

SUMMARY REPORT OF RESPONSES TO THE SERVICE REDESIGN CONSULTATION – RESPONSE PROPOSALS



PRESENTED TO: FIRE AUTHORITY

DATE OF MEETING: 18 APRIL 2017

OFFICER PRESENTING REPORT: TEMPORARY AREA MANAGER JIM POWELL

1. PURPOSE AND SUMMARY OF REPORT

- 1.1. To provide Fire Authority members with a full and final summary feedback report of the responses to the Service Redesign consultation for the Response proposals.
- 1.2. To seek a decision on those Response proposals following conscientious consideration of the consultation feedback.
- 1.3. To assist with the consideration of the feedback the report will be supported by a presentation to Fire Authority members at the meeting.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Fire Authority:-

- 2.1. **Consider** the outcomes of consultation in the full summary report of consultation responses in relation to the **Response** proposals.
- 2.2. **Consider and determine** which of the seven **Response** options (shown in appendix A) RBFA should adopt.

3. BACKGROUND AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

- 3.1. The Service Redesign consultation opened on 12 December 2016 and closed at 17.00 on 13 March 2017 following a thirteen week consultation period.
- 3.2. The report provided with this paper gives members a general overview of stakeholder activity, a breakdown of demographic profiles and a detailed analysis of responses from members of the public, staff and a variety of organisations.
- 3.3. The online questionnaire was the primary method of gaining feedback from stakeholders. It received a total of 1003 entries and along with other collection methods such as post, email and telephone gave an overall total of 1050 responses which shows an increased response rate of 222% from the

previous highest, received during the Response Standards consultation in 2016.

- 3.4. RBFA also received a petition presented by residents of Wargrave which opposes the closure of Wargrave fire station. (This is contained as an appendix in the consultation feedback report) It contained a total of 245 signatures, 92 of which were classified as being from local government electors thereby exceeding the threshold necessary to qualify as a petition under RBFA standing orders (SO19). The petition is examined in more detail in the consultation feedback report.
- 3.5. The demographic and equality data broadly shows similar trends in responses to those of previous consultations:
- Although the majority of responses were from the same age group (40-49 years old) there was an increase in our response rate from those aged 17 years or younger.
 - The overall trend in ethnicity data was broadly similar however there was a small increase in response from those identifying their ethnic origin as Chinese or other ethnic group (0.31%).
 - Previously there had been an almost even split between those who said they worked for RBFRS and those who didn't, which although broadly the same, there was a greater response rate for those who did not work for RBFRS on this occasion. This was probably due to the overall increase in response rate.
 - New data was collected on which unitary authority area respondents reside in. The majority of respondents were from the Wokingham borough council area.

3.6 **Response Options**

- Option 1 was the highest ranked with 42.91% ranking it as their 'most preferred option'.
- Option 7 was the second highest ranked with 22.47%.
- Option 4 was third highest ranked with 17.93%
- Option 2 was fourth highest ranked with 7.48%
- Option 3 was fifth highest ranked with 6.68%
- Option 5 was sixth highest ranked with 4.66%
- Option 6 was seventh highest ranked with 3.14%
- Respondents were then asked to explain why they chose their most and least preferred options. These responses were analysed and coded into themes, expressing a wide range of opinions around all aspects of the seven Response options.
- The consultation feedback report also gives focus to the specific scenarios which form the component parts of the seven Response options such as fire engine removal at Pangbourne, Wargrave and Windsor (at night) and removal of the Retained Support Unit and various other types of crewing arrangements.

- 3.7 Following the Fire Authority members decision, implementation and delivery projects will be commissioned by officers. This work will be managed by the programme office through the programme board which will oversee the work. Progress on implementation and delivery will be reported to IRMP lead member and through Strategic Performance Board to the Fire Authority's Audit and Governance Committee.

4. FINANCIAL, LEGAL, RISK MANAGEMENT, ENVIRONMENTAL AND EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 The report provides a public response to proposals that are designed to achieve financial savings in line with current planning assumptions outlined in the consultation documentation.
- 4.2 This report and its consideration are intended to adhere to the legal principles that underpin public consultation as enshrined in the Gunning principles
- 4.3 Risk management arrangements are detailed in the evidence documents that underpin the consultation proposals.
- 4.4 There are no environmental implications.
- 4.5 An equality impact analysis has been undertaken for the proposals and there are no significant implications noted at this stage.

5. COMPLIANCE WITH STANDING ORDERS / FINANCIAL REGULATIONS

- 5.1. There are no known conflicts.

6. CONTRIBUTION TO STRATEGIC COMMITMENTS

- 6.1. Commitment 1 – We will educate people on how to prevent fires and other emergencies, and what to do when they happen.
- 6.2. Commitment 2 – We will ensure a swift and effective response when called to emergencies.
- 6.3. Commitment 3 – We will ensure appropriate fire safety standards in buildings.
- 6.4. Commitment 4 – we will seek opportunities to contribute to a broader safety, health and wellbeing agenda.
- 6.5. Commitment 5 – We will ensure that Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service provide good value for money.

7. ASSESSMENT AGAINST THE PARTNERSHIP FOR COMMON SENSE

- 7.1. As part of the engagement process the IRMP team delivered presentations to middle managers from all departments. These middle managers then cascaded this input to the majority of all staff including uniformed and non-uniformed.

7.2. Representative bodies were approached and invited to participate in pre consultation activity and provide a response to the consultation via the questionnaire or other suitable method.

8. BACKGROUND PAPERS

8.1. Service Redesign consultation document (not attached)

8.2. Prevention, Protection and Response IRMP evidence base reports. (not attached)

8.3. Agenda Item 10, Service Redesign consultation options, Fire Authority meeting 6 December 2016 (not attached).

9. CONSULTATION WITH STATUTORY OFFICERS

9.1. Chief Fire Officer/ Chief Executive

The Chief Fire Officer was consulted on the content of this report.

9.2. Head of Finance & Procurement

The Head of Finance and Procurement was consulted on the content of this report.

9.3. Monitoring Officer

The Monitoring Officer sponsored this report.

Author: Jim Powell
Temporary Area Manager (Risk and Performance)
07774 021 5664

Simon Jefferies
Temporary ACFO
07775 998038

Sponsored by: Trevor Ferguson
Deputy Chief Fire Officer / Monitoring Officer
0118 838 4616

Date of report: 5 April 2017