

ANNEX A

Background Material

LFRS Official Questionnaire

FBU Unofficial Questionnaire

Rutland Pre-Printed Letter

Rutland E-Petition

CONSULTATION QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is intended for use with the Integrated Risk Management Plan 2015-2020 consultation document.

You may complete as many or as few of the sections (numbered 1-7) as you wish, but where you do complete a section, we would invite you to answer ALL of the questions within that section. When answering each question please tick just ONE of the option boxes. At the end of each section you will find a free text box where you may leave additional comments regarding your views on the proposal.

1. CHARNWOOD BOROUGH – LOUGHBOROUGH FIRE AND RESCUE STATION

We are proposing to remove one fire engine from Loughborough Fire and Rescue Station. This would result in a reduction of 20 wholetime posts. Our analysis shows that the risk, in terms of the number of incidents, has reduced in Charnwood; and, that if we remove a fire engine from Loughborough, adequate emergency cover is available from the remaining 24/7 wholetime fire engine at Loughborough Fire and Rescue Station; with the second fire engine coming from nearby fire and rescue stations. Removing the fire engine would save almost £780K.

1. Were you aware or unaware that the number of emergency incidents in Charnwood had reduced substantially in recent years?

Aware Unaware

2. Do you agree or disagree that we should target our community safety resources towards the most vulnerable people?

Agree Disagree

3. Do you agree or disagree that it is reasonable to make necessary savings by removing one fire engine from Loughborough Fire and Rescue Station?

Agree Disagree

2. RUTLAND – OAKHAM FIRE AND RESCUE STATION

We are proposing to remove the fire engine crewed by the On-Call staff from Oakham Fire and Rescue Station. This would mean a reduction of 12 On-Call posts.

Our analysis shows that Rutland is a relatively low risk area in terms of the number of incidents, and that if we remove the On-Call fire engine from Oakham adequate emergency cover is available from the 24/7 wholtime fire engine at Oakham, with the second fire engine coming from nearby fire and rescue stations. Removing the On-Call fire engine would save almost £100K.

4. Were you aware or unaware that the number of emergency incidents for Oakham Fire and Rescue Station are the lowest when compared to all of our wholtime fire and rescue stations?

Aware

Unaware

5. Do you agree or disagree that we should target our community safety resources towards the most vulnerable people?

Agree

Disagree

6. Do you agree or disagree that it is reasonable to make necessary savings by removing the On-Call fire engine from Oakham Fire and Rescue Station?

Agree

Disagree

LEICESTERSHIRE FIRE AND RESCUE AUTHORITY

3. LEICESTER CITY

We are proposing to remove one fire engine from within the city area. This will mean a reduction of 20 wholetime posts.

Our analysis shows that the risk, in terms of the number of incidents, has reduced in Leicester City; and, that if we remove one fire engine from the city, adequate emergency cover is available from the other 24/7 wholetime fire engines in the city fire and rescue stations, along with cover from nearby fire and rescue stations. Removing one fire engine would save almost £780K.

7. Were you aware or unaware that the number of emergency incidents in Leicester City had reduced substantially in recent years?

Aware

Unaware

8. Do you agree or disagree that we should target our community safety resources towards the most vulnerable people?

Agree

Disagree

9. Do you agree or disagree that it is reasonable to make necessary savings by removing one fire engine from one of the city's three fire and rescue stations?

Agree

Disagree

LEICESTERSHIRE FIRE AND RESCUE AUTHORITY

4. FIRE ENGINE CREWING LEVELS

We are proposing to crew all fire engines with a minimum of four people as standard. This will mean a reduction of 17 whole-time posts.

Current practice for city and On-Call fire engines shows that a crew of four people is a safe and adequate provision for responding to emergencies. Standardising crewing across the service to four would save almost £650K.

10. Do you agree or disagree that it is reasonable to make necessary savings by crewing all of our fire engines with four people?

Agree

Disagree

OFFICIAL

5. THE RESILIENCE TEAM

We are proposing to disestablish the resilience team. This would mean a reduction of 12 whole-time posts.

The requirement to have a team specifically to cover the availability of On-Call staff has reduced in line with the closure of On-Call fire and rescue stations. Disbanding the resilience team would save almost £475K.

11. Were you aware or unaware of the reduction in the number of our On-Call fire engines in recent years?

Aware

Unaware

12. Do you agree or disagree that it is reasonable to make necessary savings by disbanding the resilience team?

Agree

Disagree

6. OADBY AND WIGSTON DISTRICT – WIGSTON FIRE AND RESCUE STATION

We are proposing to change the duty system worked by staff at Wigston Fire and Rescue Station, from a wholetime 2/2/4 and On-Call, to a wholetime Day Crewing Plus and On-Call system. This would mean a reduction of 14 wholetime posts.

Our analysis shows that the risk, in terms of the number of incidents, has reduced in Oadby and Wigston; however, 24/7 wholetime fire and rescue cover is still required in the area. Introducing Day Crewing Plus would save almost £415K.

13. Were you aware or unaware that the number of emergency incidents in Oadby and Wigston had reduced in recent years?

Aware

Unaware

14. Do you agree or disagree that it is reasonable to make necessary savings by implementing the Day Crewing Plus system?

Agree

Disagree

LEICESTERSHIRE FIRE AND RESCUE AUTHORITY
LERS OFFICIAL

7. COUNCIL TAX

Following the implementation of these proposals we still need to make savings in order to cover the outstanding budget deficit of approximately £1.8m. These could potentially be covered by a one-off increase of £5 plus a yearly increase of 1.99%; or, a one off increase of £10 with no further increase in Council Tax, or a one-off increase of £10 plus 1.99% yearly increase.

15. Would you be prepared to pay more for your fire and rescue service?

Yes

No

16. If YES, how much; either a £5 or £10 one-off increase on your Council Tax? (£5 equates to just under 10p per week, £10 equates to just under 20p per week, based on a Band D property)

£5

£10

OFFICIAL

If you have answered any of the questions in this Consultation Questionnaire, please complete the following two questions:

I/we have answered questions contained in this Consultation Questionnaire as:

- An individual A business A group An organisation

I/we am/are located in the following District:

- Blaby District Council Charnwood Borough Council Harborough District Council
 Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council Melton Borough Council
 North West Leicestershire District Council Oadby and Wigston Borough Council
 Leicester City Council Rutland None of the above

NB: consultation responses, including the names and addresses of respondents, will be made publicly available on request, unless confidentiality is specifically requested or disclosure would prejudice third parties.

Thank you for your feedback

EQUALITY MONITORING QUESTIONNAIRE

We would be grateful if you would complete this Equality Monitoring Questionnaire, as we need to carry out equality and diversity monitoring in order to meet our statutory obligations and to ensure that the service we provide is fair and accessible to all our diverse communities

Your assistance with answering the following questions is greatly appreciated and all answers you provide are confidential and will be used solely for monitoring purposes.

Gender Male Female Transgender

Age Range Under 18 18-24 25-39 40-59 60-74 75 and over

Ethnic Origin

White <input type="checkbox"/> British <input type="checkbox"/> Irish <input type="checkbox"/> Any other white background	Mixed <input type="checkbox"/> White and Black Caribbean <input type="checkbox"/> White and Black African <input type="checkbox"/> White and Asian <input type="checkbox"/> Any other mixed background	Asian or Asian British <input type="checkbox"/> Indian <input type="checkbox"/> Pakistani <input type="checkbox"/> Bangladeshi <input type="checkbox"/> Any other Asian background	Black or Black British <input type="checkbox"/> Caribbean <input type="checkbox"/> African <input type="checkbox"/> Any other black background	Chinese or Other Ethnic Group <input type="checkbox"/> Chinese <input type="checkbox"/> Other Ethnic Group (please specify) <input type="text"/>
---	---	---	--	--

Prefer not to say

Disability
Disability is defined as 'a medical or physical impairment which has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on the ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities'.
Do you have a disability? Yes No

Religious Belief/Faith
 Buddhist Christian None
 Hindu Jewish Muslim
 Sikh Prefer not to say
 Other (please specify)

Sexual Orientation Bisexual Gay/Lesbian Heterosexual Prefer not to say

CONSULTATION QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is intended for use with the Integrated Risk Management Plan 2015-2020 consultation document.

You may complete as many or as few of the sections (numbered 1-7) as you wish, but where you do complete a section, we would invite you to answer ALL of the questions within that section. When answering each question please tick just ONE of the option boxes. At the end of each section you will find a free text box where you may leave additional comments regarding your views on the proposal.

1. CHARNWOOD BOROUGH – LOUGHBOROUGH FIRE AND RESCUE STATION

We are proposing to remove one fire engine from Loughborough Fire and Rescue Station. This would result in a reduction of 20 wholetime posts. Our analysis shows that the risk, in terms of the number of incidents, has reduced in Charnwood; and, that if we remove a fire engine from Loughborough, adequate emergency cover is available from the remaining 24/7 wholetime fire engine at Loughborough Fire and Rescue Station; with the second fire engine coming from nearby fire and rescue stations. Removing the fire engine would save almost £780K.

1. Were you aware or unaware that the number of emergency incidents in Charnwood had reduced substantially in recent years?

- Aware Unaware

2. Do you agree or disagree that we should target our community safety resources towards the most vulnerable people?

- Agree Disagree

3. Do you agree or disagree that it is reasonable to make necessary savings by removing one fire engine from Loughborough Fire and Rescue Station?

- Agree Disagree

WHAT THE ABOVE REALLY MEANS:

- Removing a Fire Engine from Loughborough **will INCREASE the risk to the people** who live, work and commute through the Loughborough area.
- With only one Fire Engine with a crew of 4 rather than 5 (which is also being proposed), **life-saving action is greatly reduced**. This is because rather than having 2 Fire Engines with 9 firefighters attending together, you will only have 1 Fire Engine with 4 Firefighters. **GREATLY reducing the life-saving tasks that can be undertaken.**
- LFRS argue that a second Fire Engine will still attend the incident, but this will be coming from Birstall which will take at least 15 minutes, or from Shepshed, (which is an on-call station) and often takes 10 minutes to reach Loughborough. **By which time lives could already have been lost.**

Is it also right to be reducing Fire Cover in light of the following:

- > Loughborough is the fastest growing area in the county
- > It has a very busy road network including the M1 which is getting busier everyday
- > It has A major UK Airport that is also getting increasingly busier
- > It has High rise buildings which are extremely resource intensive for the Fire Service
- > It has a huge University and colleges with over 20,000 students and is increasing

2. RUTLAND – OAKHAM FIRE AND RESCUE STATION

We are proposing to remove the fire engine crewed by the On-Call staff from Oakham Fire and Rescue Station. This would mean a reduction of 12 On-Call posts.

Our analysis shows that Rutland is a relatively low risk area in terms of the number of incidents, and that if we remove the On-Call fire engine from Oakham adequate emergency cover is available from the 24/7 wholtime fire engine at Oakham, with the second fire engine coming from nearby fire and rescue stations. Removing the On-Call fire engine would save almost £100K.

4. Were you aware or unaware that the number of emergency incidents for Oakham Fire and Rescue Station are the lowest when compared to all of our wholtime fire and rescue stations?

Aware Unaware

5. Do you agree or disagree that we should target our community safety resources towards the most vulnerable people?

Agree Disagree

6. Do you agree or disagree that it is reasonable to make necessary savings by removing the On-Call fire engine from Oakham Fire and Rescue Station?

Agree Disagree

WHAT THE ABOVE REALLY MEANS:

- Similar to Loughborough, removing a Fire Engine from Oakham will significantly **INCREASE the risk to the people** who live, work and commute through the Oakham area.
- With only one Fire Engine with a crew of 4 rather than 5 (which is also being proposed), **life-saving action is greatly reduced**. This is because rather than having 2 Fire Engines with 9 firefighters attending together, you will only have 1 Fire Engine with 4 Firefighters, **GREATLY reducing the life-saving tasks that can be undertaken**.
- LFRS argue that a second Fire Engine will still attend the incident, but this will be coming from Melton which will take at least 15 minutes, or from Stamford, (Not an LFRS station and currently being cut also) and even further away, or from Uppingham Station (which is an 'on-call' Fire Engine is often not available due to crewing deficiencies) **So by the time the second Fire Engine arrives the fire is likely to be further developed and lives already lost.**

Is it also right to be reducing Fire Cover in light of the following:

- > **The call rate has increased in the last year in Rutland**, so how can the fire service justify reducing the number of fire engines and personnel that are available?
- > The number of whole time firefighting **personnel has already been cut from 28 to 14**; this is likely to be reduced further.
- > Oakham has a busy road network, including the A1 but also a large number of rural roads, where if there is an accident it's likely to require a minimum of two fire engines.
- > Oakham is remote with little support, the next nearest full-time station is Melton.
- > The water supplies are poorer in rural areas, so water relays are required. This requires a large number of fire engines, not fewer.
- > Fires in remote areas are likely to develop significantly before adequate resources will be available.
- > How will the Heavy Rescue Unit be crewed? Will this leave the town with no specialist rescue cover?
- > Large Military camps in the area..... what happens in the event of an aircraft incidents?
We also have the ever increasing risk of terrorist incidents?

3. LEICESTER CITY

We are proposing to remove one fire engine from within the city area. This will mean a reduction of 20 wholetime posts.

Our analysis shows that the risk, in terms of the number of incidents, has reduced in Leicester City; and, that if we remove one fire engine from the city, adequate emergency cover is available from the other 24/7 wholetime fire engines in the city fire and rescue stations, along with cover from nearby fire and rescue stations. Removing one fire engine would save almost £780K.

7. Were you aware or unaware that the number of emergency incidents in Leicester City had reduced substantially in recent years?



Aware



Unaware

8. Do you agree or disagree that we should target our community safety resources towards the most vulnerable people?



Agree



Disagree

9. Do you agree or disagree that it is reasonable to make necessary savings by removing one fire engine from one of the city's three fire and rescue stations?



Agree



Disagree

WHAT THE ABOVE REALLY MEANS:

- Removing a Fire Engine from the city area **will INCREASE the risk to the people who live and work there**; by virtue of the fact simply having less Fire Engines means having less life-saving intervention, and it will mean the public will have to wait longer for a Fire Engine to arrive.
- If there is an increase in response time, **this will have a significant impact on the fire**, meaning it will be bigger and more developed, requiring more Firefighters and Fire Engines to extinguish it, ultimately resulting in more buildings being lost, **raising insurance costs for businesses**, and more critically; **resulting in more lives being lost** due to delays in Fire Engines arriving.
- **What is omitted from this public consultation (IRMP), is the fact that the Aerial Ladder Platform (ALP) which is based at Central Station, has recently changed the way its crewed. It used to have 2 designated crew members assigned to it. Now however, it is 'switch crewed'**, meaning that if this specialist high-rise rescue ladder is required, 2 firefighters have to jump off the back on the second fire engine based at Central (now making that fire engine unavailable) in order to crew the ALP. So in effect, if the ALP is at an incident, and it covers the whole of the county, the city will be losing another Fire Engine in addition to the Fire Engine LFRS are looking to cut. **Essentially going from 6 Fire Engines to 4 to cover the 330,000 population of Leicester, which is dangerous and reckless.**
- The cross-crewing of another Specialist Appliance, the Heavy Rescue Unit (HRU), located at Southern Station (Fosse Park) also means a similar situation to the ALP. So if the HRU is already at an incident, the Fire Engine at Southern that also used to cover the city, will also not be available, Therefore meaning even less resources to support the city. **This change was also NOT publically consulted on** and negatively affects the service the public will receive.

Is it also right to be reducing Fire cover in light of the following:

- > How can the public decide on this proposal when LFRS don't state which fire engine from which city station will be lost?
- > The city of **Leicester has the biggest risk profile in Leicestershire and it is increasing**, if anything we should be increasing the level of fire cover, not reducing it!
- > The **economic consequences of a big fire in Leicester are huge**, therefore reducing the Fire Services ability to make early intervention and stop a small fire becoming larger and even more dangerous, is vastly reduced by removing a Fire Engine.
- > **24 firefighting posts have already been removed from the city since 2010**. Removing more Firefighters significantly increases the health and safety risks to Firefighters, as they have to take more risk with fewer resources available.
- > One high rise incident in the city (a hugely complex and resource hungry incident) would leave only **one** Fire Engine to cover the rest of the city. **High rise incidents have been the greatest cause of fire fighter deaths in recent years.**
- > There are large numbers of high multi-occupancy buildings in the city with an ever growing population.
- > High number of derelict buildings with rough sleepers/vagrants

4. FIRE ENGINE CREWING LEVELS

We are proposing to crew all fire engines with a minimum of four people as standard. This will mean a reduction of 17 wholetime posts.

Current practice for city and On-Call fire engines shows that a crew of four people is a safe and adequate provision for responding to emergencies. Standardising crewing across the service to four would save almost £650K.

10. Do you agree or disagree that it is reasonable to make necessary savings by crewing all of our fire engines with four people?

Agree

Disagree

WHAT THE ABOVE REALLY MEANS:

- Reducing crewing levels to 4 Firefighters on all Fire Engines would mean that many vital specific roles will not be able to be carried out by the first Fire Engine in attendance. In essence, LFRS are **reducing the life-saving action that can be achieved by 20%** on the first Fire Engine.
- LFRS argue that we already ride with 4 Firefighters on Fire Engines at city stations, which is correct. However each city Fire Station has 2 full time Fire Engines, which 90% of the time respond and attend incidents together, therefore attending with 8 firefighters allows life-saving actions, whilst not contravening procedures. LFRS themselves justified this crewing change from 5 to 4 'due to the close proximity of the city stations'. **This cannot be argued at all other stations.**
- Therefore if a Fire Engine with a crew of 4 attends an incident and has to wait for any considerable period of time, **the life-saving actions available to that crew are vastly reduced.** This is due to strict procedures on the deployment of Breathing Apparatus, and other safe systems of work. Therefore placing the Officer in Charge in an untenable position, they either; break procedure and expose their crews to much greater levels of risk, or instruct their crew to wait until sufficient resources arrive, no doubt in the face of huge public and moral pressure. **This is completely unacceptable and dangerous.**

5. THE RESILIENCE TEAM

We are proposing to disestablish the resilience team. This would mean a reduction of 12 wholetime posts.

The requirement to have a team specifically to cover the availability of On-Call staff has reduced in line with the closure of On-Call fire and rescue stations. Disbanding the resilience team would save almost £475K.

11. Were you aware or unaware of the reduction in the number of our On-Call fire engines in recent years?

Aware

Unaware

12. Do you agree or disagree that it is reasonable to make necessary savings by disbanding the resilience team?

Agree

Disagree

WHAT THE ABOVE REALLY MEANS:

This team has already been disbanded, which makes a mockery of the consultation process and shows how little LFRS think of the public's views and thoughts on this matter.

6. OADBY AND WIGSTON DISTRICT – WIGSTON FIRE AND RESCUE STATION

We are proposing to change the duty system worked by staff at Wigston Fire and Rescue Station, from a wholtime 2/2/4 and On-Call, to a wholtime Day Crewing Plus and On-Call system. This would mean a reduction of 14 wholtime posts.

Our analysis shows that the risk, in terms of the number of incidents, has reduced in Oadby and Wigston; however, 24/7 wholtime fire and rescue cover is still required in the area. Introducing Day Crewing Plus would save almost £415K.

13. Were you aware or unaware that the number of emergency incidents in Oadby and Wigston had reduced in recent years?

Aware

Unaware

14. Do you agree or disagree that it is reasonable to make necessary savings by implementing the Day Crewing Plus system?

Agree

Disagree

WHAT THE ABOVE REALLY MEANS:

- 14 firefighting posts will be lost, leaving only 4 firefighters on a fire engine as opposed to 5.
- See points raised in question 4 for the reasons that this proposal is unacceptable

7. COUNCIL TAX

Following the implementation of these proposals we still need to make savings in order to cover the outstanding budget deficit of approximately £1.8m. These could potentially be covered by a one-off increase of £5 plus a yearly increase of 1.99%; or, a one off increase of £10 with no further increase in Council Tax, or a one-off increase of £10 plus 1.99% yearly increase.

15. Would you be prepared to pay more for your fire and rescue service?



Yes



No

16. If YES, how much; either a £5 or £10 one-off increase on your Council Tax? (£5 equates to just under 10p per week, £10 equates to just under 20p per week, based on a Band D property)



£5



£10

WHAT THE ABOVE REALLY MEANS:

- The government has savagely cut the fire services budget. Therefore, in order to safeguard the public, save Fire Engines and Firefighters, **it will be necessary to increase council tax.**
- Leicestershire's council tax contribution to the Fire Service is **significantly lower than similar sized Fire Services** in other areas of the country. So although it is necessary to increase the council tax to keep resources at safe level, it will still be lower than other fire services.

If you have answered any of the questions in this Consultation Questionnaire, please complete the following two questions:

I/we have answered questions contained in this Consultation Questionnaire as:

- An individual A business A group An organisation

I/we am/are located in the following District:

- Blaby District Council Charnwood Borough Council Harborough District Council
 Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council Melton Borough Council
 North West Leicestershire District Council Oadby and Wigston Borough Council
 Leicester City Council Rutland None of the above

NB: consultation responses, including the names and addresses of respondents, will be made publicly available on request, unless confidentiality is specifically requested or disclosure would prejudice third parties.

Thank you for your feedback

Leicestershire Fire Service Headquarters

12 Geoff Monk Way

Birstall

LE4 3BU

Leicestershire and Rutland Fire and Rescue, Chief Officer/Members of the Combined fire authority,

It has come to my attention that Leicestershire and Rutland Fire and Rescue Service has drawn a plan together in order to assist them to bring their budget in line with the financial cuts placed upon them by central government.

I am aware the cuts that Leicestershire Fire and Rescue service are proposing will have a dramatic effect on the Fire cover that they provide throughout Rutland and Leicestershire.

I have grave and specific concerns about how this is going to effect where I live in the Rutland area, I am aware that currently in Rutland we are served by two Fire stations those being Oakham and Uppingham, Oakham station is currently crewed 24/7 by a minimum of five full time Firefighters and has the back up of on call part time Firefighters to assist them when needed and also to respond to fire calls should the full time Fire engine be busy. I am aware that should the proposed cuts take place this would mean that the on call firefighters would no longer be there and also that the full time Fire crew at Oakham would be reduced to a minimum of four.

I know that Uppingham Fire station also serves the Rutland area (although it is not crewed by full time staff and is at times unavailable), Melton Fire station is also available to come into the Rutland area (again at night this is not crewed by full time staff).

Bearing all this in mind the removal of all the on call part time staff and some of the full time staff from Oakham station in my opinion is dangerous.

The cutting of Fire fighters and Fire engines to an area which is quite remote and has only one full time fire engine who rely upon the swift back up of on call firefighters I believe will compromise the safety of the people who live in the Rutland area and the Firefighters who will be left to try and deal with incidents in Rutland with fewer resources speedily at hand. In short I strongly oppose all of the planned cuts to the Fire and rescue resources we have in the Rutland area.

Yours Sincerely.

I wish my personal details to be kept confidential

Yes

No

e-petition

Stop the cuts to Oakham Fire Station

Responsible department: Department for Communities and Local Government

The Leicestershire Fire and Rescue Service are proposing the removal of fire engines from Oakham Fire Station. This will have a significant impact on safety in Rutland. We cannot be left with just one full time fire appliance supported by the Uppingham appliance crewed by retained firemen – and therefore not always available.

Rutland have a significant number of high risk sites – including 3 major plastics factories as well as the trunk roads of the A1 and A47.

Outside bodies tend to forget just how big Rutland is in terms of distance. They forget that you could drop the cities of Leicester, Nottingham and Derby into Rutland at the same time and have room to spare. If we don't have appliances in the county, the travel time from other stations will threaten lives, property and community safety.

Please support this petition by adding your name to say NO to taking away any of Rutland's fire engines.

[Sign this petition ▶](#)

[▶ Not received your confirmation email?](#)

Number of signatures:

150

Created by:

Richard Clifton

Closing:

30/03/2015 23:59

Share:





Sign this e-petition

Stop the cuts to Oakham Fire Station

Name

Email

Email confirmation

British citizen or
UK resident? yes no

Address

Town

Postcode

Country

Email me updates about this e-petition
(We will not share your email address with anyone or use it for any other purpose)

I agree to the [Terms & Conditions](#) 

[◀ Back](#)

[Sign this e-petition ▶](#)