

From: [Dean Stevens](#)
Sent: 25/07/2014 12:13
To: [John Redmond](#)
Cc: [James Bywater](#); [Rebecca Bryant](#)
Subject: Shaping your service survey - consultation response

Dear John

Please find our comments in relation to the current public consultation around Shropshire's 'Shaping the Service' survey. I have provided a brief narrative based on the comments boxes as opposed filling in the electronic form. However, as always with a fire service response to a neighbouring FRS IRMP the devil is always in the detail.

I believe the approach you have been discussing around closer integration of prevention, protection and response to be the right direction of travel and if there are any ways in which we as a Service can support you in your journey either through collaboration, joint problem-solving or sharing each other's thinking and delivery plans then please do not hesitate to let me know – I know the Chiefs and Chairs meet on a regular basis and the Deps have their own forum in which they agree actions etc. However, if there is value in some specific discussion around your IRMP thinking then I am happy to meet for a more detailed conversation – either with your nominated officer or through our IRMP leads or equivalents.

Fire Control

I believe this is a reasonable and practical option, not only given the current economic challenge, but also due to improvements in mobilising technologies, economies of scale etc. In addition there is the potential for future performance improvements such as data management, performance analysis, training, policies and procedures etc. From our recent experiences in implementing the shared facility with the West Mids it will be important for project teams to recognise any such proposals are cultural and people based as much as, or even more, so than a technical/IT project. We would be happy to share any experiences or learning to support such a proposal.

Understanding of your plan

I do find the plan relatively easy to understand, although always consider the local community will find it less easy – as to be expected with any such organisational plan. As a general observation I would recommend a suite of consultation approaches if this is not already being undertaken – which I assume is being done. This comment is also applicable to 'sufficient information about risks' and 'sufficient information about effectiveness'.

Understanding of future challenges

I am never completely sure the local community fully understand the challenges faced by fire services, evidence such as social attitudes survey tend to support this assertion. However, they often have clear expectations, albeit sometimes unrealistic and uninformed, about what effective service delivery looks like – response (immediately) verses prevention and protection, issues such as closing fire stations, which I know you have experienced for example. As previously mentioned I fully support the desire to more closely align prevention and protection with response and I believe a fully considered narrative for, and with, the community (and elected members) will help in improving community awareness and understanding – I know you have already completed significant work on public value in respect of that which the public values balanced against those things that add value to the public sphere.

Terminology

I recognise and agree that terminology around attendance standards is complex, unhelpful and often a poor descriptor. Whichever, terminology is approved and taken forward it will be important to check public understanding of what it means to them, your workforce and elected members and why.

Proposed targets for accidental and deliberate fire deaths and injuries

I think this is a difficult area insofar as, does this mean that the upper level is acceptable. The question I would pose for reflection is why has this been proposed, how will it be monitored and what resources will be put in place should you start to exceed or near this target. As a service we removed such targets a few years ago and it has assisted in helping our people better understand demand and initiatives – the conversation has evolved from whether or not the target is right to more around what is causing the particular levels of performance and what are we doing or what do we need to do about it – I would be happy to share our thinking and work on this should it be helpful.

Two final comments. Firstly, I would offer is that consideration be given to, how does the operational part of the service retain sufficient business safety (and protection, if this is included) awareness with the transfer of grey to green book roles – linked to the wider prevention, protect and response alignment – how do crews retain key operational knowledge, learning and understanding of building performance under fire conditions – this may already have been considered under your proposals. Secondly, whilst the service has indicated it is not **currently** planning to reduce the number of appliances, does this include the type of appliances or changes to design, how sustainable is this and what are the plans should you need to reconsider this point.

Once again John, thank you for the opportunity to comment and if you or one of your officers would like to discuss any of your proposals or my comments in more detail please do not hesitate to let me know.

Kind regards

Dean

Regards
Dean Stevens

Director of Prevent and Protect
Staffordshire Fire and Rescue Service
Fire Service Headquarters
Pirehill House
Stone
Staffordshire
ST15 0BS
Tel. No: 01785 898762
E mail: stevens.d@staffordshirefire.gov.uk