
- V. Public Service Transformation projects with a key focus on collaboration
- VI. Busier roads
- VII. Environmental factors such as climate change and threat of terrorism.

This consultation explored the nine proposals contained within the draft PSP:

- I. Undertaking an options appraisal on working more closely with other Fire and Rescue Services, and with Police and Ambulance Services, behaving as one, whilst maintaining our front-line provision.
- II. Anticipating changes to the demographic profile across Surrey to identify and target residents and businesses most at risk of fire in our communities by using a broad range of data, including information shared with us by other agencies, to assist us with this work.
- III. Increasing integration and meaningful collaboration with other emergency services to assist them to respond to an increasing demand for services, where we can improve community safety and add public value.

- IV. Continuing to review mobilising arrangements with our emergency service partners (other Fire and Rescue Services, Police and Ambulance) to develop a next generation 999 call system to improve how we communicate, share information and respond to incidents to enhance public value.
- V. Reviewing our training requirements and introducing more realistic training to offset the reduction in real-world experience created by a fall in demand for our traditional services.
- VI. Examining our communities to see where we can better meet community needs.
- VII. Exploring all options to maximise income and avoid, reduce or recover costs to enable us to invest in our workforce, facilities and community.
- VIII. Review our Surrey Response Standard.
- IX. Review the way we call handle and respond to Automatic Fire Alarms.

Greater collaboration is a key theme of our Plan. Surrey residents are already experiencing the benefits of our closer collaboration with Police and Ambulance services. Surrey firefighters provide assistance to other emergency services with defibrillator usage, missing person location, assisted entry and, if we are first to attend an incident, immediate emergency medical care. These are examples of how we can offer a safer, more coordinated community response, which focuses on the needs of residents and the changing nature of emergencies.

In addition, we believe that further meaningful collaboration with our emergency service partners offers greater potential savings, because we can look to create efficiencies by eliminating duplication across services, which we cannot do if reviewing our own service in isolation.

3 Survey Methodology

Recommended sample size and survey results representation

Assuming a population size of 1,182,000 we needed 385 survey respondents for a plus or minus 5% acceptance margin of error¹ rate. We sampled 496 people (96 people more than recommended in the survey Table 1 below) and found that over 85% of those surveyed are in agreement with all proposals. Given our 5% acceptance error rate, we can assume that if every person in Surrey took our survey, the actual proportion in agreement with our proposals would range from 65% to 75%.

¹ Margin of error: a percentage that describes how closely the answers our sample gave are to the "true value" in our population.

Table 1²: Respondents Needed at Error of +3%, +5%, & +10%

Population	±3%	±5%	±10%
500	345	220	80
1,000	525	285	90
3,000	810	350	100
5,000	910	370	100
10,000	1,000	385	100
100,000	1,100	400	100
1,000,000	1,100	400	100
10,000,000	1,110	400	100

All nine protected characteristics, as defined in the Equality Act 2010, were considered in the consultation plan.

The PSP should be read alongside the Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) which has been reviewed and updated following the consultation period [\(add link once the draft EIA is published\)](#).

During the consultation planning phase, we updated our previous stakeholder plans and sought advice from other SFRS and SCC colleagues for other partners and vulnerable groups we should include in our revised stakeholder plan and mailing lists.

As a result, a comprehensive revised consultation and communications plan was established to target those who are likely to be most affected by the proposals.

We used a mix of quantitative and qualitative research methods, as well as a wide mix of communication channels to gather the views of our residents, partners and stakeholders (see Appendix B for consultation plan). This included:

Direct contact:

- Surrey Fire Stations
- Public meetings in Chertsey, Guildford and Reigate
- Face to face and group briefings for staff
- Disability Alliance Network (DAN) meetings
- Surrey Gypsy Traveller communities Forum (SGTCF)
- Resident Experience Board (REB)
- PSP Member Reference Group (MRG)
- Reigate and Banstead Local Committee

Print:

- 550 documents (full plan, summaries and questionnaires) to fire stations, libraries and members of the public.
- Emails to approximately 700 stakeholders, including partner agencies (e.g. Police, NHS, Ambulance), Surrey MPs, Borough and County Councillors, Mayors, Voluntary

² SurveyMonkey Survey Sample Size/target population Chart

Community Faith Sector (VCFS) organisations, Council Leaders and School Heads & Principals.

- 700 posters issued to Surrey libraries, borough and district council receptions, fire stations, registration offices, parish councils, community locations, Age UK Surrey, Sight for Surrey and resident associations
- Banners at Chertsey, Guildford and Reigate fire stations
- Articles in newsletters including Burning Issues (SFRS staff newsletter), Surrey Matters, South East Coast Ambulance weekly bulletin, Surrey Police staff newsletter, Community First Responders newsletter, Coalition News, Horley Town Council, Salfords & Sidlow Parish Council, Runnymede Borough Council, SCC Issues Monitor and SCC Resident Experience Board newsletter.
- Plasma screen advertising in Redhill, Woking, Godalming and Guildford Libraries
- Briefs for Communities Select Committee.
- Email to all SFRS staff from Chief Fire Officer.
- Joint communications with the Fire Brigades Union.

Online:

- On-line survey link for residents, businesses, partner agencies, staff and Members (using email invites, stakeholder lists, equality and access group lists)
- Regular social media promotion on SFRS Twitter and Facebook, earning over 75, 000 twitter impressions.
- Social media promotion from others including Sight for Surrey, Age UK Surrey, Democratic services and Local Committees.
- Promoted Facebook posts regarding public meetings in Chertsey, Guildford and Reigate areas.
- Google adwords for Guildford and Reigate events.
- Youtube video to promote the consultation (494 views)
- Consultation and events featured on websites including Surrey County Council, Eagle Radio, Sight for Surrey, Runnymede Borough Council, Reigate and Banstead Borough Council, Guildford Borough Council and wherecanwego.com.
- Regular posts on staff intranet, weekly bulletin and Yammer portal.

4 Analysis

The consultation received feedback from over 600 individuals and groups, through surveys, events, briefings, emails and online platforms. The majority of people who took part in the consultation supported the proposals. No formal responses received.

Survey returns ³ Residents / businesses/staff		Meetings (community events, public meetings, Committee meetings)	Community group members
Online 482	Postal 14	3 public meetings 1 Committee meeting 5 community meetings	90 community members in total

³ See Appendix 'x' for full survey results and qualitative comments

4.1 Survey

- There were 496 responses, of which 14 were postal returns and 482 were answered online. Response rate is hard to gauge, because invites were distributed to an unknown number of people from various partner agencies' mailing and stakeholders lists.
- The postal returns were added manually to the online survey and therefore show in the graphs and comments at appendices.

For the purposes of this analysis the survey data has been simplified by combining the response categories into five nominal⁴ categories:

Response categories

- Strongly agree = 1
- Tend to agree = 1
- Neither agree nor Disagree (NAND) =5
- Tend to disagree =2
- Strongly disagree= 2
- Extremely Important =3
- Very Important=3
- Moderately important=3
- Slightly important=3
- Not at all important=4
- No answer=5

Five nominal categories

1. Agree
2. Disagree
3. Important
4. Not important
5. NAND/No answer

Label / Response category	Agreement regrouped
Strongly agree/Tend to agree	Agree
Tend to disagree/Strongly disagree	Disagree
No answer/NAND	No answer/NAND

⁴ Nominal categories are used for labeling variables, without any quantitative value. "Nominal" scales could simply be called "labels".

Label / Response category	Importance regrouped
Extremely important/Very important/Moderately important/Slightly important	Important
Not all important	Not important
No answer	No answer

Respondent groups

The respondent groups were distributed as follows:

70% of people completing the survey question about where they live in/ have their business located in, they live / have their business in Surrey.

4 % of those responded to the survey live/ have their business outside Surrey:

- Berkshire
- Bristol
- Hampshire
- Kingston Upon Thames
- West Sussex
- Weston-super-Mare

9% of the survey participants who completed the relevant question in the equalities section responded on behalf of an organisation:

- Bletchingley Parish Council
- Surrey Police
- Raven Housing Trust
- SABP NHS
- Surrey Choices – Lockwood, Adults with learning Disabilities
- Voluntary Action Elmbridge and Voluntary Action Mid Surrey
- SECAMB,
- Elmbridge Mencap,
- West Byfleet Junior School
- Rodborough School
- Infant School (unspecified)
- South West Trains
- National Trust - Polesden Lacey
- SFRS
- Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service
- Thorpe Ward Residents' Association and Green Lane Neighbourhood Watch

Across all groups, the most groups of respondents agreed overall with the proposals (80% agree, 6% disagree) – however, a lot of the agreement was qualified by caveats about making sure future concerns around duplication, resources, service cuts, service identity and purpose are addressed.

	% ⁵ Agree	% Disagree	% NAND/ No answer	% Important	% Not important	% No answer
Proposal 1	89	8	3	96	3	—
Proposal 2	92	4	4	98	1	1
Proposal 3	85	10	5	94	5	1
Proposal 4	89	6	5	96	3	1
Proposal 5	84	7	17	97	1	11
Proposal 6	68	3	21	79	2	8
Proposal 7	64	7	19	75	4	8
Proposal 8	70	5	16	78	3	8
Proposal 9	68	7	15	76	4	8

Views (qualitative comments – sample)

⁵ Percentages have been rounded and therefore may not always total 100%

Below is a sample of people's views and thoughts regarding the proposals:



"Close working and co-operation between all emergency services is very desirable and if improvements can be made, it can only be for the benefit of all who work in them, plus the general public (providing this does not mean staffing cuts as they are already cut down to their limit)"

'This makes economic sense".

"It is crucial that the fire service works closely with other emergency services, to provide a better service for Surrey residents".

"Where duplication is avoided and savings can be made this should be a priority".

"think it is vital we collaborate closely with partner agencies."

"We need to do this to comply with the direction of central government policy. In doing so we must be mindful that we protect and preserve our identity and purpose".



"Cutting services further is wrong. Incident response times are critical. You only know where the limits are when they have been passed. Then it's too late"!

"The Fire Service is a service to be proud of. Watering down their capability to do their job (which is becoming increasingly technical and wide ranging) is a mistake which will be paid for by the lives of Surrey's residents and god forbid the fire-fighters themselves.

"Sickness and stress levels within the service will increase as the personnel are required to deal with incidents with fewer/inappropriate resources and be under massive moral obligation to do something."

"Keep the fire service, police and ambulance separate and concentrate on what you are good on".

4.2 Public meetings

During May 2016 the Service organised three public meetings in two of our fire stations and one at the SFRS HQ. These were publicised in a number of ways including emails to targeted stakeholders, on websites and regular Facebook and Twitter posts.

Posters and flyers were distributed to Surrey libraries, borough and district council receptions, fire stations, registration offices, parish councils, community locations, Age UK Surrey, Sight for Surrey and resident associations. The host fire stations also had roadside banners.

Articles and events listings appeared in print and online, and targeted online advertising took place in the Guildford, Reigate and Chertsey areas.

Across the public events 35 people attended, amongst them representatives from a housing association and the Mayor of Runnymede. The SFRS gave a presentation, screened the PSP video that was explaining the 9 PSP proposals, collected feedback and replied to questions.

Points that were discussed included:

- Training updates and facilities
- What does collaboration look like for the Fire Service
- Income generation activity and examples
- Call handling process across blue light services
- Challenges of smart motorways
- Retirement age increase challenges and how it affects firefighters' fitness levels
- Wellbeing of firefighters in dealing with difficult situations
- Special services charges (chimney fires, rescuing animals)
- Fire safety for the community information
- IECR calls, the trial and charging suggestions
- Working with Surrey Police examples
- Concerns over cutting frontline with immigration and terrorism incidents
- Working with partners timeline
- Sharing property/services to reduce costs suggestions
- 'Chicago Fire' system (that provides fire and emergency medical services) suggestions
- Response times challenges (traffic, on-street parking)
- Merging senior roles in the Fire service and Police Force suggestions
- Advice and suggestions on improving accessibility of consultation printed and online materials, information and digital technology for people with disabilities

4.3 Equality & Diversity survey results

In order to make sure we provide services equally and fairly, we asked our survey participants to answer some questions about themselves. All equality and diversity information was optional and is held in the strictest confidence. 68% of the respondents said they were happy to answer those questions.

For the purposes of this survey analysis filters and cross tabs were applied here in order to select specific subsets of data to review. We used filters to examine all questions for a particular subset of the responses. By looking at the same question with different filters applied, we came to the conclusion that there were no differences between the various respondents represented by the filter.

- **Age:**

It is important to note here that 30% of the survey participants responding to the equality questions (68%) did not disclose any information on the age category and that has an impact on the percentages.

The majority of respondents (40%) who completed the equalities questions belong to 35 to 44 and 45- 54 age groups.

Looking at the level of support from older age groups (those of 65+ of age are at higher risk of fire death/injury⁶) that disclosed their age and completed the survey (11%) over 95% of them were in agreement with the proposals.

- **Disability:**

Mobility issues and mental health issues are known to be fire risk factors in Surrey⁷.

10% of the survey respondents who answered the relevant equalities question have disabilities or a long term condition that affects how they live their lives. 85% of them were in agreement with the proposals.

- **Gender**

57% of survey participants who answered the equalities questions were men and 40% women. 88% of those male respondents and 93% of the female participants were in agreement with the proposals. No significant conclusions have been drawn from the data collected in this category.

- **Ethnicity:**

In the survey, 92% answering the relevant equalities question stated their ethnicity is White British (which is same as the average for Surrey population). 91% of them were in agreement with the proposals. 3% of the respondents stated they were not White British and 80% of them were in agreement with the proposals. It is important to note here that 48% of the survey participants how responded to the survey equalities questions did not disclose information about their ethnicity and that had an impact on the percentages.

- **Religion:**

49% of the survey respondents, who were happy to answer the equalities questions, did not declare their religion/belief. 78% of them answered this question. 54% of the respondents stated their religion as Christians and 93% of those who belong to this group were in agreement with the proposals. There was also nearly 100% agreement of the proposals from survey participants who belong to other religious/belief groups. No meaningful conclusions were drawn regarding this equalities group as the data collected here was not statistically significant.

- **LGB:**

2% of the people completing the equalities questions defined themselves as gay/lesbian or bisexual. All of them were in agreement with the proposals; however it is important to note that the low number of respondents in the equalities group has an impact on the percentages.

Feedback relating to vulnerable adults and high risk groups

Disability Alliance Network (DAN) meetings comments:

We received feedback from DAN representatives. Comments were raised mainly around:

- Accessibility of information for disabled people

⁶ Surrey Fatal Fires Report 2006- 2015, Surrey Fire and Rescue Service [ADD LIVE LINK](#)

⁷ Surrey Fatal Fires Report 2006- 2015, Surrey Fire and Rescue Service [ADD LIVE LINK](#)

- Consultation materials and video not available in alternative formats at the time of our attendance to those meetings

Following feedback from the DAN groups about alternative formats and ways disabled people can access our draft PSP documents we have started taking actions to improve this.

We have also revised our Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) to include additional actions on the way we communicate and share our information with disabled people.

4.4 Staff briefings

The consultation was advertised in the staff newsletter (Burning issues) in April 2016 and a direct email went out to the wider workforce.

Briefing sessions were also organised for the Assistant Group Commanders (AGCs) that enabled them to successfully communicate the draft proposals with their teams and capture their thoughts and respond to any concerns.

The consultation was further highlighted on Yammer (our online platform for staff collaboration/communication), SurreyFire.net (intranet), end of the week e-bulletin, SCC public website, Facebook, Twitter.

Team and station briefings took place between March and May 2016.

4.5 Fire Brigades Union (FBU)

Throughout the development of the PSP, Surrey Fire and Rescue Service has worked closely with the Fire Brigades Union. It is important that they have the opportunity to comment on our proposals and our vision for the service. As part of this co-designing process, the Fire Brigades Union has authored Chapter Three of the PSP and is supportive of the proposals within the PSP. In addition, representatives have met with Elected Members, and they are members of the PSP Steering Group.

4.6 Councils and Committees

Member Reference Group:

A subgroup of the Resident Experience Board have met together as a cross-party Member Reference Group. This Group was set up to act as a sounding board and provide a Member steer as the project progressed and the refreshed PSP was developed. It has also questioned and challenged officers about the changes being considered and assisted in ensuring that the refresh is as comprehensive as possible. The Member Reference Group has met roughly once a month since its first meeting on 29 April 2014. Surrey Fire and Rescue Service and Democratic Services work together to facilitate the meetings.

The Member Reference Group has discussed the PSP refresh and its timeline, the workforce transformation programme, risk modelling and Community Risk Profiles. It has also met with representatives from the Fire Brigades Union, the Chief Fire Officer and senior officers from Surrey Fire and Rescue Service.

As part of the pre engagement phase the Member Reference Group also tested the proposals and the survey questionnaire with community groups and individuals and, based on the feedback, amendments were made as necessary.

Resident Experience Board (Scrutiny role):

On 30 June 2016, the Resident Experience Board reviewed the consultation responses and agreed the report. Members noted that the document was much clearer and easier to understand than previous versions.

Reigate and Banstead Local Committee

Officers attended the Reigate and Banstead Local Committee on Monday 6 June 2016. Support for the proposals, in particular around collaboration with other emergency services, was given by the Committee. It is important to note here that across Surrey, this local committee meeting was the only one scheduled within our formal consultation period.

4.7 Other feedback

Officers (a service support officer and the Woking Borough commander) attended the Surrey Gypsy Traveller Communities Forum (SGTCF) AGM on Wednesday 8 June 2016. 46 people attended, amongst them the Surrey PCC, borough councillors, reps of local organisations and traveller school children.

The officers discussed the proposals, screened the video, gave advice and shared information about fire safety for the Gypsy Traveller communities, captured people's thoughts on the PSP and answered questions.

All members of the forum were supportive of the proposals. Key points discussed included:

- Income generation information and examples
- Questions about fire safety advice to councils regarding private premises, building regulations and fire safety procedures and guidance
- Fire risk assessment information to traveller sites
- Fire safety information in traveller sites

4.8 Media coverage

As part of the formal consultation one press release and two news in brief pieces were published. Additionally, one radio interview was conducted.

From 29 April 2016 – 3 June 2016, the proposals featured in 14 media items.

5 Key findings

All consultation data including informal responses, survey comments, emails, feedback from our online platforms, was coded to determine the most frequently raised questions.

The feedback of the consultation overall has been positive, with 85% agreement on all nine proposals.

The key comments made during the consultation revolved mainly around:

Transformation:

- Transforming public services is essential.

Collaboration:

- Close and more effective collaboration with emergency services and other agencies is needed more than ever before.

Merging resources:

- Sharing building and merging back office support and systems is essential.

Sharing data:

- Overcoming data/information silos would improve service delivery and better response.

Service identity:

- Risks of losing identity and purpose of the Fire Service if close integration of emergency services happens.

Equalities:

- It is important to consider how we approach groups of people with learning disabilities to ensure that the information provided is understandable and provided in different formats. There were recommendations about working closely with the council's local community team for people with learning disabilities that can provide support with this.
- There was a suggestion about connecting with community groups especially those whose first language is not English.
- Fire Service should have a greater focus on prevention and protection activities for the most vulnerable people.

Income generation, cost avoidance and recovery:

- Concerns about generating income and reducing costs at the expense of frontline roles and public safety.

Automatic Fire Alarms (AFAs):

- Concerns about an AFA that could be a genuine emergency.
- Support on the approach that reduces demand of these Automatic Fire Alarm incidents, has an effective call challenge and call handling system in place and provides a proportionate response given the nature of the risk.
- Suggestions about drawing a distinction between building types when taking into account with the nature and associated risk of the occupancy.

6 Next steps

Following the analysis of the consultation feedback, the Service reviewed all the responses and the draft plan was updated to reflect those.

This consultation report outlining the finding will be included as evidence in the paper outlining the proposals to Cabinet on Tuesday 20 September 2016.

When the Public Safety Plan is approved, a delivery plan will be implemented, and the actions outlined in the EIA will be taken into consideration.

DRAFT

This page is intentionally left blank