

Appendix B – Summary of Feedback with Management Responses and Recommendations

<i>Overview of Issues Raised throughout the Consultation</i>				
<i>Response Times – “Proposed changes will result in longer response times due to the proposed location at West Ashland and the additional distance from many areas” “Proposed changes will mean the lives of people in the area will be at risk” “Do not close Bletchley station as it covers large population and is in a good location” “Proposed changes leave the North and West of Milton Keynes vulnerable”</i>				
Number	Issue	Source	Management Responses	Recommendations
1	Further information required regarding the impact on people with increase in response times.	Letter from Wolverton and Greenleys Town Council Letter from Stony Stratford Town Council FBU Emailed Response	We have analysed the relevant road networks and speeds of travel to assess the most suitable site for the hub station. For a realistic analysis of journey times, different speeds were applied to different types of road, based upon the mobilising system operated by the Thames Valley Fire Control Service. The West Ashland site is next to the A5, so the improved access to the north and south of Milton Keynes, combined with the grid road network, means that fire engines can travel more quickly to emergency incidents. The Blue light drive analysis from West Ashland identified an average increase to attendance times for Wolverton of 1 minute and to Stony Stratford of 2 minutes. This is based upon fire appliances being located at the West Ashland facility and responding from this location.	Officers to identify a range of options to provide fire appliance cover within the North West of Milton Keynes. The Service will continue to ensure that current response standards are met via its dynamic mobilising system, utilising the fire crews that are out in the community delivering vital life-saving community safety work, or when appropriate utilising standby points strategically located across Milton Keynes, ensuring our communities will always benefit from the quickest possible attendance in an emergency.
2	Difference between areas covered by the two stations within 5 and 10 minutes compared to the area covered by the new site.	Emailed Member of the Public Feedback	Our analysis shows that cover remains relatively consistent. This is based upon our fire engines being at the stations, we know that they are currently out in the community for 22% of the calls they currently receive across MK. This will increase as we engage in more work in the community with Health, social care and other partner agencies.	Noted

Appendix B – Summary of Feedback with Management Responses and Recommendations

3	Is the service worsening its response times thus service?	Email from Kents Hill and Monkston Parish Council	See feedback for Issue 1. Firefighters are out and about undertaking community safety work more than ever. We also have a mobilising system which uses automated vehicle location technology to select the nearest fire engine, regardless of whether it's in a fire station. This ensures that our communities will always benefit from the quickest possible attendance in an emergency. It also means the location of fire stations becomes less important when crews are not necessarily in them at the time the 999 call comes in.	Noted
4	Response times to Deanshanger and surrounding area.	Emailed Member of the Public Feedback	This is in Northamptonshire and therefore subject to their risk management planning. However we have shown it in our mapping as it represents a minimal impact on attendance times.	Noted
5	De-valuation of property/increase in insurance due to increase in response times.	Emailed Member of the Public Feedback	Attendance times by the fire and rescue Service are not known to affect property prices or insurance premiums.	Noted
6	Growth of MK, especially in the North West. Impact of fewer appliances and stations in a growing city.	Email from Loughton and Great Holm Parish Council	The data pack provided with this summary document clearly shows that as Milton Keynes population has grown incident numbers have decreased, in line with national trends. However, we continually assess the impact of new developments to inform our future service planning.	Noted
7	The removal of Wolverton Fire Station in the past was based upon the resources moving to Great Holm.	Letter from Wolverton and Greenleys Town Council	See feedback for issue 6 and recommendation in issue 1.	Noted
8	Are things like the location and size of	Emailed Member of the Public	We measure risk and this is based upon socio demographic data, national trends, intelligence shared with us by partner	Noted

Appendix B – Summary of Feedback with Management Responses and Recommendations

	schools taken into account when considering response times?	Feedback	agencies and previous incidents attended. This information is factored into our integrated risk management planning process which informs how we Implement the right balance between Prevention, Protection and Response across the service area.	
<i>No Need to Move</i> – “Keep the two stations where they are” “Do not close Great Holm station as it covers a large population and is in a good location”				
	Issue	Source	Management Responses	Recommendations
9	Why move fire stations when less money can be spent to improve the current facilities?	ORS Questionnaire – Member of BMKFRS	The existing fire and police stations in Bletchley are located within the area designated by Milton Keynes Council for regeneration. Implementation of the Development Plan depends on the existing Fire and Police Stations being re-located. We analysed a number of sites for relocation with a requirement to limit any impact on the time it would take to respond to 999 calls. The site that came out of this analysis as the best location is at West Ashland, just off the A5 near Redmoor Roundabout. Given the proposed site’s proximity to Great Holm, we can also relocate the resources currently based at the fire station to the new site without adversely affecting our services to the community.	Noted
10	Great Holm and Bletchley are strategically placed to access their respective areas of the city.	ORS Questionnaire - Resident	The location of these two fire stations was based on standards of fire cover created in 1947. In 2004 the FRS nationally move to local integrated risk management planning. As part of this process it was identified that with incident numbers decreasing we should look at merging our resources to reduce our costs. This has been done in a risk assessed way that ensures that there is a minimum impact on attendance times.	Noted
11	Bletchley is placed in	ORS Questionnaire	See feedback for issue 10.	Noted

Appendix B – Summary of Feedback with Management Responses and Recommendations

	order to serve vulnerable and deprived areas of the city.	- Resident		
<i>Future Proofing</i> – “Growing population and housing development means provisions should be increased in these areas”				
	Issue	Source	Management Responses	Recommendations
12	Growth of MK, especially in the North West. MK will continue to grow in the future, not just current planned expansion. Is the risk modelling based on the continual growth of Milton Keynes as stated in the thirty year plan?	Letter from Milton Keynes Council ORS Public Forum – Great Holm FBU Emailed Response	See feedback for issue 6.	Noted
<i>Congestion</i> – “Disagree with location of proposed new station due to perceived traffic problems”				
	Issue	Source	Management Responses	Recommendations
13	Congestion resulting from match days/shopping centre at peak times.	Emailed Member of the Public Feedback	We take into account congestion created by public events in our planning. We ensure that we manage our resources to minimise any impact created by traffic congestion.	Noted
14	No evidence of blue light runs during	Emailed Member of the Public	The blue light runs were completed on weekdays at three different times of the day, 0800, 1300 and 1700hrs. The	Noted

Appendix B – Summary of Feedback with Management Responses and Recommendations

	congested times i.e. rush hour.	Feedback	average of the three drive times was used to identify the likely impact on attendance times following any move to the West Ashland site.	
<i>Use of Government Funds – “Proposals are financially motivated”</i>				
	Issue	Source	Management Responses	Recommendations
15	Money could be better spent elsewhere.	Email from Great Holm and Loughton Parish Council FBU Emailed Response	We have been very successful in a number of bids to the Government, most recently securing a grant of £2.8million to build a new fire station. There will be no additional cost to the local community through extra council tax.	Noted
16	Public funds being spent on something public do not want.	Emailed Member of the Public Feedback	The feedback from the Public Forums who had the opportunity to directly challenge and ask questions of BFRS officers was contrary to this view. Page 36 of Appendix A – the ORS report sets out the response in more detail.	Noted
17	With expansion more schools and doctors surgeries are needed.	Emailed Member of the Public Feedback	As a fire authority we do not have any say in investment in education or health property strategies, however, the consultation included recommendations for wider community use and we are actively engaging with local authority partners to identify opportunities for co-location which will enable them to review their delivery models for other services.	Noted

Appendix B – Summary of Feedback with Management Responses and Recommendations

<i>Use of Sites</i> – “Agree with collaboration with other ‘blue light’ services but not at the expense of the two stations”				
	Issue	Source	Management Responses	Recommendations
18	<p>Lack of information about use of sites.</p> <p>Impact on local residents.</p> <p>De-valuation of property.</p> <p>Site could be used for anything.</p>	<p>Email from Loughton and Great Holm Parish Council</p> <p>Emailed Member of the Public Feedback</p>	<p>The consultation document set out the impact on attendance times across West Milton Keynes, however the specific use of the sites should this proposal be approved and the land sold for re-development would be part of a planning application consultation.</p>	Noted
19	<p>Is the redevelopment in Bletchley more important than adequate fire cover?</p>	<p>Emailed Member of the Public Feedback</p>	<p>The proposal sees a new blue light hub facility being built in a location that provides minimal impact on attendance times across the Western MK area currently served by Great Holm and Bletchley fire stations. In addition we have set out in the consultation how we will be managing risk in a more dynamic way using technology to ensure that our mobile fleet of fire appliances are utilised to ensure that the public receive the quickest response regardless of where the fire appliance home station is located.</p>	Noted
<i>Other Issues</i> – A selection of other issues raised within the feedback.				

Appendix B – Summary of Feedback with Management Responses and Recommendations

	Issue	Source	Management Responses	Recommendations
20	Limitations of mapping provided in consultation document.	Email from Newton Longville Parish Council	The mapping clearly set out the travel times from each of the existing fire stations and the proposed site at west Ashland. The times of 5 and 10 minutes were chosen to demonstrate the impact – our publicly approved attendance times are “the first appliance in 10 minutes and subsequent pre-determined attendance in 20 minutes”. This was all supported by an explanation of the methodology used to calculate these times including how they were evaluated against existing data from incidents we have attended in the last 5 years.	Noted
21	<p>‘Low key’ nature of consultation.</p> <p>Quality and comprehensive nature of consultation document.</p> <p>Lack of data in consultation document.</p> <p>Short time period of consultation period.</p>	<p>Emailed Member of the Public Feedback</p> <p>Email from Loughton and Great Holm Parish Council</p> <p>FBU Emailed Response</p>	The consultation has followed national best practice, as part of a continuing dialogue with the public, rather than a ‘one-off’ event, which began with the ‘listening and engagement’ research which we did with the public prior to embarking on the development of the 2015-20 PSP (this was carried out in November / December 2013 and the findings presented to the CFA at their February 2014 meeting) followed by the full PSP consultation which ran for 12 weeks (22 July – 13 October 2014) with findings reported to the 17 December 2014 CFA meeting. We wrote to MPs, local councillors, parish councils, town councils and the local press in advance of the consultation starting. We could have spent more public money on advertising however best practice guidance for public consultations (including the FBUs) endorses the use of qualitative methods such as Public Forums as the best way to obtain ‘meaningful opinions’ from a consultation.	Noted, the decision paper to the Fire Authority includes the additional data that was used in the Public Forums.

Appendix B – Summary of Feedback with Management Responses and Recommendations

22	Concerns that merger will result in redundancies. Concern over budget cuts due to less fire stations.	Email from Loughton and Great Holm Parish Council ORS Public Forum – Great Holm	The Service has a medium term financial plan for the period 2015-20, this sets out the financial modelling that BFRS have completed to ensure it can continue to deliver the highest possible service across Bucks and MK. The Area Reviews set out in the PSP 2015-20 will deliver the remodelled service. We are required to consult again if we propose any changes to the number of fire stations or fire appliances or the times that a fire appliance will be available. If any staff reductions are required they will be managed through the Authority's workforce planning. Managing it in this way enables us to remodel the workforce without the need to make staff redundant.	Noted
23	Lack of FBU support for proposal.	Email from Loughton and Great Holm Parish Council	The Fire Brigades Union have been consulted throughout this consultation, through the staff engagement group, quarterly joint consultation forum meetings and through individual meetings with BFRS officers. Their concerns have been picked up through this feedback document and responded to.	Noted
24	No mention of consultation with staff over proposal.	Emailed Member of the Public Feedback	A staff engagement group was established in July 2015, it has representatives from each of the MK stations and the FBU, who all feedback to the personnel at their respective stations and bring forward their comments to monthly meetings of this group.	Noted
25	Concerns that merger will result in fewer resources/appliances.	Letter from Stony Stratford Town Council	Under the proposal, all existing fire engines and specialist appliances at Bletchley and Great Holm fire stations would be relocated to the new hub station. The fire stations at Broughton, Newport Pagnell and Olney would continue as now, unaffected by this proposal.	Noted

Appendix B – Summary of Feedback with Management Responses and Recommendations

26	<p>Is the current collaborative training level inadequate if a new facility is required?</p> <p>Why is geographical proximity necessary for collaborative training?</p>	Emailed Member of the Public Feedback	<p>The new facility would have training buildings and facilities designed to support joint blue light training and exercising. This will complement the training and exercising that currently takes place. In addition to this it is anticipated that the co-location of blue light staff into fully integrated and shared facilities will enable informal conversation which (as has been seen in other parts of the country) stimulates new ideas from front line staff and these can lead to new more effective ways of working.</p> <p>Collaboration is a key part of the Fire Authority's strategic plan. Every paper that is received by them includes a section on whether collaboration has been considered and if not why not. We encourage all our staff regardless of level or role to actively consider and engage on consultation.</p>	Noted
27	No Police presence in Bletchley.	Letter from Milton Keynes Council	Not for the Fire Authority to comment on.	Noted.
28	Maintaining the Fire Services image of being separate from Law Enforcement.	Letter from Milton Keynes Council	<p>The fire service and Thames Valley Police already work closely on prevention and data sharing initiatives to improve our services to the public. There is no evidence that this has impacted on either organisations image. The Fire authority already has an enforcement role as part of the Regulatory Reform Fire Safety Order 2005. We have prosecuted businesses for breaches of this order over the last 10 years and this has not impacted upon the public's perception of our role.</p>	Noted, BFRS Officers will continue to monitor this through the regular public satisfaction questionnaires completed by members of the public.

Appendix B – Summary of Feedback with Management Responses and Recommendations

Recommendations – Alternative proposal provided/need to retain and upgrade current facilities i.e. invest in existing stations.				
	Issue	Source	Management Responses	Recommendations
29	<p>Retention of an 'unconventional' fire station at Great Holm.</p> <p>Why can't Great Holm be upgraded for accessibility?</p> <p>Create 'blue light hub' but retain both Great Holm and Bletchley.</p> <p>Retain Great Holm fully and create 'blue light hub'.</p> <p>Relocate Newport Pagnell as the new 'blue light hub'.</p> <p>Make Great Holm into 'blue light hub'.</p>	<p>Emailed Feedback from Local Councillor</p> <p>Direct Public Feedback ORS Questionnaire</p> <p>–</p>	<p>The Fire Authority has been successful in securing a grant of £2.8m from DCLG transformation fund. This successful bid requires the co-location of Fire and TVP from Bletchley. The new location at West Ashland brings into question the location of Great Holm fire station, the travel time analysis combined with the use of technology set out earlier in this summary demonstrates that we do not operate purely from fire stations anymore. We are a flexible and mobile resource that addresses risk dynamically.</p> <p>Relocation of the Blue Light Hub to Great Holm would not work due to TVP needing to maintain a presence in Bletchley and also the scale of the redevelopment required to enable the facilities proposed at the new site, it is generally more expensive to extend and adapt an existing building than build one from scratch. In addition we will have all the benefits of a modern environmentally sound and sustainable building that will provide financial savings and benefits to the local environment for the lifetime of the building. The move to an industrial estate with businesses that already operate 24/7 will enable training that is currently limited in residential areas (especially at Great Holm due to the close proximity of neighbouring houses who have complained in the past about noise) to be done at any-time of the day or night.</p>	Noted

Appendix B – Summary of Feedback with Management Responses and Recommendations

<i>Support – General agreement with proposals.</i>				
	Issue	Source	Management Responses	Recommendations
31	Support for further collaboration between emergency services in general and in the form of a ‘blue light hub’.	ORS Public Forum – Great Holm	Noted	Noted
32	Financial and working efficiencies can be created.	ORS Public Forum – Bletchley	Noted	Noted

Appendix B – Summary of Feedback with Management Responses and Recommendations

33	Forward thinking service being proactive regarding decreasing demand.	ORS Public Forum – Bletchley	Noted	Noted
34	The location chosen is sensible due to accessibility to main roads and grid system.	ORS Public Forum – Bletchley	Noted	Noted
35	Support for the inclusion of community facilities within the proposed 'blue light hub'. (Recommendations made)	ORS Public Forum – All	Noted	Noted
36	Both stations need updating.	ORS Questionnaire – Member of the Public.	Noted	Noted
37	Trust in the Fire Service to do what is right as they are the experts.	ORS Questionnaire – Member of the Public	Noted	Noted
38	Increase in training facilities and collaboration can only be a good thing.	ORS Questionnaire – Member of the Public	Noted	Noted