



## **DRAFT Consultation report**

1	Executive Summary .....	2
2	Context – Surrey Fire and Rescue Service .....	2
3	Methodology .....	3
4	Resources.....	4
5	Analysis .....	5
5.1	Survey.....	5
5.2	Focus groups .....	7
5.3	Public meeting.....	7
5.4	Neighbourhood Panels.....	8
5.5	Equality & Diversity sections .....	8
5.6	Staff meetings / feedback .....	12
5.7	Union response .....	13
5.8	Councils and Committees.....	14
5.9	Other feedback.....	16
5.10	Media coverage.....	16
6	Key findings .....	17
7	Response to frequently raised concerns .....	17
8	Next steps.....	17

### Appendix

- A. Questionnaire
- B. Letter to stakeholders
- C. Poster
- D. Press release
- E. Press coverage
- F. Consultation plan
- G. Data analysis



## 1 Executive Summary

From April 2013, there will no longer be a fire engine based at Horley Fire Station, which is operated by West Sussex. Surrey Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS) intends to alter the deployment of fire engines in order to maintain effective emergency response arrangements in accordance with the Public Safety Plan (PSP). SFRS aims to create a chain of single fire engine fire stations running through the boroughs of Epsom & Ewell and Reigate & Banstead, with two new fire stations in Salfords and Burgh Heath. This would create a more efficient use of resources across the county.

Consultation on this proposal ran from 10/12/2012 to 04/03/2013 and Members of the public, staff, councillors, community groups, businesses and partners were invited to provide us with their feedback.

Around 350 responses were received including from focus groups, surveys and questionnaires, email feedback, staff workshops, public meetings and formal responses. The results are as follows:

- Feedback from the survey, emails, focus groups, public meetings and formal responses was mixed. After merging and analysing the data, the level of support for the proposal overall is as follows:
  - 42% supportive
  - 20% uncertain
  - 32% opposing
  - 6% no opinion
- Staff were slightly less supportive (38%) and had concerns about the new facilities, the accuracy of the modelled response times, impact of changes to on-call contracts, and the resilience of the service. Some said that the FRS should be looking to relocate sources from north Surrey to avoid reducing the number of pumps in the area.
- Members of the public (including community representatives and Councillors) were slightly more supportive of the proposal (42%) than staff.
- Main objections came from people of Epsom and Ewell, where 60% of the public opposed the proposal and only 15% supported it. The main concern was that the continued growth in their area will add to congestion and increased fire risk – which in their opinion requires the second pump response time to be much faster than under the new proposal. Also, the cost of the move and the overall drivers for the proposals were questioned.
- Residents from areas in R&B that have been chronically under-served were supportive of the proposal. 61% of the public in R&B supported the proposal, saying it would be fairer distribution of resources; only 13% opposed it.

## 2 Context – Surrey Fire and Rescue Service

The Public Safety Plan (PSP) outlines 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. Subsequent to the PSP, West Sussex Fire and Rescue Service are relocating the fire engine based at Horley and terminating their agreement to receive and respond to calls for assistance in the local ceded area with effect from 1st April 2013.

Surrey Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS) currently base two 24 hour fire engines each at Epsom and Reigate Fire Stations, which provide most of the initial response cover for Epsom & Ewell (E&E) and Reigate & Banstead (R&B) Borough areas.



This project seeks to provide a more balanced service provision across the E&E and R&B Borough areas, in order to be better positioned to achieve the Surrey Response standard. It should also address the relocation of the fire engine from Horley as well as improving the property provision in these boroughs.

The preferred option is to create a chain of single fire engine fire stations running through the boroughs of Epsom & Ewell and Reigate & Banstead.

**Proposal 1:** Relocate one fire engine from Reigate to Horley Fire Station by agreement with West Sussex FRA on an interim basis from April 2013 whilst a more permanent second stage solution is created at a new optimal location in the Salfords area with a target date of the end of 2013.

**Proposal 2:** Relocate one fire engine from Epsom to a new optimal location in the Burgh Heath area with a target date of summer 2014.

This 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.

This report summarises the results of the extensive consultation about the proposals undertaken between December 2012 and March 2013.

### 3 Methodology

Government recommends running proportional consultation exercises ranging 2 to 12 weeks.<sup>1</sup> The proposal generated strong public opinion and significant interest, which is why the consultation period was extended from originally 8 to 12 weeks (10 December 2012 to 4 March 2013).

Before the start of the consultation, we agreed with key stakeholders on how they would like to be kept engaged during the consultation process. All nine protected characteristics, as stipulated in the Equality Act 2010, have been considered in the consultation plan. We sought advice and support from an external Equality & Diversity expert and the directorate's Equality and Cohesion Officer. We also followed the good practice developed during the PSP consultation and national and SCC consultation and engagement guidance. As a result, a comprehensive 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 stakeholders (see Appendix F for consultation plan). This included:

- Letters and emails to approx 700 stakeholders, including partner agencies (e.g. Police, NHS, Ambulance, etc), Voluntary Community Faith Sector (VCFS) organisations, Resident Associations, Resident Panel members and County Council, Borough Council and Parish Council Members (see Appendix B).
- Distribution of consultation material through the External Equality Advisory Group, borough councils' community officers' mailing lists and business associations
- On-line survey for residents, businesses, partner agencies, staff and Members (using email invites to ORS panel<sup>2</sup>, R&B and E&E mailing list, Business mailing list, EEAG member mailing list<sup>3</sup>)

<sup>1</sup> Cabinet office, Consultation Principles, July 2012, <http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/sites/default/files/resources/Consultation-Principles.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> ORS – external research organisation used for previous consultation on Public Safety Plan in 2011.



- Postal questionnaires to care homes in Epsom and Ewell and Reigate and Banstead and a mental health group in Reigate (see Appendix A).
- Presentation at Horley West neighbourhood panel, Horley neighbourhood panel and Horley North West neighbourhood panel (through Surrey Police)
- Presentation at Horley Town Council and Salfords and Sidlow Parish Council meetings
- Informal meetings of Reigate & Banstead and Epsom & Ewell Local Committees
- Presentations at Communities Select Committee in January and March 2013
- Meetings with partner agencies to discuss the proposal (West Sussex FRS, Fire and Rescue Advisory Group, London Fire Brigade, Public Sector Board)
- Meetings with the Fire Brigade Union
- Face to face briefings for staff at two workshops in Reigate and Epsom
- Frequent briefs and written communication for staff
- Two focus groups in Reigate and Epsom, with members of the public recruited through the survey
- Public meeting in Ewell's Bourne Hall
- Advertisement of our consultation through:
  - SCC, E&E and R& B websites, social media (SCC, E&E and R&B Twitter / Facebook feeds), boroughs' residents' magazines (articles appeared in both), Members' and Senior Manager bulletins ('Communicate', Select Committee Briefing, 'Issues Monitor' and E&E BC Members briefing), press and media (see Appendix E).
  - Leaflets and posters sent to libraries, town centres, resident associations, community centres, Citizens Advice Bureaux, schools, churches, GP surgeries, fire stations, post offices, Borough Council offices, E&E Town Hall notice board (see Appendix C).
  - Posters (inside and out) at Bourne Hall and flyers in Reception area.

#### 4 Resources

A dedicated team has developed, delivered and analysed the consultation between October 2012 and March 2013. The principle resources dedicated to this have been:

- Senior manager in Surrey Fire & Rescue (30% FTE throughout)
- Project and evaluation support (approx 100% full time equivalent throughout)
- Communications and promotional support (approx 80% Full Time Equivalent throughout)

In addition to the dedicated team, there has been a considerable time commitment from other senior Fire & Rescue officers, including the Chief Fire Officer, in providing guidance and progress review and liaising with elected Members.

The Cabinet portfolio holder has dedicated support and time to help shape the process and to present to other elected Members.

---

<sup>3</sup> EEAG – External Equalities Advisory Group (Surrey-wide network of organisations representing people with protected characteristics)



## 5 Analysis

The consultation received feedback from around 350 individuals and groups, through surveys, workshops, emails and calls, formal responses from Councils and other representative groups.

	Staff		Public*		E&E		R&B		Total
Survey	56	22%	187	74%	69	27%	149	59%	<b>253</b>
Workshops	27	57%	20	43%	31	66%	16	34%	<b>47</b>
Emails / calls	3	17%	15	83%	14	78%	4	22%	<b>18</b>
Neighbourhood panels			22		0		22		<b>22</b>
Other (rep groups)	1		9						<b>10</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>253</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>350</b>

\* includes residents, businesses, representative groups, neighbourhood panels and councils  
 See Appendix G for full listing and analysis.

### 5.1 Survey

- 253 responses, of which 38 postal returns and 215 surveys answered on-line<sup>4</sup>. 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	141	56%
Representative of a business	33	13%
Member of staff (Surrey Fire and Rescue Service)	56	22%
Member of staff (Surrey County Council)	6	2%
Partner agency, for example NHS, Police, other FRS	4	2%
Representative of a community group	7	3%
Elected Member	6	2%
<b>answered question</b>		<b>253</b>

- 94% of respondents value or strongly value the SFRS. Only 4% stated that they were unsure.
- 33 respondents said that they had contact with the SFRS because of a fire incident in the last three years, and 26 respondents had a Home Fire Safety visit. The main contact point, as staff and partners also completed the survey, was in a professional capacity (34%). If we discount staff and partners, the main way that respondents had contact with the FRS was still in a professional capacity (15%), 12% through a fire incident and 11% through a Home Fire Safety visit. 52% of non-staff and non-partners had not had any contact with the service.
- 41% of all respondents agreed with the proposals. 20% were not sure and 31% rejected the proposals. Only 8% stated that they held no opinion or didn't submit an answer. The level of support for this proposal, by respondent group, was:

<sup>4</sup> This sample size means, the survey has a confidence level of 95% and confidence interval of 6.2% (slightly above standard).



	SFRS staff (56)		Public (residents and businesses) (174)							
			E&E (56)		R&B (110)		Other (8)		Total (174)	
Yes	24	43%	12	21%	54	49%	1	13%	67	<b>38%</b>
Not sure	12	21%	11	20%	26	24%	1	13%	38	<b>21%</b>
No	15	27%	32	57%	19	17%	4	50%	55	<b>29%</b>
No opinion / na	5	9%	1	2%	11	10%	2	25%	14	<b>7%</b>

	Community Representatives / Councillors (13)					Partners (4)		SCC staff (6)		
	E&E (7)		R&B (6)		Total (13)					
Yes	0	0%	6	100%	6	<b>46%</b>	1	25%	6	100%
Not sure	0	0%			0	<b>0%</b>		0%		0%
No	6	86%			6	<b>46%</b>	2	50%		0%
No opinion / na	1	14%			1	<b>8%</b>	1	25%		0%

	TOTAL (253)							
	EE (69)		RB (149)		Other (27)		TOTAL	
Yes	13	19%	77	52%	14	52%	104	<b>41%</b>
Not sure	12	17%	32	21%	6	22%	50	<b>20%</b>
No	40	58%	27	18%	6	22%	78	<b>31%</b>
No opinion / na	4	6%	13	9%	1	4%	21	<b>8%</b>

- Councillors, community representatives and residents from Epsom and Ewell were the strongest opponents of the proposal. The main points of objection were:
  - A doubling of response time for the 2nd engine in Epsom and Ewell, with its continuing population growth and development
  - Cost of building new fire stations
  - Resilience of a one pump station
  - Lack of detail for the proposals
- We received 38 postal surveys, mainly from care homes and some from members of a mental health community group. Their feedback on the proposals was a bit more positive than the on-line responses: only 8% rejected the proposals outright. 53% supported them and 26% were unsure. The main concern for care home managers was the increased response times which they felt would impact the safety of their residents.
  - “Arrival of 2nd fire engine (12 minutes) would not be acceptable as we have 75 elderly residents.” (Care home manager)
- 8 in 10 respondents said that we explained the proposals clearly. Of those that requested more clarification, 35% were staff. The main demand was for more details on the location of fire stations, planning permission and costing. Very few respondents were under the impression that we proposed closure of fire stations.
- General comments included praise for the service in general, concerns about the proposals (reduction in fire engines, extra cost and fragmentation of fire stations, vicinity of major transport hubs and increasingly dense population) and the wish that consultation should be more extensive and better advertised.





- 44% of respondents heard about the consultation directly from the SFRS (for staff it was 96%, for the public the figure was 18%). The other major channel was local press, where 34% became aware of the consultation. Only 8% of respondents were alerted to the survey through the SCC website, Facebook and Twitter.
- 77% were willing to complete the Equality and Diversity section. Compared to the demographic make up of E&E and R&B, the sample was slightly more middle-aged, more male and with fewer representatives of the disabled and BME sections. However, care home managers responded on behalf of their elderly and disabled residents, which would increase the elderly and disabled sample size. There was one pregnant respondent and none who had undergone gender reassignment. 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 statistically too insignificant to be representative.

## 5.2 Focus groups

### Reigate

Seven members of the public joined the group to discuss the proposal. Issues like costing, risk profile, possible locations and staffing were explored with the attending Fire Officers. The overall consensus at the end of the session was supportive, as respondents recognised the proposal to be about service improvement and fairer provision across the borough and county, rather than a cost cutting exercise. Three of the respondents stated that the session had answered all their concerns and that they had changed their minds as a result. Only one attendee, despite being overall supportive, maintained slightly concerned about response times to major incidents on the M23.

- *“The proposal seems sensible and I’m happy that the service has explored all options to put forward the most robust approach.”* (attendee)

### Epsom

Seven members of the public, among them 2 Councillors, attended the focus group in Epsom to discuss the proposals. The overall consensus at the end of the session was more re-assured than at the beginning, when attendees registered their concerns, which revolved around suitable locations in Burgh Heath, the cost of building a new fire station, the overall reduction in pumps, an increased response time for the 2<sup>nd</sup> fire engine and congestion. Equally, positives about the more flexible approach and improved service for areas around Burgh Heath (Chipstead, Kingswood) were identified. The FRS was able to reassure attendants about the comprehensiveness of the modelling and response standards, and that partners are being involved.

- *“There is a greater area of deficit for the 2<sup>nd</sup> response but I do accept that the 1<sup>st</sup> response is the most important. I think you may have difficulties finding a Burgh Heath site – may be unachievable.”*
- *“Tonight has certainly changed my views on things, changed the picture.”*

## 5.3 Public meeting

The SFRS organised a public meeting on request of Epsom and Ewell Borough Council. The meeting was held on 14 February 2013 and was publicised in 102 outlets, including libraries, town centres, GPs, community centres, churches, schools, post offices, borough council offices and town halls. Posters were put inside and out of Bourne Hall, with flyers available in



the reception. A press release on the event was issued and the media were also briefed separately by E&E BC staff and an article appeared in Epsom Guardian. The event was also publicised online 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. 6 people attended, amongst them 3 local councillors and 3 members of the public. The SFRS gave a presentation and collected feedback and replied to questions which included:

- Cost of building new stations (is it worthwhile?)
- Finding a suitable location in Burgh Heath
- Epsom and Ewell is an area with continued growth
- Frequency and nature of cooperation with Sutton Fire Brigade
- Option of acquiring an additional engine in Burgh Heath  
*“As an Epsom resident I don’t want to just defend us, that’s not right, but the quicker you get somewhere the better. Looking at it in the great whole of things, it’s worth spending the money. So I’d like the option of keeping a 5<sup>th</sup> engine on the patch.”* (attendee)
- Cover when the engine is out and about
- Number of false alarms
- Proportion of one pump incidents
- Number of crew on a fire engine
- Incidents on Epsom Downs, the common and Horton Country Park in dry summers

#### 5.4 Neighbourhood Panels

As part of the consultation, officers and Members attended three Neighbourhood Panel meetings in the Horley area in December and January. The general consensus was:

##### Horley West, 12/12/2012:

- Kay Hammond attended. No feedback.

##### Horley, 18/12/2012:

- Seven members in attendance. Several questions about the proposals, including locations, response time impacts. Everyone present, including the Police officers, seemed to support our proposals.

##### Horley North West, 24/1/2013:

- Well attended (over 15 residents). Very few questions about the proposals and general support for proposal.

#### 5.5 Equality & Diversity sections

##### E&D 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
15-24	11%	12%	14%	1%
25-44	28%	26%	33%	33%
45-64	26%	28%	33%	47%
65-84	14%	14%	17%	19%
85+	3%	3%	4%	





It is not representative of the demographic make up of the boroughs. The survey contains questionnaires that were completed by care home managers, who represent old age pensioners (predominantly 75+). When looking at the postal questionnaires (mainly from care homes), we find that 53% support the proposal and only 8% reject it outright. Of those that were unsure and unsupportive, the main feedback concerned the safety of the elderly residents.

Only two respondents were aged 15-24 and they were not supportive of the proposal. The reasoning however reflected the average causes for objection (population growth in Epsom) and had no reference to young age.

The older age group 65+ (those at high risk of fire death/injury) seemed least supportive of the proposal. However when looking at the verbatim from objectors, comments were mainly made about the location of the Burgh Heath station (2x) and increase in response times (2x) and cover for the M25 area from Reigate (1x).

Age	Sample size		Yes		Not sure		No		No opinion	
15-24	2	1%					2	100%		
25-44	54	33%	25	46%	9	17%	18	33%	2	4%
45-64	78	47%	37	47%	15	19%	24	31%	2	3%
65+	32	19%	13	41%	7	22%	11	34%	1	3%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3%</b>

In this survey, age as a risk factor has only been raised by care home managers.

- 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 more positive. The main concerns for the disabled group were reduced resources and longer response times. Respondents stating that they had no disability were slightly more negative about the proposal.

Disability	Sample size		Yes		Not sure		No		No opinion	
Yes	18	11%	10	56%	4	22%	3	17%	1	6%
No	146	89%	64	44%	27	18%	51	35%	4	3%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3%</b>

- Gender:** The survey was completed by more men than women, which is not representative of the boroughs. Also, females are more at risk of injury or death by fire.<sup>5</sup> In terms of support, women seemed less negative and unsure of the proposal. Men had a much higher objection rate.

Gender	Sample size		Yes		Not sure		No		No opinion	
Female	64	40%	27	42%	16	25%	18	28%	3	5%
Male	97	60%	47	48%	11	11%	37	38%	2	2%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3%</b>

<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, 91% of those that stated their ethnicity was White British or English (which is slightly above the average for R&B and E&E population, 88%). 7 respondents came from an Other White background (4%) and 4 from an Asian background (2%), 1 (1%) from a Mixed Asian-White background, 1 from a Chinese and 1 from an Arab background and 1 respondent from the Black community. There were no ethnicity-specific comments amongst any of the ethnic groups. On contrary non-White British respondents were more supportive of the proposals.

Ethnicity	Sample size		Yes		Not sure		No		No opinion	
White British	147	91%	68	46%	24	16%	51	35%	4	3%
Not White British	15	9%	7	47%	5	33%	2	13%	1	7%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3%</b>

- Religion:** The majority of respondents classed themselves as Christian (66%, average for R&B and E&E is 62%). 30% said they had no religion (average for E&E & R&B is 25%). 3 respondents were Buddhist and 3 Hindu. There were no Muslim or Jewish respondents amongst the sample. There were no religious-specific comments amongst those that held a religion.

Religion	Sample size		Yes		Not sure		No		No opinion	
Christian	101	66%	46	46%	18	18%	33	33%	4	4%
Other faiths (Buddhist, Hindu)	6	4%	1	17%	4	67%	1	17%	0	0%
No religious / faith group	45	30%	24	53%	7	16%	14	31%	0	0%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3%</b>

- Marital status:** Single occupancy is known to be a fire risk factor. Hence, looking at the 25 respondents stating to be single, divorced, separated and widowed, we can say that their level of support is not as positive but also that their negativity is slightly weaker than average. A considerable part had no opinion. The main concerns for the single group were reduced resources and longer response times. Married and co-habiting respondents were more positive about the proposal.

Status	Sample size		Yes		Not sure		No		No opinion	
Married, co-habiting, civil partnership	132	84%	61	46%	24	18%	46	35%	1	1%
Single, widowed, separated, divorced	25	16%	9	36%	5	20%	8	32%	3	12%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3%</b>



- **LGB:** 4 of 253 respondents stated to be lesbian, gay or bisexual. The level of support split into 25% supportive, 25% unsure and 50% unsupportive. However, it was only a very small sample, which makes this data unrepresentative. The verbatim that the unsure and unsupportive respondents gave had no reference to their sexuality or any other lifestyle choice associated with this protected characteristic (single occupancy, etc).

Status	Sample size		Yes		Not sure		No		No opinion	
Heterosexual	147	97%	71	48%	27	18%	45	31%	4	3%
LGB	4	3%	1	25%	1	25%	2	50%	0	0%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3%</b>

- **Pregnancy / maternity:** One respondent stated that she was pregnant / had been pregnant in the last 12 months. She objected to the proposal, because of the increase of the 2<sup>nd</sup> engine's response time for Epsom and Ewell. There was no reference to her maternity status.
- **Gender reassignment:** No respondents stating that they had undergone gender reassignment.

Empowerment Board East Surrey and Mid Surrey:

The Surrey Empowerment Boards is a group that represents disabled people with physical, sensory and cognitive impairments in Surrey. The consultation response was prepared by the chairs of the five Empowerment Boards and representatives from the following groups: Surrey Coalition of Disabled People, Social Information Disability, Reigate and Banstead Access Group and Epsom and Ewell Access Group. The group also represents residents from all boroughs of Surrey and the greater dispersal of resources will affect every town and village across Surrey.

The Boards do not support the proposals for various reasons:

- location of other essential services such as Epsom and East Surrey hospitals
- shutting two fire stations to build a new one doesn't make financial sense
- difficulties in responding to serious crashes on the M25 from Salfords and Horley (modelled response times do not reflect rush hour) – maybe operate a similar system to the ambulance service where the engines are based throughout the county on side roads.
- incidences at homes – i.e. Telecare is currently being promoted. If more people take up the offer of having a smoke detector linked to the community alarm this will mean the Fire Service will have to respond to more alerts.
- continuous development of housing and other buildings in Epsom, Horley, Reigate and Redhill
- concerns about sufficient cover if there is a major accident at Gatwick or Heathrow airports
- London Fire Brigade are losing fire engines – effect on response times



## 5.6 Staff meetings / feedback

### Survey responses:

56 SFRS staff responded to the survey. The support for their service was strong with only 7% not being sure about valuing the service. Judging the proposed option, 43% of staff supported the approach, 21% were unsure and 27% rejected the proposal.

The key reasons for those that were unsure or unsupportive were:

- reduction in engines from five to four is detrimental to the service,
- response time will be too long in E&E

59% said that we had explained the proposals clearly. The main criticism of the 26% that said that we hadn't was mainly lack of detail in the plan.

Other comments made by staff were:

- About the timing / extent of the consultation and how the proposal was portrayed
- Proposals timelines were unrealistic and having a fire station at an industrial unit would remove community focal point and might impact on facilities
- Proposals were best possible solution

Of the 46% that were willing to submit information on their demographic background, all were of working age so fell into the 15-24, 25-44 or 45-64 age groups. One staff stated that s/he had a disability (4%), which is above with the general make up of the SFRS (1%). 80% 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).

### Workshop themes:

#### **Epsom, 18 January (attended by 18 staff):**

- Cover for training (used to be 2nd pump) – acknowledgement that a reliance on the current two pump stations to cover crew based training would require consideration. There was consideration being given for an alternative training delivery but this was still in its formative phase.
- Cost of move to 4 one pump stations – under the current model a two pump borough relies on one station being at 28 and one at 24 compared to a single two pump station being staffed with 48
- Chance of redundancy – concerns around the mechanism by which the Service would manage the reduction in establishment. This was placed in the context that vacancy levels would be managed in order to avoid the necessity of redundancy.
- Modelling times from Epsom not accurate - staff at Epsom had produced a map. London have never been factored into the modelling. The only appliance which was over the border and from another Fire Authority was Horley.
- Because London Fire Brigade and Surrey would both be using the Vision system, the shared principle of nearest and quickest asset would apply. Therefore staff had concerns that where borders were shared LFB would be used in preference to Surrey FRS and therefore there would be a smaller mobilising footprint for SFRS assets in certain part of Reigate and Banstead borough.
- Agree with Proposal 1 (Salfords) but not with Burgh Heath



#### **Reigate, 18 January (attended by 9 staff):**

- Concerns about accuracy of modelling and predicted response times, should be put in context with staff knowledge
- Move is planned out too quickly. Can Salfords move be delayed, renting Horley for 2 years?
- Concern about reduction in pump numbers overall
- Resilience impaired – concerns about big incidents on M23 for example
- Staff feel that they could have come up with better proposal (but did not mention what)
- Change in on-call contracts might make move more difficult
- Cost of move and if SCC fund it
- Concerns about attractiveness of station in Salfords and functionality (i.e. for training)
- Proposal affects staff morale (prefer 2 pump stations)
- Question recruitment phase commencing before consultation closes – looks like decision was already made
- Consultation in north R&B and Mole Valley and Tandridge
- Contingency plan if SCC reject proposal

#### Email feedback:

Three staff had contacted the consultation inbox with following queries and concerns:

- Cautious to lose two pump stations – risk factors haven't changed, so reducing cover doesn't seem safe
- Banstead area looks feasible, A23 location ideal for south R&B station
- Avoid over-reliance on neighbouring Fire and Rescue Services
- Changing to crew contracts will increase risk
- Salfords - Potential lack of suitable facilities so managerial role cannot be executed effectively
- Concern about SGI's increasing role in the service

#### **5.7 Union response**

No formal response was received from the Fire Brigade's Union (FBU) during the consultation period.

However, the following is a summary of the one of the discussions with the Surrey FBU during the consultation period:

- Overall, the FBU feel that the fire cover model seems reasonable.
- Timescales associated with staff needing to apply for the posts that will be at Salfords (Horley) and the ability for FBU to meet with staff at Reigate.
- Duration of the consultation. FBU indicated that they felt the consultation should be 16 weeks (due to Christmas).
- Volume of incidents in certain areas (Burgh Heath and Horley) when compared with areas that the fire engines are being moved from.
- Response time graphic and the table of drive times not being representative and possibly being misleading.
- FBU have requested a risk assessment of the impacts of the proposed changes, specifically in relation to the geographic area where response times will be extended from what they currently are. Specifically the area to the north and west of Epsom fire station.



- Risks associated with Gatwick Airport and training for Surrey crews, now that the West Sussex fire engine will no longer be based at Horley. FBU feel that Surrey crews are much more likely to attend an incident at Gatwick and therefore need additional training.
- Technical suitability of both the Horley and Salfords sites, specifically for Salfords this was linked to training facilities, possibility of being blocked in by traffic, etc.

No formal response was received from any other Representative Body during the consultation period.

## 5.8 Councils and Committees

Before presenting the proposal to the Local Committees and Borough Councils of Epsom & Ewell and Reigate & Banstead, the proposal and accompanying information had been approved by the Portfolio Holder, Kay Hammond.

### Communities Select Committee (Scrutiny role)

At the meeting on 16 January 2013, following points were made by the Members:

- Concerns were expressed that the north of Epsom & Ewell was left vulnerable by the proposals, which were protecting the majority at an increased risk to a minority.
- Concerns were raised about the risk presented in low income or densely populated areas, in particular where there were old high-rise flats. The increased response time for second engines was felt to pose a significant risk in the eventuality of a serious incident taking place in such areas.
- In reference to Reigate & Banstead, the plan would not be able to meet the requirements of the response standard. Dissatisfaction was expressed with the communications received from Property Services when sites were under consideration for potential development.
- Some Members felt that Banstead was left vulnerable by the proposals. The Committee raised a question as to the implementation in Horley and requested further information about the interim cover for April 2013.
- The Committee raised concerns about Members not being informed of public engagement exercises in relation to the consultations.
- Next meeting to be held on 21 March 2013.

### Survey responses from Members

There were 6 responses from Councillors in the survey (mainly from ward level). Four of those objected to the proposal, with reasons revolving around the 2<sup>nd</sup> engine's response time in Epsom and Ewell and the fact that Epsom is such a built up place. One councillor raised the concern that changes in West Sussex and London Fire Brigade have not been discussed in the consultation material.

### Reigate and Banstead Borough Council:

- Members expressed their support for the proposal and welcomed the resulting service improvements in the Borough.
- The Council offered assistance to the SFRS to find a suitable location for the new fire stations in Salfords and Burgh Heath.

### Reigate and Banstead Local Committee:

- Members expressed their support in principle for the proposals.





- Concerns centred around Members wanting to be consulted on possible site locations, the short time line (summer 2014), the suitability of the location in terms of minimising impact on traffic and accessing a new housing development in Netherne on the Hill. Also, the planned refurbishment of Purley fire station needs to be taken into account.

#### Epsom and Ewell Borough Council:

The council objects to the proposal. Main areas for concerns were:

- Consultation should have been better publicised and a public meeting held (in response public meeting held on 14/02 in Ewell)
- North E&E is very populated and whole borough is heavy traffic area. Also, population growth is predicted and new developments are planned.
- Major incidents require two engines, response time for second engine is too long.
- One pump station in Epsom means reduction in prevention work and enforcement work
- Request new risk assessments for new housing development

#### Epsom and Ewell Local Committee:

- Consultation should have been better publicised.
- Epsom is a growing area with new housing developments, and a large volume of traffic.
- Seek to continue the arrangements with West Sussex (Horley) instead of acquiring two new stations.
- Burgh Heath should be in addition to existing resources. Reduction in service (2nd engine response time) is not desirable.

#### Response from Salfords & Sidlow Council

- Supportive of fire station in Salfords.
- Consideration must be given to the correct location in respect of residents and highway matters.

#### Response from Horley Town Council

- Supportive of fire station in Horley and then Salfords.
- Concerns on the ability to meet the second appliance response times. The drive time during day from Reigate Fire Station to Horley is calculated to be 14.8 minutes, which is too close to give any confidence that the target of 15 minutes is achievable. However, the council is aware that there is no quick solution to this.

#### Tattenhams Resident's Association

- Supportive of fire station in Burgh Heath.
- Respond to emergencies more quickly in the surrounding area, especially M25, in East Ewell and West Ewell (avoiding Epsom traffic), in Woodmansterne, Banstead, Kingswood, Walton.



## 5.9 Other feedback

### Email from residents:

14 non-staff submitted their feedback to the consultation email address (one of them a councillor from Epsom, the rest residents and one business with a tender enquiry). One resident left comments via telephone.

Of those 15, 12 were from Epsom and Ewell and 3 from Reigate and Banstead. All but one objected to the proposal or registered some concerns, which included:

- Consultation was not widely enough publicised
- Growing population and more traffic in both Epsom and Reigate means that risk of fire incidents increase and an increase in the second engine's response time will put life at risk (rule by which major incidents need 2 pumps)
- The projected travel times might not be accurate as they did not reflect rush hour
- Cost of creating new fire stations
- Resilience for major incidents (i.e. M25, airports)
- Most in favour of keeping 2 pumps in Epsom

One resident from R&B supported the proposed building of a Salfords station.

### Staff feedback on what customers said:

When asked what residents and businesses made of the consultation, fire and rescue staff didn't have much to report, other than the consultation should have been more publicised in the Reigate area and that there was objection in the Epsom area.

## 5.10 Media coverage

As part of the consultation, several press releases were published (see Appendix D). From 7 Dec – 5 March 2013, the proposal featured in 30 media items:

- 58% Positive
- 15% Neutral
- 27% Negative

Paid-for advertising equivalent for this positive coverage would cost £34,824 (Letters and advertorials are not rated). See Appendix E for full media coverage.



## 6 Key findings

The feedback of the consultation overall has been balanced, with more support from Reigate and Banstead and less support from Epsom and Ewell.

Group	Yes	Not sure	No	No opinion	Key themes	Total
Staff	38%	22%	34%	6%	Facilities at new locations, reduced resilience of service, cost of proposal, effect of changes to on-call contracts, accuracy of modelling times, cooperation with London Fire Brigade (over-reliance, Vision)	87
Public:	42%	20%	32%	6%	Reduced resilience of service, finding suitable sites (accessibility, noise disturbance), cost of creating new locations, consultation should have been better publicised	253
Public EE	15%	21%	60%	3%	High density area with continuous growth in Epsom, reduced resilience, increased risk and long waiting time for major incidents, growing volume of traffic and accuracy of modelled response times	91
Public RB	61%	19%	13%	7%	Fairer distribution, finding suitable sites, increasing population in Reigate, cost of creating new fire station	152
Partners	25%	25%	50%	0%	Support from NHS Surrey and Borders Partnership	4
SCC staff	100%	0%	0%	0%		6
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>6%</b>		<b>350*</b>

During meetings and focus groups, it transpired that the public require more information and re-assurance about the plans, which will be covered in section 7 below.

## 7 Response to frequently raised concerns

All consultation data including formal responses, survey comments, emails, workshop feedback was coded to determine the most frequently raised concerns and questions.

## 8 Next steps

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

The Community Select Committee will review the final proposal on 21 March, before the Cabinet will make a decision on 26 March. If the proposal is approved, the Action Plan will be implemented. Equally, actions outlined in the EIA will start to be implemented.

This page is intentionally left blank