



**Cheshire**  
Fire Authority



**Draft 2024-2028  
Community Risk  
Management Plan**

Pre-Consultation Summary  
Appendix: Free Text Comments

[www.cheshirefire.gov.uk](http://www.cheshirefire.gov.uk)

## Appendix: Free text comments

### Q. Is there anything else you think the Authority should consider within its guiding principles?

#### Public comments

- Ensure that all fire stations are maintained
- standing by and adhering to its core values rather than picking and choosing to suit itself. Fixing the broken on-call system. Plugging the shortfalls with whole time appliances is shifting the problem and reducing whole time cover, robbing Peter to pay Paul. Accept responsibility and admit when it's wrong.
- Should listen to what the public thinks
- The on call status how this impacts response time and community feel of the fire teams.
- Health and wellbeing of its operational staff
- It is difficult to comment on speed of response without further info on this
- I'd appreciate less discrimination. At the minute, I believe Cheshire Fire Service has an Agenda to increase diversity, which is fair enough, but you are going about it in the wrong way. You pretty much force the people who are interested and have the skillset to do the job to lie on diversity forms, saying they are gay, to be able to get a position. At the minute, it's a tick-box exercise; you only look at numbers. If people say they are gay on the form, they get more points in the interview process and you offer them a job. The reality is that a lot of your numbers are wrong because the vast majority of your "diverse" firefighters only ticked a certain diversity box to get offer the job they are so clearly passionate about and fit enough for. The reality is that the vast majority of the people who WANT to be a firefighter is straight, white and male, but to get offered the job, they feel forced by the organisation to lie, so that Cheshire fire, on paper, can increase their diversity numbers. Really poor effort from the organisation. You should be looking at the % of "minority" people applying, and making sure that the % of candidates offered a position is the same or greater. At the minute, it just seems as though you will only hire 90% of minorities/diversity, so your employees have historically been lying to suit your Agenda/ Marketing needs. Your numbers are all lies, I'm sorry to say.
- I think these are all principles which try to mask the issue of the diminishing staffing available as a result of the service not being able to keep up staffing. These are all just side stepping the issue of being under staffed.
- Ensuring local provision specifically meets local risk. For example, boat rescue team stationed (even on retained basis) near areas where people are routine in water
- Transparency and accountability of the use of public funds
- Night time cover
- It's hard to know what the guiding principle statements mean, there could be interpreted several different ways.
- Common sense in how you achieve those guiding principles.. Don't just put down on paper what people want to hear, you MUST follow through on it
- I've heard of a lot of brake in, my local station was broken into the other day I saw on Facebook? Someone got hurt as there was a lot of blood and they wanted to kill someone? Did someone die? Safety should be one
- This questionnaire is totally loaded to gain the answers you can use in a public forum to cut the service and not improve it. Loading questions when only the answers that can be selected are preordained by yourselves shows the contempt you have for the

public which includes myself. Most multiple questions you state should have an option to write an answer and not be loaded into another question where you can manipulate it.

- More accountability on senior managers
- Close Frodsham fire station
- What does allowing staff to be more 'productive' actually mean in real terms? The only people that work 24/7 are frontline staff, how about making office staff and the 9-5's more productive first
- More attention to opinions of operational crew members
- Improving the culture throughout the service and how staff treat each other and the communities they serve.
- Utilise on call pumps that are available instead of utilising neighbouring appliances first. It demotivates staff that are available and on call by utilising neighbouring services first. This is for standbys and make ups. Surely look after your people first. Resting facilities in neighbouring county's are far better with Manchester re introducing beds. Most neighbouring stations to Cheshire have beds and look after their staff. Cheshire fire have great equipment and appliances which is great for frontline staff and the community and to continue to develop this. On call pay and retention should be developed to aid in retention. Staffing of special appliances. This is being staffed by alternate staffing and not correctly staffed. The community are being left exposed when these could be potentially required due to delays in mobilising or not even available when they are required. Targets for HSA and other workstreams are being prioritised over training a dramatically new workforce.
- As a fire service we require more FF's to provide a quick and efficient service to the public. Appliances going off the run due to staffing issues. Not enough drivers on shifts and knocking special appliances off. To reduce the number of Hsa's station have to achieve each year to the detriment of training. Provide gender specific changing areas not everyone together in the same area. PODs don't work. Makes Ff's feel "uneasy" or "vulnerable"
- The mental and physical well-being of its employees
- Best good practice from all fire services worldwide to be incorporated within your training, given that technology, chemicals are more readily transported particularly around Cheshire.
- Consult staff to seek opinions on workplaces and appliances
- possibly needs to call out something regards reducing carbon.
- Creating equality for its operational crews in line with all neighbouring fire services. Mainly but not limited to providing proper resting facilities at night. It is very easy. GMFRS have just brought them back
- Provide a fair service across cheshire and not just certain areas. We deserve the same standard of service that another area gets.
- Work more closely with the other emergency services?
- Staff welfare and support
- Utilise resources effectively across all emergency services in response to incidents, sharing burden when workload is particularly high for certain services.
- Let the firefighters decide rather than 'jobsworth' management and pen pushers
- Risk should be considered over probability
- Skill retention and extension across stations. As specialist team members move stations, skills might be lost. Primary teams such as boat or high level rescue, with support reservists?

- I guess availability of engines is increased during the day time because that's when there is peak demand. If not, then I'm not sure about that wording
- No, main focus should be having a robust coverage of fire cover within Cheshire
- Either increase or keep the existing crewing at stations
- Whilst modernising facilities I feel it's the fire authorities duty to introduce facilities for firefighters to rest and study in individual bedrooms like GMFRS has on all its new fire station's. This would give firefighters privacy, space to relax and unwind after incidents if needed and the ability to rest comfortably whilst being able to respond at a moment's notice and not have to worry about sharing a communal rest room with up-to 12 other firefighters with no privacy
- Public education
- Return to national standards of fire cover, they served the UK well for many years and we're only abandoned due to the cuts carried out by previous Senior Managers
- Possibly education wrt fire safety, ie community engagement to increase awareness of safety measures at home.
- I think that the fire service to spread out across Warrington strategically and can only decrease the time people are waiting. One thing I am not sure about is where Cheshire/Warrington is going as a whole to assist those experiencing Mental Health crisis'? So many floors in the H&SC sector and MH, who is going to pick up these individuals
- Giving more talks at schools and colleges.
- Make ops a priority and also increase appliance numbers
- Modernise outdated working practices that make operational staff unproductive.
- Our rural area is rather remote, roads are frequently cut off and I hope the Fire authority take account of this
- Never ever letting a situation like the Manchester Arena bomb happen again with firefighters not helping immediately
- The point of service seems rather distant from some calls. Recent fires saw Warrington, Birchwood and Widnes. To me that signals a lack of resources that need to be filled with, more pumps and staff to operate them in the areas that are affected by this spread of fire engine supply in the event of the worse happening.
- I think there could be more focus on fire prevention. Maybe better use of social media to get the messages across.
- From personal experience, if fireman turn up to assist, they should actually do something to assist. Instead it becomes a risk/benefit assessment practice. If judged to be of not enough importance to the lead (fireman), very simply, they take no action. It's astonishing.
- Ensure you tailor the proposals to each individual location and its needs
- I think "Continuing to promote our Service's safe, supportive and inclusive workplace culture" should be reviewed in light of recent reports of misogyny and bullying in fire and rescue services across the country - it sounds complacent and lacking in ambition to identify and root out issues
- Location of motorways and possible Rita's in certain areas
- Employing sufficient Fire Fighters to enable ALL wholtime appliances to be fully crewed and available 24/7 not alternate with specials as currently happens
- Ensure that all parts of Cheshire is covered adequately by manned stations to provide an acceptable response time to incidents.
- No, seems comprehensive - but is all that achievable?
- I think they are doing everything possible.

- Would it be economical to consider sharing facilities with other emergency services and the wider community? Perhaps an income stream for hiring out meeting rooms?

## Staff comments

- should also include the support and development of staff including retention and progression.
- A commitment to battle the impending climate crisis and be a leader amongst FRS nationally in doing so.
- helping staff to develop individually and also taking a more personalised message to the community rather than national reputation campaigns
- RESPOND TO INCIDENTS QUICKER
- with towns getting bigger and roads are busy as well as traffic lights up everywhere on call staff are finding it hard to get to stations which is affecting turn out times.
- I believe investment towards a work based electronic system that interconnects information that we correlate for performance would help reduce the paper trail work load. Managers need more time to be productive with the development of personnel, especially now with more recruitment happening than ever. More time could be put in to developing the way we deliver home and road safety initiatives as an example. If an electronic system could be purchased that joins all our saved information from Fire core, CAP's, Sapphire, performance etc and allow this information to be manageable from one location/system, this would save time at levels from inputting, to scrutiny.
- The effect that certain changes that may be considered will have on the staff
- Maybe using local business for station updates rather than using large companies who sub contract down so the work we receive isn't the best value. Value for money is something I don't feel that the service receive because of its current policies.
- How will this be measured? The 7 points all appear to be credible plans, but there interpretation go be positive or negative for CFRS.
- Value for money, the service is widely inefficient in relation to staff and finances.
- Using our financial resources wisely and effectively. Monitoring the strategic environment in which we operate and ensuring we are able to adapt and improve.
- Consider the staffing levels that would deliver a service where there is slack in the system for employees to take time off when they choose. Consider staff in regards to rest and recuperation in line with most brigades in the country that supply personal pods for their firefighters.
- NFCC guidance around producing/developing a CRMP.
- The principles at this stage are generic and meet our statutory duty as a fire and rescue service
- Constantly reviewing and improving fire fighting equipment and PPE and looking after the health and safety of our staff.
- increasing our pro active work strategy day to day for a better impact and more value for money, this should be our main goal before having to respond.
- Move all Departments back to CF&RS from the Police as Blue Light Collaboration clearly didn't work.
- Committing to maintaining and improving dignity at work for employees. e.g. Gender-specific facilities, improving facilities for employees resting at night, improving station security, minimising lone working, improving policies regarding maintenance of fitness during working hours.

- Diversifying the targeted age range to capture younger families, more involvement in fire setter education and tighter responses to hoarding and squaller
- to keep as many pumps on the run as possible
- increasing availability of appliances both during daytime and night time
- Developing staff to have the correct skills, knowledge and behaviours to lead CFRS
- Technological advancements; We should embrace technological advancements relevant to the fire service, such as advanced communication tools, enhanced firefighting equipment and PPE. Regularly reviewing and investing in appropriate technologies to enhance response capabilities and operational effectiveness. Research & Innovation; Encourage research in innovation in fire safety, prevention and emergency response. Collaborate with academic institutions and industry experts to explore new technologies, methodologies, and best practices that can further enhance CFRS effectiveness and contribute to the overall goal of minimizing fire deaths, injuries and damage.
- Keeping work life balance as a guiding principal
- staff satisfaction and retention
- Adding to the last point, as well as continuing to promote, there should be a commitment to improving the culture throughout the Service at all levels.
- meetings face to face with the watches
- I think the last one should say continue to develop and promote a safe inclusive workplace as it shows we evolve and are not complacent in the face of national feedback from elsewhere
- Keeping special appliances available
- Develop greater collaboration with front-line staff in the development of policy and operational planning.
- Value staff by recognising skills
- Respecting and treating support and operational staff the same, not medals for some and coins for others. Recognition not only for firefighters but the work that is done everyday by support staff
- Build on resilience and wellbeing
- fire fighter safety. The number of available fire engines has decreased whilst the number of incidents has increased.
- Ensuring their staff are also not given unrealistic workloads.
- Practicality and knowledge.
- Consider increasing the number of whole time or day crewed stations
- Review the on call duty system to try and improve fire cover. Review NWFC, as I believe the service provided is well below the standard it should be, the turn over in staff and performance levels during times of increased calls is certainly below the standard it should be.
- Improving current systems of work to make sure our ways of working and the systems that we use are as efficient as possible to help manage our time and resources better moving forward.
- Firefighter safety in terms of contaminants.
- Increase appliance's not reducing them, we struggle to maintain cover across the county if we have 1 medium size incident, we rely massively on over the boarder assistance more than we ever did. key stations left uncovered due to no appliances available to back fill leaving our public vulnerable. Invest more in firefighter welfare during incidents. spread the specials more evenly across the county instead of being top heavy north of the county.

- the only thing that matters is the response times. The rest is purely for show and virtue signalling
- A drive for quality and continuous improvement
- To provide our FFs and their families the possibility of earning extra money and support them through the current crisis
- Identifying and developing its people and future leaders.
- Promoting wellbeing for its staff.
- Fewer vehicles that are busier to reduce costs of procurement and maintenance
- Allow dual role staff to be able to cover more between shifts, allow Firefighters to manage their own work / family time
- Reviewing the umbrella size of what the service, its workforce, can realistically achieve with the staff and budget it has. A common feeling among every department of late is everyone is creaking under increased workloads, increasing accountability, increased recording and monitoring, increased performance requirements and expanding roles. Much of this is driven by external factors such as HMI or a Coroners recommendations.
- Rewarding stations that have always gone above and beyond to protect local communities and Cheshire as a whole. Cross training of staff in specials use and better distribution across the service.
- new technologies which will enhance fire prevention within the home.
- My main concern with the Fire service, as it is with all the other blue light providers, is that when i need you, you are there and can respond quickly.
- How we safeguard vulnerable adults and children and young people. It is risk critical to the service.
- I would like to see reference to operational and organisational learning being a tenant of our improvement pathway
- as part of 'enabling our staff' please can access to training be considered, as currently its hard for some people to access training and people cancel (for various reasons) at short notice, which has an effect on their development and also the services budgets. Can staff have more accessibility to attend networks, that they support or are part of, and not feel guilty about attending in works time.
- "Innovation and Technology Adoption: Striving for continuous improvement and innovation in all areas of our operations, including the use of technology for fire prevention, detection, response and recovery. Maybe even collaboration with academic institutions or industry for research and development. Health and Wellness Focus: Prioritising the physical and mental health of our staff. Environmental Responsibility: Implementing environmentally sustainable practices in our operations where feasible and contributing towards the region's broader environmental and sustainability goals.
- To tackle the misogyny amongst some middle managers, instead of covering it up again and again.
- Developing a more modern approach to work and workplace methods to allow for diverse needs of the employees
- Looking after its staff mentally and physically. Ensuring the shifts are family friendly and appealing to all
- Promotion processes and prospects for all staff, succession planning and retention of knowledge
- Staff mental wellbeing, do a really good job at the moment but still can improve i feel
- Strengthen our preparedness to deal with sudden events
- Availability of appliances 24hrs a day and not just increased daytime hours

**Q. To what extent would you support the Service measuring its response times from the moment a 999 call is received, as opposed to from when the first fire engine is alerted to the incident?**

**Public comments**

- im unsure as to how long in between
- We should have an immediate response to a fire emergency. It is worrying that we now almost expect a long wait for an ambulance. That cannot happen in cases of fire.
- That is the real start of the emergency, and if it means the service aims for faster then that can only be better?
- This is the national standard that Cheshire moved away from due to moving to North West Fire Control in a cost cutting bid and their inability to meet the national and previous chehshire standard met by it old in house control room.
- Should be when fire engine leaves the station
- It's always good to have a collection of data to improve where possible
- it would be an unrealistic measure of the crew response time as every emergency call will vary in length.
- from the moment of the 999 call seems more straightforward, and you can then also hold other teams accountable (ie. phone operators), not just the firefighters
- That's the true response time
- Accountability
- It's the total time CFRS takes to respond that matters. That time starts on receipt of a call.
- The emergency has existed for a period of time already by the time the 999 operator transfers the emergency call to the control room. As is the case with ambulance, it seems reasonable therefore, that how you handle the 999 call and dispatch emergency responders should be targeted and improved where possible
- I can't believe that it has taken so long to make attempts to rectify this glaring omission. Regional mobilizing will never replicate the speed of local control rooms.
- I have always believed the response time was recorded from the point at which the station was alerted. This reflects the firefighters response to a call, rather than the handler and the time it takes to gather the intelligence.
- NWFC is not run by CFRS rather is an independent organisation their policy and procedures which impact the speed of mobilisation should not be accounted for in measuring the responses times of CFRS resources
- If you only achieve the current response time 80% of the time now adding the 90s will make it worse?
- peanuts
- Whilst you state the 'average' call handling is 90 seconds, this can, as you well know, be much longer, and whilst the call handling is taking place, the crew(s) know nothing about it. So it's somewhat unfair that a response standard could be missed due to extended call handling times. You stated that there is no national response standard; there used to be, but it was eroded.
- Not familiar with the process,,,Just wish to preserve safety
- It could well be the response time could be critical if lives are endangered
- Brought into line with national practice, improves incentive to reduce response times especially for remote areas.



- This will set the organisation up for further failure in meeting the attendance times. The current system relies upon the North West Fire Control which Cheshire Fire have limited control over and therefore placing themselves in a position of failure. This method of measurement is seen as a way of intentionally playing with figures to create failures, thus need to implement already planned changes.
- Consider this to be a perfectly reasonable thing.
- This sounds like Cheshire are planning slower response times?
- Part of the response and recovery is the triage and prioritisation of an incident..
- Pointless getting these quick if the call takes ages
- It makes no difference if they still arrive quickly
- Tell the truth just because you try to say North-west Fire Control is a separate entity you own it. when a person calls 999 then it is an emergency service from that point not from when you deem fit a time to suit your egos or to cover up your shortcomings.
- It gives the actual whole and full response time unlike currently where senior management manipulate figures to suit by using broken down statistics. Call time, mobilisation time, travel time, etc. are all used to suggest times times are quicker to gain an advantage whether to cover delays due to crewing levels or implement systems which are a cut to service. This is by no means the only things where response times are broken down to manipulate a situation.
- I think this may lead to pressuring call handlers into poor questioning and deploying resources prematurely and therefore in effectively. The change should be only counting a fully staffed fire engine that attends under 10 minutes. So as to not count rrru's and SIU's as a proper attendance in under 10 minutes
- More accurate statistics
- It will give a true reflection of the actual times taken for a resource to be at the actual incident
- There are many variables to take in to consideration including how busy the road network is, are crews undertaking other duties when called so they only true time check is from the moment a call for help is received, bring it back in house and staff the control properly would be a start
- This additional time from the 999 call may highlight difficulties in responding due say, failures in other services responses, technology, staffing levels and ability to respond to multiple calls.
- Including call handling times gives a true reflection of how much time it takes for the whole of the Fire Service to respond to an incident.
- Heavy call being received would have a severe time delay on attendance times especially in control staff is reduced
- Time would increase, which then has a negative and inaccurate representation of the response time of crews. Some call handlers will have a quicker system of work than others therefore, depending on who has answered the phone, times will differ.
- From the time of call would increase our turn out times
- This will give a accurate record of your capabilities for location of dispatch, on a future review this could show the need to move a fire station to a new location to meet the demands of our ever growing townships and road networks.
- NWFC is understaffed and run in overtime, there is a huge turnover of staff and competency's not completed, I believe shortcomings in call handling should be measured
- your sector must know what is a real KPI and not a hoop jumping initiative.
- As you said, emergency starts with the 999 call

- Every second counts.
- gives true representation of response times
- To reflect the effectiveness of the centralised control room staff
- Because it's figure bending to make a response fit that currently doesn't! Not acceptable!
- We all know figures /stats can be 'massaged' so don't add another layer of cost or red tape. The information produced will be of no use.
- I support including the call handling time within the measured response time with a caveat that 10 minutes remains a good, reasonable standard and should be kept. Include the call handling time but work to reduce this and the subsequent response time to remain within the 10 minute standard.
- It makes more sense to measure from the moment the fire is reported. It would be interesting to find out if the length of time between the call being first answered and the fire station alerted varies significantly between call handlers or other factors.
- Common sense, it should be from when you were first notified of the incident
- Live saving is time critical. Including in response time could put focus on driving down arrival time rates, perhaps with better coverage. I imagine response can be plotted on a distribution curve where reducing 90 seconds and the following ten minutes can have a significant effect.
- This will enable a clearer understanding of the full process and ensure that all teams are accountable for their elements
- If it will help monitoring and measuring of performance, yes. If not, I don't know. You are probably best places to make this decision provided it's done for the right reasons
- Lies, damn lies and then statistics. Don't try and hide the "true" response time by cherry picking which metrics to use. A typical example why the public have little faith in the public sector and local government.
- The fire/emergency is already underway when the call is made, so the response is required asap. Therefore, measuring the response time from when the call is taken is correct.
- Fire service can't respond until it is notified
- It might make the response time quicker.
- I feel the clock should start from the moment the call is made giving a more accurate time from call to arrival at the incident
- It is more logical to public perception therefore more transparent.
- Call handling times are too long, control should be brought back in-house and phone lines properly staffed with people that have local knowledge to assist crews
- For the caller that is when the first touch your service and would expect the response timing to begin then
- Despite all the pressures at present, human factors must be taken into account and I think you are doing everyi in your power
- I think that is all part of the response time
- In theory it should not impact overall response time
- Once the call handler receives the call and established where and what type incident it is they then can alert the station or the appliance if out of station. This can be vital seconds if it's a persons reported or an RTC.
- I basically agree as long as adding them doesn't add extra pressure to call handlers already under pressure to record accurate information

- This would skew the figures even more. The response time should be for the actual workers at ground level.
- Seems reasonable to me
- Makes sense
- The time it takes for a pump to attend is travel time nothing to do with how long it takes control to delq with the call
- Helpful to know the full picture.
- Least worst option given the obvious difficulties living remotely
- Not sure about this because when the call centre receives the call the fire dept are not aware there's a fire until they are told . That means they will have less time to get to the fire if the response time for them is less .
- More realistic
- As my previous answer you do not have enough staff or equipment at present. I am sure that the vast majority would gladly pay extra on their rates to have that extra cover from Fire and Rescue and the Police.
- Because it encompasses the whole episode of incident response.
- A sense of urgency and a willingness to act should be the basis of this service.
- Gives a truer reflection of response time. If you fall short of the targets maybe you should look at more stations for better coverage of an area
- Gives a wider picture of performance
- This would measure the response time from call centre to fire tender arriving on scene.
- I think this would be a better indication of length of time to take the details and then fire services deployed.
- It's a real time response as an emergency caller would see it.
- It will show up any unacceptable delays at the control room.
- It is a more accurate measure of the reality of the response process
- Because it is part of the reaction time.
- It's a true measure of performance
- It won't make any difference. You will respond in the fastest time possible in any case
- It gives a complete picture and allows the call management team to develop their own plans for improvement.
- It seems better practice to me. All areas of the process should be monitored.
- I think it should be measured, however the Service should measure the total time from initial call, and also the response time from notification by Fire Control as is done currently.
- No reports of late arrivals to fires
- Seems to only be an issue around measurement, not actual respond times
- I feel if your alerted and the time starts then it may speed things up best it can
- It will make no difference to the time it takes to reach the incident

### **Staff comments**

- An incident is a pertinent risk as soon as a member of the public has made a 999 call. Recording from the point of the 999 call gives an accurate reflection of how rapidly the Service are able to respond to emergencies and should be the set standard so the public have accurate statistics. I would make a point that prior to dispatching crews, improving response times is 'out of our hands' but that isn't the point. These statistics need to be accurate so that the public have an accurate

interpretation of how long it will take a fire engine to get to them when they require one.

- it important that this measured so the service find ways to improve it response times
- YOU ALREADY ADMIT TO ONLY HITTING A 10 MINUTE RESPONSE STANDARD 88% OF THE TIME THIS WILL OBVIOUSLY REDUCE IF YOU ARE TO INCLUDE CALL HANDLING TIME ASWELL. YOU WOULD ONLY CONSIDER THIS WITH AN ALTERIOR MOTIVE IN PLACE
- Without having further insight into how many calls are received by the call centre in relation to how many of those calls turn into actual jobs, its hard to make a case either way. I feel moving the response will make the target less achievable, but more importantly, it makes no difference where you measure the response time from. Just moving how we measure response times doesn't actually get responders to the scene any quicker, we should be concentrating on how we get responders to emergency situations faster to make a difference to peoples lives. That includes looking at how we assist other agencies respond to life threatening situations where we could potentially get there quicker than other services and save life.
- This proposal effectively means less time to travel to an incident within the response standard - could this not lead, potentially, to increased risks to members of the public along those routes to incidents?
- As control is no longer in house, control operatives do not have the local knowledge they used to. Therefor i feel this could affect response times given that it already does when the computer decides which truck is closer without taking into account road networks etc. just because one route is less miles does not mean it is a faster route yet control operatives will not know this. taking this into account response times will take look longer obviously, especially if the response time is measured from the moment 999 calls are answered. this could increase the risk to crewes trying to make response time targets.
- Because this is the first moment that the danger is spotted and is being reported
- I believe Cheshire should have its own control room again. This will help with the statement.
- This approach should ensure an accurate attendance time is achieved.
- Pointless exercise, this information is already available.
- it would give a clear response time from when the person wanted us to attend
- it wouldn't technically be the pump response if you added the call time but then again it would be an overall response time so i could see both options valid
- It will focus the operator on ensuring information is obtained as early as possible. The Service needs to ensure its call handlers have effective and competence based training in this area.
- the time should start from when the appliance is mobilised
- Time should start and be recorded from when the fire appliance is mobilised
- it should be from when the appliance is alerted
- To measure the performance of the respondents within our control (operational staff), it makes sense to measure the turn out time from when the call is received on the appliance or station.
- Clarification needs to be provided on how this will be measured and performance managed where North West Fire Control is not under the direct and sole control of CFRS and therefore this could represent CFRS' response negatively. However, approval of this means that it aligns with how this is measured by the HO, meaning a consistent standard and easier for reporting purposes.

- I believe that our current model of starting the 'clock' on the activation on the mobilisation of the appliance(s) is a better system. NWFC will have their own standards in terms of timings to mobilise from the receipt of a 999 call. I think to have someone and some other policy having an impact on another's is not the best idea. During scrutiny, it is currently clear to see what each individuals response was to the activation of the incident and it is their own actions that dictate this and not others. To include NWFC within the time frame, the 10 minute response would need to be reviewed. With an 8% margin in current statistics I would predict without seeing stats whilst writing this that we would not meet the target of 80%.
- I feel that this would be unfair to the Service as it is out of our control how calls are taken at NWFC, there could be delays in getting the right location from the caller etc. The standard should start from when the first appliance is alerted.
- To make it comparable to other Services if that is how they do it to be able to help identify short falls or particularly good areas..
- This would put more strain on CFRS but will offer a better attendance time for the person in need.
- how we measure should not be the issue as long as this is the same for all, the issue should be can we better that response anyway possible in any areas.
- By measuring response time from point of call, it measures firefighters performance on the ability of fire control staff to process the incident. Depending on the location of the incident in Cheshire, I.e. more rural areas require longer travel times. It also reduces the firefighters time to prepare for the incident, ie. reading SSRI information, sharing local knowledge.
- If you are the person on the end of the phone calling 999 you want the Service to arrive asap.
- Could changing response time from mobilisation to time of call reflect badly on crews if a set response standard is selected which is then not being met due to a hold up in control for example?
- I do not understand how this will help to monitor response times more effectively and provide information regarding how to improve them. Increasing fire cover across the county will improve response times.
- I don't see the idea behind this and how this will improve/help in monitoring response times. Crews will be unable to proceed until all details have been received and passed on
- I feel it is important to include this as most of the public would measure from the time the call is made. Analysis however does need to be carried out to determine where the issue might be for improvement should there be a need
- Because we cant equate for how flustered or confused a caller might be and i think a better measure of our response is how we do it now. FF's should not be measured on time they know nothing about.
- Seconds count. If there is an opportunity to review and improve call handling times this should be explored. The 10 minute response definition needs to be clear to all, does this include just incidents when the station area pump was available in area to respond or does this apply to all incidents?
- As the On Call duty system travel from home/ place of work when alerted the extra few seconds added to the response time if starting from the time the call is received by control would be added at the other end in the attendance time. This could , in some situations, give the impression that On Call are not meeting the 10 minute response time.
- This will give a true reflection of attendance times.

- efficiency
- It does not take into account the response for On Call personnel who have to travel to the station. It may also put pressure on call handlers to mobilise appliances resulting in more pre-alerts or turnouts that result in immediate stand downs.
- 999 calls can take different lengths of time to gather all the required information before crews are alerted. Response time in NWFC are probably all ready monitored and the crews attendance time in my opinion should stay as it is as there is no benefit to changing it
- The 10 minutes is the time for crews to respond, if you include the call, this can sometimes take a couple of minutes which is out of the control of the responding crews.
- It doesn't matter where the response times are measured from as long as they are standardised nationally and explained clearly. They should then be recorded honestly so as to get a clear picture of any failings or positiveness from the results. This would enable future improvement if required.
- Why does it make any different? This wasn't explained in the above.
- We currently have a pre alert system in place, that although mobilises stations geographically within the postal code area of the incident, does not detail the type of incident. This in itself can defeat the objective of pre alert, as crews must don the appropriate PPE. Standard mobilising of crews with incident type is still the most effective mobilisation, along with timed response from mobilisation on station, to attendance. Crews cannot be timed on a 10 minute response, if they are already 2 or 3 minutes into the clock running, and with the exception of heavily rural areas, currently meets the response times set by CFRS
- this then puts some ownness on control operatives to also be monitored not just ops crews.
- This gives a true reflection of all aspects of Cheshire Fire and Rescue Service responding to an incident.
- I believe the 10min response is from the moment crews are alerted. This doesn't take into consideration the time the control room operator takes information from a caller which can be upto 90secs, thus giving a more accurate 8.5min response which in most station areas is unachievable.
- This is difficult as there are a number of factors such as incoherent callers or hoax callers. I feel it should be the same for all services to make this easier to assess. Also taking into account the ruralness, congestion etc.
- It is easy for the general public to understand. If they pick up the phone to report an incident the clock starts for them from that phone call, not from when a pump is mobilised. It could like a fudge to make our response times better in their eyes. If the whole time was recorded from making the phone call it is transparent.
- The CFRS response time should not include call handling time as that should be measured by NWFC
- Provides an accurate time line from the 999 call being made
- As Cheshire use an external provider for the Call Handling (North West Fire Control) any stats that encompass the call handling element should be clearly identified. Whether or not the decision to include the Call Handling times depends on the specific reason why the published data being published! If the published data is there to show the CFRS Operational Turnout times by our Fire Appliances ONCE they have been alerted, then do not publish the Call Handling times. If the published data is there to highlight the performance of North West Fire Control, then publish the Call Handling data but not the CFRS appliance times. If the reason to publish data is

to show (or compare with Central Government) statistics of the whole process from initial 999 call being answered to the arrival of the first pump, then use both.  
CLARITY of the title/description of the information published is key, in this regard.

- I agree with measuring times and seeking changes for improvement purposes. However, the proposed will result in the attendance times being extended and therefore not achieving CFRS standard of 80%. The current 88% achievement demonstrates the existing method works albeit with a 12% failure rate. The service should seek a different proposal to overcome any current shortfalls in attendance times/station locations/ staffing issues.
- I think the quicker we can get to the incidents from the moment of call the better for the member of the public. Is the 10 mins still going to remain and if so what impact will the change of on crews ability to get there still most of the time within target? Hopefully we know there is a marginal gap in time currently between phone call to control and crews being mobilised?
- The response time should be from when the first fire engine is alerted or for on call when the firefighters are alerted.
- 10 minutes is poor. It should be less.
- Anything that can be done to get our response time as close to 100% is a positive thing and the service seem to have this in their focus.
- Surely the most important thing is getting the correct resources to an incident in the optimum time. The clock starts when the incident occurs.
- I'm sure everyone does their very best when responding to a call out now, maybe it will add even more pressure?
- Official Government statistics report on the total response time (from time of call to time of first arrival) and are divided into call handling time, crew turnout time and drive time. It therefore makes sense to include call handling time in the measurement of our response time.
- The moment the 999 call comes in is the accurate time of the incident and should be measured from then.
- the caller is in an emergency situation from the moment they make the call. Not once the call is concluded and the crews are mobilised
- What gets measured gets done
- this is merely an attempt and making our fire services response more opaque. The standard has already been reduced from the previous national standards. The current standard does even account for other life risks such as height and water, so a further reduction in standard would not be to the benefit of communities or fire fighters
- Each 999 call is different so the timings will be different. one could be 90 seconds and the next could last 5 minutes.
- Anything that incentivises better response times is welcomed.
- Being retained, we obviously have to respond to the station once Fire Control alert us within a 5 minute window. Factors vary for every incident - whether it be time of day, traffic, location of the incident etc. so these make a big impact on our turnout time. I feel as a Retained Firefighter it is out of our control to speed the process up once the call is received as we only know once Fire Control alert us regardless, therefore I would prefer to have a target for when we are alerted.
- This is a completely different benchmark and is reliant on the effectiveness of NWFC. In my opinion, both responses should be measured and monitored to ensure the quickest possible response

- Its pointless a fire service having a response target if the call handler takes 5 - 10 15 mins without that being measured. the time should be from first contact to in attendance, this way improvements start at the start
- From the moment the call is received, the operator could take a moment to gather more information on the location of the incident or any other further details which could eat into crews response times.
- I dont see how that would benefit anyone other than control as we only respond when alerted not when a call is made.
- It makes sense to measure from the point a 999 call is received because this is the point at which someone becomes endangered and not 90 seconds later after the call has been handled.
- Both standards should be measured and reported on.
- We should be able to measure ourselves nationally as well as locally. NW Fire control should have their own measures from response to contacting the station. The station measured from when they receive the call. But both figures should be consolidated so that we can measure ourselves against other services depending on how they measure themselves?
- I think the response time should be from the Appliance being alerted as Control could be on the call for some time before alerting the first Appliance so I think it is a little unfair to measure response from time of call
- As long as the changes to how the time is measured doesn't put undue stress on crews to try and get to incidents faster increasing the risk to themselves and other road users
- The moment a 999 call is received is the point at which a fire engine is required, therefore the time taken to mobilise an appliance should be considered when measuring the response to arrive on scene.
- don't have enough information to give an educated response.
- Sometimes calls can take a matter of minutes to ascertain the details of the incident, the location and whether a response is needed so feel that this would not benefit the Service as it would create the illusion that we are slower at responding, when we can only start to respond when we are notified of the incident not when the initial call is made.
- This will encourage NWFC to pass calls through to station more efficiently.
- Control staff sometimes take longer to mobilise due to information gathering etc. and this would take up some of that mobilisation time. NWFC are also an external company so their response time should not be factored into CFRSs response time.
- the emergency start with the 999 call, with most cases we are pre alerted so our response has already started. this shows a open and honest approach to the public.
- Call centre now challenges caller on various issues before mobilising a pump. By all means measure and record the time it takes a call handler to mobilise a pump, but do not include an outside body, over which we have no control, in cheshire's response times. We respond from the moment the bells sound. Whatever paperwork and statistics you choose to do before then doesn't matter.
- I think there are too many people parking irresponsibly which can impact a pump arriving promptly at a destination. Looking more closely into response times could help to highlight a trend of issues.
- I feel the standard is a good time frame, its a shame this cant be maintained due to lack of availability with the On-Call.
- Because every second counts, and by including this measurement it will highlight areas of greater risk of not having a fire engine on site within 10 minutes.



- NWFC are working for CFRS so should their call handling time also be included? If the standard is only for life risk incidents then surely the call handling time will be minimal anyway.
- Every second counts for someone in an emergency situation. They call when they need our help so the response time should be from that point, not at the end of the call.
- I trust the hierarchy, if they believe this would be beneficial I have no objection to it
- To then be able to ensure that the call handling time is not too long as well as ensuring response times for the appliances as well
- Does not give a fair reflection of our response times as we are only able to start our response when we are aware of the incident. We have no control over the time it takes to be provided with sufficient details as to determine the response.
- When the on call appliance is on the run we all turn in within the 5 mins and be out the door promptly after that. We have issues when we have no OIC or driver so we not on the run as much as we were before.
- The member of the public is waiting for the full amount of time from when the call is placed so it makes sense to include it in the time.
- That is the 1st instance of an incident
- I feel the call handler (NWFC) time is beyond our control and if a member of the public takes longer to give an address, for whatever reason, then that will also be reflected in our response time.
- this gives the public reassurance that once an alert is received by the control room it is quickly activated on (which I'm sure it is), measuring it from this point is your evidence for this and there therefore cannot be any doubt in this, it also proves either way that the Service has the resource to respond effectively to an alert by including this time within the response.
- It supports the need for NWFC to efficiently mobilise CFRS assets.
- It feels as though you are looking to massage the figures, and not deal with the original problem. There used to be a national standard, and this has been eroded away through previous IRMP's
- I am not operational so I do not hold enough information to accurately answer this question
- Crews do not need additional pressure from something they cannot control.
- This is what I would want if I was in need of emergency help, so think it's a good move. The result could be life and death.
- This is the measure undertaken by the Home Office so why would we deviate?
- I think the time of response should start from the moment the call is made. If pumps are busy and they are all out, then on call pumps will be needed or other outside services depending on the severity of the incident. And the on call has a 5 minute delay anyway, and a lot of the time on call pumps don't have enough availability to be operational. So this is my reasoning for why the time of responding to an incident should be from the moment of call.
- response times must include control room handling time to ensure a true 999 response from fire/ control to make both parties accountable for attendance times
- This will ensure that people get our help from the moment they pick up the phone
- The inclusion of call handling time might lower the percentage of responses that meet the current 10-minute target due to the additional time accounted for. However, this could provide a more comprehensive picture of the Service's overall efficiency and pinpoint areas for potential improvement, such as the speed of call handling and dispatch.

- This is the time that the person reporting the incident would calculate the response time from.
- Because this is the true time it takes, from the person requiring our help to our arrival, every second may count.
- I'm not operational so don't want to incorrectly sway but feel there are more elements outside our control by measuring from 999 call so it makes more sense to me to measure from the time we are called into action.
- Support, as it is good data to capture to provide a benchmark for improvements provided there is sufficient infrastructure in place and used effectively and not as a 'beating stick'.
- As Call Handling is dealt with at NWFC, it is out of our hands as a performance measure. We can only control how fast we respond once the station is alerted. However, as it is used in national performance reporting, it would make sense to align with that as best we can
- We work as a whole service not as control, fire engines and others so we need to be measured as so. If we need to streamline this to get a more effective time then we should but we shouldn't change how we measure to get better figures, our communities don't deserve that
- I believe that this is a more transparent figure for the public to understand, is in line with Home Office reporting and may be what the public would expect in terms of an overall response time.
- This will also enable us to consider the effect of questioning / systems at NWFC
- This would highlight the need for more fire engines on a wholetime system as you will not meet the 80% target
- More information required and a improvement would be for CFRS to have its own fire control instead of the poor service it receives from NWFC

**Q. Do you think the Service should have the same response standard across all areas of Cheshire, or differ our speed of its response to reflect fire and rescue risks in local areas?**

**Public comments**

- The same response standard across all areas may reduce the response time for high risk areas
- I think higher risk situations should aim for a faster response - eg I live on a terraced street so a fairly high density population - a fire could have a huge impact if allowed to take hold and spread along the street
- We pay the same tax to the service therefore should expect the same service.
- Then you would know the time it would take to get there
- It should not matter where you live. The standard should be the same.
- A house fire is the same wherever you live, everyone should get a similar service in an emergency
- 1. Response should closely reflect the total risk (to life, to property, the nature of the premises, likelihood of spread of fire to neighbouring properties, risk to firefighters from collision on the route to an incident, etc).
- 2. Being realistic, as a society, we probably can't afford the cost necessary to get the same resources to all rural areas as quickly as to urban areas.

- The standard already provides for more rural areas in that you are required to respond within 10 mins in 80% of cases. The 20% allowance currently provides the "flex" to account for geography of rural locations which are less densely populated and therefore attracting a lower risk score
- Impractical to expect the same speed of response in rural areas to urban
- I live in a densely populated area but would expect that there may be a slightly longer response time if I lived in rural Cheshire.
- It should be a standard approach to attend all incidents at the best possible speed
- As a tax payer I would expect the same level of service wherever I am in the county
- There is always a chance anyone can have a fire, so why should some areas have longer response times, a life is a life regardless of the frequency of calls to a certain area. Even if less frequent, more rural areas and lower risk areas still deserve the same response times as other areas if and when it's required
- A life at risk in rural Malpas is just as important as a life in Chester.
- How could you justify that - wouldn't that be a form of discrimination?
- Do not wish to put the Brigade under danger for trying to meet targets
- Seems sensible
- There are practical problems in remote areas, but it is still reasonable to expect same response effort, perhaps encouraging some of the more remote stations to stay open even if not used as much
- The organisation should deliver a service based on the relevant risks the local stations serve. Where increased risks are present such as roads, housing, deprivation then the cover should be maintained/increased to suit. In rural areas where likelihood of risk to life or delayed attendance is identified, an increased cover should be offered.
- It is just practical to hope for, and therefore expect, a speedier response in highly populated areas than more sparsely populated ones.
- All residents pay taxes for the service and should expect the same response. Everyone should be able to get a fire engine when requested for an emergency.
- If there are areas that are known issues, what is being done to mitigate them.. moving the goalposts and reducing standards is not acceptable
- As long as the differing approach worked and local crews felt it was useful and effective.
- Life is still important no matter where you live.
- Questions 4 to 11 are totally loaded. instead of saying how successful why not say you failed on the amount of times also state which shift system including part-time is the most cause of these failures. Asking people to select a response time is not based on risk. If all the public demand 5 mins response time the on the basis you are using demand as a factor then you should then ensure that demand is met which shows the absolute contempt you have as it would not happen.
- Everyone deserves the same treatment
- A person deserves the same level of response regardless of area lived. Typically worded question which suggests local risk and demand to lower a response to people who live in different areas. Those people pay the equivalent amount of tax as everyone else so this is surely discriminative, either that or give money back to those who have a lowered response.
- Response time should not be a postcode lottery
- Everybody deserves the same attendance

- Everyone is paying for the same service. If you are not giving that same service then those with a reduced cover or response time should see a reduction in their cost as per your reduction in your service to them.
- It is unreasonable to expect the same level of service if you live in rural areas, any service being provided is slower than in urban communities this is not limited to the fire service
- The loss of a life has the same effect on families etc whether you live in Chester city or Parkgate.
- While risk may be lower, a house fire in a rural area is as serious as a house fire in a built up area.
- As an emergency service, all incidents should be responded with a standard response.
- Doesn't matter where you live the same response times should apply
- The one standard would prevent confusion. A second standard could give the an opportunity to manipulate figures so that all standards are met.
- I believe all incidents should be treated the same, drivers and crews face the same risks travelling to any incident, I don't believe it's a fire service responsibility to attend animal rescue
- risk related sounds obvious
- Maintaining your standard across Cheshire is the right thing to do. You talk about equality then be equal to your community
- Could lead to political pressure to focus on certain areas at the expense of others.
- Doesn't everybody deserve the same level of response...?!
- This would prevent a 'postcode' lottery e.g. wealthier parts receive a quicker service than rural or poorer areas.
- I don't think it's fair to combine risk and demand in this question/answer. Obviously areas of higher and lower risk should have different response times. Changing response to meet demand is an entirely separate question that doesn't consider risk. Therefore I answered that I would prefer the same response standard across Cheshire as I don't think demand should be considered in this way.
- It would be perceived as unfair by those areas who were given longer response times. A desktop view of risk and demand is just that and may not reflect reality or unique circumstances. It also makes it easier to just have the one standard so there can be no confusion or misunderstanding.
- This would give a clearer and more realistic expectation of response times
- Why should people who live in rural areas be penalised for doing so? They pay the same for the service as those living in urban areas
- Life threatening should have the same priority and response time. County variation to other incidents is sensible, but demographics and incident type history would guide service provision.
- A simpler approach to response time that allows for the local risks and demands to be reflected within the target will give consistency to crews and managers. This also encompasses different risk factors without wasting resource time managing complex kpi's
- We should have fire engines positioned in correct locations so that the 10 min response time can be achieved no matter where you are in the county
- I don't have enough information to comment on this. I guess everyone outside of the fire service answering this is the same. It would be better if you explained the pros and cons (if there are any) beyond the brief description here
- There should be consistency across Cheshire

- Based on the narrative above, once again rural areas would be treated as 'second class', having to wait longer for a response. This is not acceptable.
- Affluent areas pay some of the highest council tax and yet wait some of the longest times for fire response. I believe this to be due to the availability of on call stations.
- It doesn't matter where the emergency is, if your home is on fire, you need help as soon as possible.
- It is a big county with a mix of rural, urban and commercial areas. The risks are different in each area.
- The service needs to have the same response regardless of location. Removing the on call model and replacing it with a wholetime model would help massively
- If 'affordable' means fudging target response times to disguise a reduction in cover, then how would this be transparent?
- In more rural areas it is anticipated that you may have to wait longer for any kind of service, in more built up areas with higher density of both population and business a blanket 10 minutes is insufficient and should be much quicker
- Why should people accept a lower standard because they don't live in an urban area
- I really don't like the postcode lottery scheme and this is what will end up as
- It is only logical that some more remote areas are not reached in the same time as more accessible areas
- Everyone should be treated equally
- If it is a retained response area then there is a time factor to allow the retained crews to arrive at station. They then may have to travel on B and C roads to get to the incident. That is reason for a longer attendance time.
- Rural fires can be devastating to farmers etc I believe that although difficult understandably to reach these places attempts should be made to do so whilst acknowledging somewhere within the stats. that the fire was in a rural location
- There are too many factors involved to use an average response time
- You can die just as quickly in the countryside as in town
- Logistics demand a common sense and realistic approach to targeting
- I don't think it's feasible to have the same response times because of the traffic for one thing . Some areas are further away from the fire stations and it takes longer to get there . I think the fire fighters should still do their best to arrive within the ten minute response time , especially to areas that are local , but for the public to accept that sometimes it's just not possible because of distance and traffic .
- A bit of "how long is a piece of string" The response should be as quickly as is safely possible
- I like to think a response time to say a major chemical site or RTA where people are seriously injured got a higher priority than a small bin fire or rescuing an animal, and your appliances should be diverted to more serious incidents if required
- Better use of resources
- It will not be possible to have the same response times due to the nature of the county. With such rural area to cover and many industrial areas along with lots of new build areas to respond to.
- For instance a town with chemical plants vs a town or village with none of these wouldn't be at the same risk
- Best use of appliances and staff.
- This would reflect realistic travel times to rural areas.

- Different standards for rural areas feels like discrimination - even if the reality is that travel times are longer, it is not OK to set a lower target for one part of the community vs others
- Some areas of higher levels of industry could pose more dangerous situations and need speedier response, similarly with higher levels of road traffic.
- Geographically appliances ought be where there is greater risk
- It is not realistic to have the same standards for a city centre and the most rural farm in Cheshire
- Hoses for courses
- Every life counts, irrespective of where the person lives.
- Very difficult to achieve I'm sure due to costs of maintaining suitable resources.
- I believe the same 'target' should apply to all life risk incidents as all residents should receive the same attention and priority regardless of where they live, however for lesser priority incidents, there could potentially be more 'relaxed' targets factoring in lower risk and the remote access
- Response in all parts is always the same/ASAP
- Offering different levels of service would seem to be in conflict with your guiding principles
- Realistically you and we must recognise the potential barriers to be overcome. This must never become a political pawn.

### Staff comments

- i think when more than one pump is required at an incident rather than emptying a two pump station to then bring in a standby pump, where a 2-3 min response time difference is showing to an alternative pump then this option could be utilised to reduce times of cover depletion over larger areas. whilst still keeping response time down.
- A common response standard is required (for life risk) otherwise this is unethical to members of the public who through a post code lottery find themselves living in an area where a fire engine will take longer to reach them when they need one.
- It should just be a set standard throughout the county. Same staff, same training.
- so the service has a set standard across the service to all parts of cheshire
- EVERYONE DESERVES THE SAME RESPONSE STANDARD WHEREVER THEY LIVE IN THE COUNTY. IF YOUR CURRENTLY STRUGGLING TO MEET TARGETS IN RURAL AREAS MOVE THE STATION EMPLOY MORE ON CALL FIREFIGHTERS OR CHANGE THE DUTY SYSTEM
- everywhere in Cheshire should be the same
- Given we are a rural service, its hard to respond to every corner of the county in the same amount of time. Given the number of on call stations, if one isn't available at the time of a given incident, the next available appliance may be 20 minutes away. People must consider these factors when they choose to live in remote locations, although this probably doesn't cross people's minds. Its very difficult to compare response times, for example GMCFS, where there are no on call appliances, with Cheshire response times due to the rural nature of the county. Attempting to achieve the same response time for the whole county would be an impossibility without an infinite amount of money, but reaching all built up areas should be achievable, if we had pump availability guaranteed, as apposed to 'if its up' as an on call pump.
- Makes sense to adapt responses to reflect demands & geography of Cheshire

- All areas within Cheshire have their own specific risks. just because there is a fire in a more rural area shouldn't mean it takes longer for a fire engine to arrive due to population or risks factors of the area. It essentially sounds like a postcode lottery for members of the public if they live near to a station or not but it also puts crews at higher risks due to longer times for backup trucks should it be a protracted incident. However, i do understand this can be difficult and the likelihood of fires is less in some areas.
- Areas may have a higher risk and therefore an incident may rapidly increase and spread leading to a larger incident
- These statements are hard to answer definitively based on the different staffing models and the nature of incidents we attend. Life at risk jobs denote a faster response compared to animal. However the incidents we respond to are dynamic. So an animal stuck incident could soon become a human life risk should a passer by or owner try and rescue the animal themselves.
- All resident should have the same response regardless of who they are or where they live.
- why would one area be afforded a quicker response than another, if it was me i would want the same response time as everyone else
- one areas is no more important than another!!!
- people, properties & business no matter what area should all be afforded the same response time. Having different would make it seem one area is more important than others
- Fairness and transparency
- I would hope that response times don't differ too much but in the areas that have on call, they will obviously have slightly extended response times. I would however want the on call to be on the run at all times so nobody has to wait longer than they reasonably should.
- Different response times means more data that can be subject to scrutiny but I think where the response times reflect local risk, this aligns with the principles of focus that are a result of a CRMP. It is difficult to determine what an "acceptable" response time is based on the hundreds of variables that are impossible to predict in each scenario i.e. distance to a wholetime station, cause of fire, persons reported etc. In terms of reporting, I think different scenarios promotes transparency when providing data to the public and encourages people to be mindful of risks facing them in Cheshire. This can be reinforced through delivery activities in Prevention & Protection and reminds the public of CFRS mission statement whilst managing their expectations of what is realistic and achievable in a society with ever-increasing risk.
- Just because the likelihood of an incident within a rural area is lower to that in the urban area, all residents of Cheshire are entitled to the same response. All lives, property and environments are worth the same in my opinion. To differ the response to persons across the county would put the service at risk, morally.
- While I would like the response time to be the same as all of us deserve the same level of help when it is required on potentially the worse day of your life, I don't think that is practical when Cheshire has a mix of urban and rural areas. So would expect it to differ. Therefore, I would expect the Service to look at risk factors an other factors to be able to make calculated decisions to be able to support the community as best it can.
- Everyone contributes to CFRS either through council tax or business rates and therefore deserve the same standard.

- As a organization I can see the logic of different responses to different risk, but as a Cheshire resident I would want the same response where ever I lived in Cheshire.
- altering response times creates a 'postcode lottery' for fire cover.
- There are positives and negatives for both options and neither sticks out as more positive
- It will give a more accurate picture of the services performance. If it is impossible to achieve the present targets/ response time in rural areas then the current data doesn't give a true record of how the service is performing. If it is impossible to reach certain areas within the 10 minute the target set is always going to be unachievable.
- Rather than looking at ways to extend the targets, the service should look at the coverage that is (not) maintained in rural areas which is generally the cause of longer response to incidents in these areas
- Some areas of Cheshire will be hard to reach within 10 mins, others will be reachable within 2.
- Anything different would imply an individuals life could be worth less. Also in terms of financial contribution to the Fire Service those individuals will have contributed a similar proportion.
- Because a fire would spread just as quickly in a rural dwelling than in one in a central town. A person who lives in the sticks probably already feels quite isolated so we don't want to increase this y our response being downgraded.
- Emergency response shouldn't be a "postcode lottery"
- In my experience, a fire engine will endeavour to respond to any incident in the shortest possible time regardless of its nature. Changing this may only create confusion.
- Response standards should be the same for all across Cheshire.
- Yes everyone should get the same response times
- i think all people in cheshire should expect the same response standard
- Often an incident can be more complex than what the caller describes. Any slower response could imply that we value some lives less than others.
- Cannot be expected to be the same for out or town rescues e.g. water and animal compared to going to incidents within the town
- In some rural locations it can be difficult to respond in 10mins, allowances should be made for this as its out of the crews control
- A life is a life no matter where you live. We don't live in an ideal world and the placing of our fire stations does not have a straight forward answer. Everyone deserves the best emergency service that we can give.
- Life and property pose the greatest risk factors, hence the quicker response. were small refuse or animal rescue pose a lesser risk factor. CFRS would historically attend 90% of AFA activations, which has drastically reduced due to call handling etc. This could be similar to attending differing risks
- it should NOT be a postcode lottery - Understandably its harder to provision for more remote areas but that household deserve exactly the same response as the next. they all pay council tax
- protects life
- we shouldn't give preferential treatment.
- To protect life
- It depends where the station is. If it's in a rural area it might be more difficult to stick to the same time standard.



- A house fire in a rural area is as serious as one in an urban area and requires the same response. A delayed response in a rural area means that more resources may be required to deal with it effectively as delayed attendance allows a fire to develop.
- Shouldn't matter where you live or work, everyone pays tax (fire authority) and therefore everyone should have equality.
- I think it may be better reflected (but maybe more painstaking) to categorise distant calls such as over a certain distance from the station. e.g. house fire in a far off location. EG 1-5 miles, 5-10 miles etc. The only problem with this is that pressure should not be placed on drivers to hit these targets for safety's sake and it should be a reasonable target.
- It shouldn't matter where the fire occurs people should receive the same service across the county. You cannot have some areas feeling like they are second class, and this could become very political rather than practical. It would take a lot of explaining for those people within an area with a longer response time to understand and it could cause issues with a lack of trust in the fire service and people becoming hostile, at the moment the fire service is a very well respected emergency service.
- There should be enough stations, statically placed and appropriately staffed to ensure this,
- Everyone deserves the same response, but this is not always possible, as described above.
- Public choose where to live an accept living in a rural area will increase response time
- I think we should produce statistics for BOTH. An overall Cheshire Average (most prominent on PR materials) - but with a statement along the lines of "regional variances across the County do exist - see the breakdown here.....". A smaller table with regional response times being available nearby or elsewhere, but within easy reach/click. People who are vaguely interested will see the larger more prominently displayed Overall County total and be satisfied (not delving into the regional details). People who are more invested into a regional view would then look first at the Overall and then go to the regional sub-display - keeping them satisfied. We keep all the people satisfied this way.
- I would expect those stations with a more rural or larger area to have tighter response standards to ensure targets are met. Communities have the right to a fair and consistent delivery of service. Currently it is somewhat of a postcode lottery on how quick someone will get fire service attendance without reliance on cross-boarder assistance. Cheshire should be capable of self reliance.
- I think irrespective of geography all cheshire residents should expect to receive a response within the same standard of time otherwise inequality arises based on where you live - all pay poll tax
- I think the response time should be the same for all incidents. However, the location and time of day should have varied response times. For example, an extra 2 minutes at night for responding from home.
- Staff shouldn't be put at risk on response when attending non life risk incidents
- It is logical to adapt response targets in accordance with risk.
- Response time differ significantly between predominantly urban and predominantly rural areas. Cheshire is a mix of both.
- You cannot have a standard response as each scenario is different. You cannot put animals with the same waiting as a human life. We must respond to fires as a priority and other work must be a less priority. Firefighters are paid a good wage to fight

fires putting themselves and others at risk, rescuing pigeons, cats should not be a priority.

- all communities pay council tax and contribute to have an emergency service that is available immediately within their area. Any discrimination of location would put rural community lives at risk. Resource location should factor in regional cover
- This would meet the geography and demographics of the county
- I think it would help with peoples expectations to reflect the different areas of the county. Some of the more rural place will always take longer to get to and would take longer than the standard response time would give some people unrealistic expectations.
- Our residents all pay the same for the service so it should be the same for all.
- I feel like every incident has the same end goal, therefore no matter where it is it should have the same response times.
- Using a house fire as an example, it shouldn't matter where you live, you should be getting a similar response time to those houses in more urban areas.
- Risks and demands change through out the day. in an ideal world one standard one response, but that obviously isnt affordable, so moving or response to where the risk is might not be easy but is obviously more effective
- there are some areas of Cheshire that with best intentions from crews, it would be a struggle to get an appliance to an incident within 10 minutes. Availability of appliances also and an impact on this.
- I think it would be best to give realistic expectations, if you give an average of 10 mins for example, that is all people will see, so if it takes longer, i think that's when complaints would arrive, it's best to be realistic.
- It depends on whether the station is on call or wholetime, not fair to ask for the same response from the two different types of station
- The response time should reflect the locality, urban or rural, traffic density, type of incident eg motorway access, versus locality to water etc
- I don't think one area should be penalised above another area just because of its location. eg: a house fire is a house fire etc
- There are many different parts of Cheshire and the same response time can not be applied to all areas, it's just not feasible
- I would prefer the same response times however I'm aware this is difficult and more rural areas will probably suffer from different response standards due to lower risks.
- response times have to be realistic. if you live or work in the countryside then the response will be longer.
- I don't think it is up to us to decide what areas are more important then others and believe this would potentially create a negative image of the service. I understand geographical issues etc may have an affect but if we start to say it is 10 minute response for house fire in Tarporley for example because there are less incidents there and houses are less built up but Runcorn is 5 minute response then it is like we are valuing peoples lives in one area more than another. Yes we may have areas where we have quicker response times but we should have a same response standard across Cheshire to endeavour to treat all as equal as possible. Different response times for the nature of the call possibly but not the same call in different areas.
- It's only fair to the people of Cheshire that they receive the same level of response, no matter where they live in Cheshire
- For fairness. If different stations have different targets, stations with quicker response times may start to fail some response times due to station training or incidents at

further areas within their boundary. Managers and stations would then be under the spotlight for not hitting a response time(s) and this could lead to people feeling aggrieved.

- We can't pick and choose a response time for members of our community who pay the same level of council tax. Unless you discount areas receiving a low standard
- Everyone in Cheshire pays for the Fire and Rescue Service and deserves the same standards. If the Fire service chooses to prioritise areas with more incidents, then the average response time will remain the same.
- All areas require the same standard as all lives are vital.
- It is unfair for one area to have a slower response standard than others. All life risks should be weighed equally.
- For like for like incidents the response time should be the same i.e. house fire persons reported should be 10 minutes irrespective of your geographic location. Where risks are deemed lower it would make sense to reflect this
- Everyone should receive the same level of service
- All areas are important regardless of location or access. Obviously the more rural areas will take longer to get to when dealing with an incident.
- Rural areas require different response than industrial/ towns
- I think if there is a greater risk in a certain area e.g. COMAH sites then it is reasonable to have a faster response standard.
- It shouldn't really matter where you live or work as to when to expect a fire engine to arrive. Pointing out a longer response time may worry some who have no choice about where they live.
- I think it is difficult to say that one emergency is more important than another until you get there or that distresses are different until you get to a scene. I also don't think that an animal's distress should be given less priority, if budgets are reduced then you should respond within the powers of the budget and prove that the money is not sufficient to provide an effective service, rather than trying to cut corners.
- The people of Cheshire deserve the same response time in all areas, fires & emergencies don't understand postcodes !!!
- It is impossible for crews to make up time if there are circumstances beyond control e.g. a water rescue that is inaccessible by road, an RTC on a jammed 4 lane smart motorway, assisting in rural incidents that have poor road access.
- I think the risk to life should be standard across the country, but agree that the response time could differ depending on non-life threatening risk, if in more remote areas of Cheshire.
- I think this needs to be incident type specific i.e. life risk conforms to a robust response time. This reflects my responses above
- You say 10 minutes is the response time on some occasions. But according to geography that makes it difficult. Either increase more availability across the on-call pumps so there is a constant availability status when whole-time pumps are busy on other jobs, or look at creating more stations to increase that 88% response standard to lower the risk rate and really have a Cheshire with no deaths.
- A house fire should have same attendance times regardless of how built up the area is
- It would be risky to base our response times on local risks and/or past figures. Normally high category risk sites are the best managed
- While I understand the possible advantages of a varied response standard, there could be a perceived inequality: Residents in areas with slower response times might feel they are receiving a lesser service, even if their risk level is lower. A universal

standard ensures all residents of Cheshire, irrespective of their location, can expect the same level of service from the Fire and Rescue Service. Asserting the principle that all lives matter equally. It would only take one incident in a lower response area to shake public confidence in the service.

- Until you get to the incident, you cannot assume the severity of the situation, based on the category it sits in e.g., bin fire could be a stand alone bin, or a dumpster placed underneath a air con inlet on the side of the building.
- Fire does not discriminate between urban and rural areas. All people in Cheshire have the right to the same high level of attendance at serious incidents
- The first one is not achievable, due to the landscape
- Ideally it shouldn't matter if there was an RTC on a motorway or on a rural road, the response time should be met, one persons life is not more important than another. Motorways can be at risk of lots of traffic and delays, rurally you may need to travel further to get to it, but shouldn't matter. If our stations are positioned for the 'hot spots' of incidents response times should almost always be met subject to crewing availability. Perhaps we could have mobile pumps that are positioned in areas to respond in addition to a local station.
- A blanket response would likely be easier to maintain from a performance point of view. However in areas where say 10 minutes is unachievable, these areas would always be showing as 'over target', when its known the target isn't achievable. The service has used blanket standards and varying standards in the past based on population, risk, etc so it seems to be ever changing.
- All communities deserve the same level of response, it states it in our core values be inclusive and do the right thing which that is.
- It is hard to understand a range of different response standards and arguably is unfair on those in rural areas who also pay and contribute to the Service via council tax (often at a higher banding).
- A risk based approach is the most sensible option as your response and resources should match your risks.
- Everyone should be treated to the same service, just because I live in a rural area shouldn't mean I have to wait longer if my house was on fire than say I lived in the middle of Chester.
- Set Standard for all of county

**Q. Thinking about the number and type of fire engines across Cheshire, which option would you prefer?**

**Public comments**

- Keep the fire engines and recruit more permanent firefighters.
- I would support whatever ratio of engines and staff are needed to meet and exceed the targets - it seems pointless to have under staffed engines that can't be used. Can't you staff the engines better and provide a better service?
- Less fire engines as in option 1 reduces fire cover in other areas when they respond to the short fall created by Cheshire's senior leadership team by breaking the current on-call system
- If you cut the service they will not be able to get there on time
- I would prefer keeping all engines on the run and working. Keeping a healthy balance of work life and community

- number of engines don't matter if they can't get to where they need to be within an acceptable time frame
- I think its better to have fewer who are available more as unused engines are a waste of resources
- CFRS meeting the response standard is what matters.
  - There is too little information available above to decide between the two main options given. The figures for availability, and for achievement of response standard would be crucial towards answering this question.
- You will be able to improve availability of the larger number easier than to restore resources once decommissioned. The current model (I assume) allows for retained firefighters to back up full time at a prolonged incident, thus making better use of availability
- Improve availability and keep number
- I feel I would rather have the engines available than the thought of cutting them back. Questions I would have are; If there were a major incident and fire engines were allocated here in support, are other vehicles and on-call staff available to deal with any other incidents in Cheshire, would this reduction in engines impact this?
- So long as a resource reduction doesn't inadvertently impact the availability of a fire engine and there is accountability for this
- If my local engine is not available I know there are full time engines that will come, I would rather have a chance of a quicker response from my local engine than it not being there at all and having to wait anyway
- Weighted question
- Engines need to be available across Cheshire , it's pointless having engines that are not available
- This is a ridiculous question! You've not stated how you would achieve the first point; when I know your thoughts, then I may be able to answer the question.
- you have kept us safe, so far
- Some availability (and improving) is better than no availability.
- Neither option is a solution. Keep the same appliances, if not increase, and ensure all are available
- Think this option the most practical.
- Do not reduce the numbers, make the job more appealing.. Pay, benefits are the number one consideration.. what is being done to market the opportunities? Nowhere have I ever seen it advertised across any social media platform or jobsite
- I would like to see an option to increase the number of fire engines across Cheshire.
- If you got better availability by getting more people, giving bonuses for better availability that could work?
- Totally loaded question you are putting forward a divide and conquer scenario. Obviously the larger the population density of a town would gain more responses from there so you would no doubt use it as a vote to gain the answer you require and remove fire engines where least opposition would be. Scandalous and shows the contempt again you have for people.
- Whole-time pumps always get into the village sooner, with the on call sometimes the 3rd appliance in attendance.
- Shouldn't be losing fire engines.
- Very loaded question! How about same number of fire engines and better availability.

- The question is loaded, how can it possibly be acceptable to "understand that some of these may not always be available to respond to emergencies" work on staff recruitment and retention at oncall stations instead of reducing overall fire cover.
- Reducing fire engines , reduced resources. They may not be available all the time but that resource is there. Remove it and it's gone with no option to use it when available.
- By reducing staff numbers and then migrating staff from on call to whole time you have weakened one system to artificially back up another that you had previously cut down. You don't use on call in areas like Chester or Ellesmere Port where you could easily have reinforcements if you relaxed the timings and used a 30 minute recall for larger incidents
- A very poor either or question which appears to illuminate a decision already formulated. Vehicles line up in a shiny Fire Station look impressive but are useless without sufficient guaranteed staffing levels.
- Cheshire already have services crossing the border at incidents which would be considered medium sized. Rather than reducing fire engines, efforts should be made to understand why the on call system isn't working. Have
- The problem is not the amount - it's the availability of those, should you reduce the amount of fire engines, ultimately you are raising response times due to distance being needed to travel, so it is the same as a low availability percentage. At least with those extra appliances in circulation, there is the possibility for an increase in availability, if they go, then so does that opportunity.
- Keep the same number if not more. Pay On Call a decent wage and there maybe more people applying for these positions. Reduce the number of hours they have to complete each week.
- Personally I would prefer to see a increase in fire service vehicles that are best suited to the areas and incidents that occur.
- The on call model doesn't work apart from a small No of occasions, look at Xmas, new year and if there is a large incident
- efficiency and not what you have - risk derived.
- I would support option two but managed properly so that they are all always available. Turn the On Call into whole time. All of them. Make them Day crewing or use a 30 minute Whole time on call model like Merseyside do. Better to have a pump available in 30 minutes than not available at all. It will open up the on call option dual role to a lot more whole time fire fighters
- I don't want a response standard I want a fire engine to respond quickly as possible. The choices above are poor and loaded! Have less fire engines and wait longer or keep the fire engines but hit and miss if my local one available! Do better Cheshire Fire
- Would not support reducing the number of fire engines. Possibly increased working from home could increase number of on-call firefighters.
- Staffing and management should be reviewed and contracts reviewed and monitored so on-call staff are more accountable and managers manage staff availability rather than being able to change their hours at short notice.
- A reduction in fire engines is less fire cover no matter how you dress it up....
- None of the above options work for me. I would prefer to keep the same number and improve the service.
- There's no point having equipment that isn't available, I would prefer resources going into increased availability of a reduced amount of fire engines.

- It's the crews rather than the engines that are the most important factor. There's no use having more fire engines if they can't be mobilised due to lack of staff.
- It would be best to utilise the resources available in a more efficient way and ensure that the available fire engines are manned sufficiently to be able to meet demand.
- Improve what you've got instead of just getting rid of it
- HQ will know its fire engine distribution, requirements and ability to cover emergencies. If a station has surplus engines, then reallocation, but no reduction in stations/ operational bases. A central reserve of pumps to cover unserviceable appliances and major incidents must be mandatory. However in a major incident it's the crewing that is critical. Off duty firefighters that can be called in an emergency is the answer, but very dependent on morale and a motivated workforce.
- Provided the correct resources can be provided in terms of availability and numbers to suit the type of incidents that should be sufficient. Risk assessment should include consideration to the number of high hazard facilities in Cheshire and potential full scale response for such although infrequent
- But ,they need to get to incidents within 10 minutes of the fire engine being alerted to the incident . If you change the number of fire engines and the response time gets worse, Then you'll have to re-think and plan a better solution
- I don't know the consequences of these
- The first the thing to point out is that the response time target should always be met, and the first option states, ".able to meet response standards for most of the time". This is not acceptable as the response standard should always be met. Equally, this applies to the second option as well, but retains the same overall level of engines. Perhaps a better solution/option would be have more permanent, 24/7 fire fighters.
- Reducing the number of appliances across the County would put greater strain on the crews and appliances having to attend incidents further away. This would be a health and safety risk. Also it could mean greater reliance on support from neighbouring fire services who are also facing the same strains on their budgets and would be unfair to expect this. The residents of Chester, Cheshire, Halton and Warrington pay for a fire service and to reduce this would be an outrage
- Better value for money and a better service delivered
- Option 1 seems to be the most cost effective option
- If there are less fire engines how can they be available more frequently? If the number of fire engines are the same why would they not always be available?
- This option provides greater resillience to the service.
- I feel keeping the amount of fire engines is important as is changing from on call to a wholtime duty system the fire authority needs to recognise that fire cover shouldn't come down to price why pay for something that's only available 50% of the time pay for a system that's that works and is available 100% of the time
- I support an emergency response team that is fully equipped, staffed adequately and funded without 'affordability' being a priority. Pay all emergency services suitable wages and they'd be no issues in staffing.
- Without explaining the first option fully you are wording the question to fulfill the argument for reducing appliances, you haven't yet agreed a new standard. Only full time appliances can guarantee immediate response 24/7
- The solution should focus on response times not number of stations. A reduction in the standard of service shouldn't be an acceptable by-product of the decision
- I fail to see how reducing the number of fire engines available is an improvement
- See previous answer.

- Would like some more detailed explanation of how these 2 models would operate. Eg where would any reductions occur.
- Having engines that can't be available due to lack of crew does not seem an appropriate use of budgets as the maintenance would still need to be completed
- Not sure
- Cheshire is in no position to reduce pumps, bring prop'd up by Gmc isn't right for the public, of both services
- Realistic approach demands more resources for most people, not for scattered population in rural areas
- I'm not too happy with all the cut backs being made of late and would be even more unhappy with less appliances. We are all entitled to a properly manned fire station and a decent service but I'm not holding my breath.
- Reduction of engines gives less response ability in times of high demand eg hot dry weather flooding etc
- I would prefer an increase in engines with the latest type available depending on funding, which is too low. We have to have insurance for many things and some are required by law (car) I look at the 999 services as an insurance that gives top class service for the money paid into the rates. If that money is not adequate then, no matter how hard everyone tries, there will be delays in service without financial input.
- Because it's the most sensible option. All emergency services have to make best use of their resources.
- You also need to look at your policy for on call duty systems and it's pay structure off getting paid for their time once called out not on arrival. You'll struggle with the recruitment and cover due to the red tape of your systems which I know first hand as I was trained in fire fighting ie. Chorley, Liverpool & Teeside training centres but your voluntary recruitment turned me away from applying.
- A reduction in resources would be difficult to replace if found to be necessary
- If we have less fire engines it would effect the likes of wild fire support and backup
- Is this cost cutting or efficiency improvements? Why not have the same amount of engines, more full time staff and therefore better utilisation of the engines available and improved response times.
- The actual response time is the most important factor.
- I am not sure about reducing numbers of fire engines but do not understand why they may not always be available.
- I think it requires careful analysis to understand if there would be any practical impact on communities that loose an engine - not just on emergency response times, but also on other local duties
- Currently the service fails to provide sufficient crew to operate the 24/7 whole time appliances. Frequently pumps are off the run.
- The more fire engines available, the more incidents they can attend (particularly major incidents).
- What matters is how soon a fire engine arrives
- Reducing the number of fire engines must present a cost saving, This saving could be invested in the firefighters.
- It does not matter significantly that there are specific numbers of appliances, particularly if they are not being used, unless of course these are needed for contingencies and major incidents. However, it is more important that they are available and able to meet the response standards
- I think a fleet of 35 sounds small for the whole of Cheshire (an opinion without any knowledge of fire fighting coverage).



- I don't see how reducing the number of engines can help?
- How can less Fire Engines be available more frequently?
- Fire engines are not 10 a penny

### Staff comments

- the current coverage of cheshire pumps is good with fairly equal response times to remove pumps would massively increase these areas of cover increasing response times but also put more stress and OIC's and Drivers responding to incidents knowing that their response times could be increased.
- Reducing the number of Fire Engines in this organisation is an unsuitable long term solution. The first as discussed in previous questions is the ethical issue of making people in certain areas wait longer for a fire engine than in others, or an overall reduction in response times across the board by amalgamating currently existing fire stations, this in my mind is a step backwards, reducing the service we offer to the public in the interest of saving some small amount of money. The other issue is the lack of resilience in such a system where you have fewer stations and less fire engines. For example when large scale fires or spate conditions occur (which is happening more regularly year on year as we start to feel the effects of climate change) the On-call can generally be relied upon to provide additional cover. If these stations were to close and the appliances removed you would have no such resilience. With an increase in day crewing stations you also have more difficulty in providing relief crews, issues revolving around taking adequate rest periods. For example when a day crewing station needs to take a necessary rest period there is no oncoming watch to staff the fire engine as exists with other models such as optimum crewing. That fire engine is then off the run for a set period of time offering no resilience. I do not feel on-call retention has been fully explored. Do on-call firefighters who leave have an exit interview to document why they leave the job? Has a pay model change been explored as the employment may not be considered economically competitive for the commitment required in modern society.
- as a county we currently have a good coverage of the county with minimal areas of extended response times. to remove appliances would massively increase the gap between stations and also increase response time.
- I believe that we have a good blanket cover across Cheshire.
- i would prefer to keep the same number of fire engines across cheshire but improve the availability of the fire engines by changing the some of the on call stations to day crewing to increase availability so there is no short fall on the busy periods
- I WOULD NEVER SUPPORT A REDUCTION IN FIRE ENGINES AND I DONT UNDERSTAND WHY THE ON CALL MODEL CANT BE AVAILABLE MORE. EMPLOY MORE ON CALL FIREFIGHTERS LESS OF WHICH ALREADY WORKING FULLTIME AS THEY OBVIOUSLY CANT COVER WHEN WORKING FULL TIME AND WONT WANT TO WORK AT PEAK TIMES IE WEEKENDS AND BANK HOLIDAYS. 53% AVAILABILTY IS DISGUSTING WHERE IS THE ACCOUNTABILITY FOR PROVIDING SUCH LOW COVER ?
- Cheshire is a rural and years ago stations where available a lot more than they are today, people come and go a lot more also no commitment so pumps go off a lot, also we do a lot off training, commitment un social hours and the wage we get is very poor so people leave on that account.
- I think more money needs to be put into the on call system. If the retaining fee was greatly improved the retention of staff would significantly improve. I know of quite a

number of people now that have given up their on call role as the money isn't worth the hours that they are tied to an area. Having said that, if an on call pump is only available 30 or 40% of the time, costing nearly 200k, and it could be replaced with an alternative system that could provide 100% cover, this would be a better option. But where does the funding come from?

- I would support a mixture of both. it would be better to have resources available more of the time. but by stripping back resources and then making them available more i feel will cause problems when there are larger incidents. you could potentially lose more relief firefighters as we have less fire engines if we reduced the number of trucks. this would impact staff welfare. however, as an on call firefighter i also understand these trucks can become unavailable and thus leaving us back to square one.
- Availability of fire appliances must remain a priority
- Because these fire engines will still be available for some of the time and therefore still be providing cover to their local community. It will also still boost numbers of available fire engines
- This again is difficult to pin on an exact answer. The On Call model is currently struggling for its own reasons. This often is not the fault of the personnel, rather the demographics of the station and the current financial climate. On call station locations are historic and based on the demographics of a 50 year old model. If you were to build new on Call stations they would not be built in such locations due to house prices and the working class of people.
- The on call system is broken, fire appliances not available, high flight risk of staff, poor financial incentives, pumps leaving station area to cover other areas leaving local communities without cover.
- engines should not be reduced! a better oncall model or coming up with a way to make the oncall pumps available more would be better !
- I don't feel the service has a below average response time even with the limited availability of the on-call engines.
- Some of these fire stations have very little operational activity and resources would be better positioned elsewhere.
- makes for better resilience?
- I think some areas that are worst for retention should be looked at and maybe move to a new duty system. I am strongly against making any more cuts to appliances or staffing levels.
- I think that providing that this is explained clearly to stakeholders, the availability of appliances far outweighs the number. In terms of Operational effectiveness, an appliance is only as good as when it is in operation. Sat in an engine bay, serving little purposes and requiring continued maintenance does not seem like solid value for money to taxpayers. Revising the On-call model allows for potentially increased recruitment of wholtime firefighters which appear far easier to recruit for.
- There are arguments against both suggestions. For me, to have less but have them available more is the best idea. On a usual day, having local appliances available, guaranteed, will work well. The impact with this is that if we encounter a large scale incident then we will have less appliances to deal with it and maintain fire cover across the county.
- It seems a waste to have pumps sat empty idle when that money could be better spent improving the service provision of the stations that can regularly be available. But this option only then works if response times etc aren't affected.

- I would like CFRS to keep the same amount, or more, appliances and review how these can remain available more frequently than is currently the case. Look into working practices and impact on all duty systems and cover.
- I would like to look at the data on this before making a choice, however the upset to lifestyle is not compensated by pay, i wonder if this was better paid would more locals and even wholetime staff be interested and would this increase cover.
- If a major incident occurred we would need the On Call pumps to be available for other incidents.
- Winsford, Northwich 2nd appliances are not worth the money spent on them
- As a dual role member of staff, I am unsure whether reducing the number of fire engines to ensure a greater percentage of availability will affect my on-call role. I would ideally like to remain in the position I am currently, whereby I work 2-2-4 and provide 50+ hours of cover per week on-call.
- I feel we need to maintain resources but improve the model in which they are used in. Keep the same fire engines, just make them available more frequently
- I would only support this if the service has adequate engines to cover Cheshire, especially at times when there are a few major incidents happening at the same time. It can not put the lives of the residents of Cheshire in danger.
- How will decreasing the number of appliances increase availability? Investment should be focussed on retaining on-call firefighters and making it an attractive 2nd employment, rather than relying on goodwill for fire cover at these stations. It should also be looked at the number of on-call firefighter who migrate to wholetime and then are not able or willing to continue staffing their on-call roles.
- Make more on call stations day crewed or whole time, eg Nantwich and Frodsham. Close certain on call such as Audlem where they are not frequently busy.
- The second point is not working so it would seem appropriate to go for the first options
- Because we clearly need more, not less
- The service need to look at being honest with new on call staff about the level of commitment required and at the remuneration for them. The service also need to review how many staff are taken on migration as the majority quit the on call once they get in wholetime.
- A reduction in the number of fire engines would have a detrimental affect on the service during spate conditions and major incidents and cause a shortage of appliance cover in other areas of the county when these incidents do occur. Better to have the option of more appliances than not as these appliances could be available when needed. Availability changes from day to day, sometimes positively and some times negatively.
- There is a need to make the on call system more attractive and more user friendly.
- manage the availability of the on call ,overall this has never been done correctly
- Look at ways in which to make the current on call system more attractive to attract more new comers and retain the current staff
- Although I think the on call is incredibly important part of the service, the only way to increase availability would be to make it easier for the on call staff to earn more. Make it part-time rather than an active hobby!
- Removing fire engines will ultimately result in less resiliency when major incidents or protracted incidents occur. Having 2nd pumps allows them to be mobilised to relief jobs as well. If the system is changed this may bring up a couple of pumps during the day but will reduce the numbers available at night.

- A reduction of fire engines would increase attendance times. Keeping what we have or better still, increasing what we have would be better. The on-call recruitment needs to be managed in a way so that the potential new recruits know exactly what is expected of them and a minimum term of employment possibly enforced to keep the staffing levels where they need to be. Financial reward should reflect this commitment.
- Put simply and in answering Q13, the on call system needs to be made more attractive to members of the community, extended response coverage areas, more usage for appliance moves, more flexible on call hours, dependant on individuals circumstances
- This cant be answered in a yes or no question as is complex. A reduction in fire engines is not a good thing as ultimately at large incidents you will not have the resilience, however the on call system is broken and it does not make sense paying 16 on call staff for their appliance to be unavailable 80% of the time as a tax payer this is not acceptable. So in my opinion every station should be whole time staffed and if that means re jigging station locations and increasing the number of appliances at each station (like it used to be) that would be my suggestion although this comes at a cost!
- cutting engines public lives and firefighter lives at risk and also increases the chance of injury
- I feel that the number of engines is sufficient although the dedication of the on-call system is not where it should be. I speak as an ex on-call firefighter.
- Reducing fire engines increases the risk of death and injury to the public as well as firefighters
- I think on-call pumps should be day crewed in certain areas.
- It would be preferable for people who have dedicated years of Service to their local communities to not lose their jobs as On Call firefighters and for the Service to try and resolve the issues facing On Call retention.
- Create a duty system where on call pumps remain during the evening (usually available) but staffed by WT during days
- It would be great to keep the same amount of engines and i have heard a retainer fee for on call firefighters may be happening which may entice more crewing
- Availability and response times are key, there is not much point in having pumps sat idle due to lack of available crews. This could be seen as a cut to the Service so would need good comms to go along with any change.
- I am not fully aware of the on-call policy but a look at what the on-call are paid or their required hours may improve recruitment, retention and availability.
- It would be a waste to reduce the fire engines, unless they are due to be replaced - then it would be time to review
- less fire engines would save money and the money could be used to fund fulltime employees and a more cost efficient duty system
- Mathball stations that are surplus after more Wholetime stations become the norm. Don't be in a position where in years to come we need to build new fire stations!
- Neither of the above answers result a positive outcome. There needs to be a more guaranteed solution for attendance times. Reducing the 5 minute response period for on call firefighters to 3/4 minutes would improve turn out times as the current 5 allows for no room delays. Have the service considered the use of blue lights for on call responding ( with strict conditions and still respond at road speed with no sirens).
- I do not have the understanding to be able to comment which works best - my gut instinct says we should keep the overall number of fire engines and be able to make

them more available in the case of peaks/emergencies - whether extremes are increasingly an issue and put crews under pressure if lots of incidents in small time period. Mapping to check working with partner services at our borders more may help too - think we do this already as I believe engines from Greater Manchester came to the recent Roberts Bakery fire - think we should build on the covid operational resilience and keep a bank of recently retired firefighters to help at peak times - know this has training costs but may support flexible retirement but keeping skills the service needs at times of high demand

- Several stations and second on call appliances in the county appear to be really struggling to be staffed. Having remote staff such as the on call support crew managers that were trialed could be beneficial to keep struggling pumps on the run. Also stations that have an excess of staff during the day could be offered hours to staff struggling pumps.
- Shorter response times
- The first option would cause cuts to the service overall. The second seems like a false economy. We pay for fire engines and stations and staff training why not do everything in your power to have those fire engines available all the time by changing the on-call staffed stations to either day staffing or 24/7 staffing.
- The two statements above suggest should not be considered to be mutually exclusive. I would prefer to see greater commitment to on-call recruitment and retention combined with more flexible approaches to staffing, with the aim of maintaining the number of appliances and also improving availability. The number of appliances in the service is already seen to be inadequate in the event of more than one large scale incident occurring simultaneously. Any further reduction would expose the service to the risk of being under-resourced.
- A significant number of On Call stations have low availability despite healthy staff numbers
- Both options lead to a reduction of service or impact of cover. I would support, the same number of engines but for them to be available all of the time.
- Fire engines should be used to fight fires as a priority, not used to save cats pigeons. This is taking up valuable resource and engines.
- In the event of a critical incident more fire engines may be required
- we need more full time fire engines not engines available 40-50% of the time.
- I think the current system is clearly not working so an overall is needed. If I need to call the fire service for whatever reason, I won't care where they are coming from, only that they get to me as quickly as possible.
- I feel like some of the second appliances maybe wasted, and some on call stations don't seem to have the capability to improve overall availability. As a station, we are quite good at being flexible with our primary employment which reflects in our availability - I understand this can't always be the case. One thing I strongly believe lets our station down, if not all on call stations, is the skillsets. We have 14 members of staff at our station... 5 OICs, 7 drivers, and the rest are Firefighters - 6 of which are development and 2 are competent. Although this seems a lot, the majority of the time when we're unavailable we have enough numbers to make a crew but there isn't a Driver or OIC available. After reading a previous slide which mentions struggling to recruit/keep on call firefighters, I feel the problem is the skillsets. Driving seems to take quite a while to book in, and of course not everybody can be an OIC. I have only been in the service for 2 years, but when I first started there were on call crew managers helping with my development etc. I think having a team of OIC/drivers that can float around the county putting pumps up would increase availability quite a

considerable amount. I also feel like when there are pumps only requiring 1 or 2 firefighters, it could be beneficial to some how try and offer nearby stations with more than 6 firefighters available (Myself and a colleague have stood down today due to there being 8 responding) a chance to sit at neighbouring stations so the pump is available, maybe for a slightly reduced rate of pay? I feel like numbers don't seem to be an issue, but I understand what a difficult job it would be to manage these thoughts.

- I believe consistency is the key. If we are consistently available, we would be able to plan better for spate conditions and appliance moves.
- Measuring availability is different to resilience. In spate conditions and when big or multiple jobs are taking place often more pumps book on to help with resilience. % availability is only one tool of measuring how useful an appliance is- Cheshire have reduced to a level that we struggle on normal occasions. reduce the number of pumps further it will get worse. DC1 models provide 24 hour cover but in spate conditions often book OTR or are not available for relief duties so when measuring % you cant say they provide 100% cover as they dont
- As it becomes more common that the service faces periods of spate conditions during winter for flooding and an increasing number of grass fires during the summer, which are both types of incidents that are resources intensive. Reducing the number of appliances across the service will only increase our demand from neighbouring services or mean that exhausted crews will be unable to be relieved. Although on-call appliances may be unavailable, crews can be made up from different stations or locally stations may be able to make a pump available if it is required.
- Neither option is an adequate provision
- This is a very complex question and i dont feel the answers provided are all encompassing or give enough options.
- If recruitment has become impossible in these areas, an alternative approach needs to be considered. There is also a heavy reliance on wholetime firefighters taking up secondary roles. 91 of the 238 OCFFs have a wholetime role as well. This may not be sustainable in the long term.
- cut down 2nd pump on call and make more on call day maned stations
- I don't there is an easy answer to this
- Reducing the amount of stations, even if a few others are made day crewed, will mean longer response times and less resilience when crews are already deployed to an incident.
- I would prefer the same number of fire engines in the service but availability to increase.
- the on call duty system is built on a foundation of pumps being able to go off the run. I believe the service has a responsibility to review the on call duty system and replace them with wholetime appliances with different duty systems to ensure operational response standards are met and standards are maintained.
- because recruitment will only get harder, especially when the older employees retire, and the younger go whole time.
- Availability is struggling using the on-call model, so a revamp of the model or replacing some on call appliances with wholetime appliances, to improve availability makes sense. I would rather lose 2 on-call appliances that are second appliances at wholetime stations, to replace it with making one on-call appliance wholetime if it improved the service we provide to our community.

- It is important to have these additional appliances to support the current response, even if not always available. Some investment in helping bring up availability at these stations could be looked at.
- we cant afford to lose fire engines, this would affect the safety of our firefighters, waiting longer for support. We struggle now with the few we have.
- I would support the reduction in fire appliances as long as the remaining provide more than what is being provided currently. If it was the same, or less then i would not support this. On call appliance staffing could improve with some remedial work, whilst once an appliance has gone, it is unlikely it will be replaced. This means that once the reduction has happened, CFRS is unlikely to improve its fire cover.
- It is not a fire engine if there are no staff on it. With 53% availability then of the approximately 18 on-call fire engines only 9 are available. So lets make those 9 100% available instead, and you lose nothing, and probably save money. you could lose 9 x 15 (approx) staff who cost £10,000 per year and save £1.35million. Use that money to upgrade the other pumps to 100% availability. Or only pay On call staff if their pump has 90%+ availability. Plenty of options.
- In busy periods it is still possible to have an appliance become available after a message or call go's out to request people put their lines up. The idea of latent staffing is also a good one which can make pumps available if required. If these were removed, in busy periods you would have no back up options and be reliant on neighbouring services coming standby in Cheshire.
- If a large job breaks out in Cheshire there is not enough appliances available
- It would be imperative that the availability be 100% and that the response standards are met.
- Having appliances sat but not available is a waste of time, money and effort. Vehicles need to be maintained and personnel need to be trained all at a cost, less assests, reduced costs with increased availability must be the way fowards.
- Have to consider larger jobs where no just the immediate response time should be considered but also the total availability.
- Respond to the societal changes rather than reducing resources
- Making the pump available or changing the on call program might help with availability. We have a problem that most of the ica and drivers are on red watch so makes hard to get pump on run. A re shuffle could make it better.
- Alot of stations on call systems are failing and propped up by others. These budgets could be better spent on the stations that achieve high performance and improve standards overall.
- Public is priority
- I feel this model would offer greater consistency and would probably be more cost effective.
- Incidents happen at any time of the day, yet often oncall teams struggle for cover in certain time periods. I would rather 100% availability of fewer assets. EG - 53% x13 OC stations = 689. 7 x WT (100%) appliances = 700. slightly more cover but 5 less appliances.
- anything other than keeping the same amount of fire engines is a cut, simple as that. The opening statement in this survey was that there would not be any cuts. The solution to on call avaibility and retention is easy, the money has to increase significantly, currently we are paid well below the minimum wage when you divide the amount of hours we cover by the actual retaining fee, significant investment is needed.
- At least you could rely on those fire engines

- I would say keep the amount of fire engines and those who are oncall and want to be wholetime, they should be offered a wholetime employment so that ensures those pumps will always be available and that would resolve responding to incidents quicker. I don't know what that would look like, with working hours etc? I believe the oncall once worked, but times are changing and I think we need to move with those times too.
- our ability to cope with multi resource incidents is not great with the current availability model. I would prefer duty systems where there is more consistent availability.
- Given the ongoing recruitment and retention issues, it's clear that improvements can be made. Potential strategies could include enhanced incentives for on-call firefighters, such as better compensation and benefits, as well as targeted recruitment and retention efforts. The on-call firefighter system is a crucial component of Cheshire's Fire and Rescue Services. While there are challenges, the system has key advantages that I feel justify its continued existence: Local Knowledge: On-call firefighters live or work within close proximity to the fire station, which means they have intimate knowledge of the local community, geography, and potential hazards. This can be invaluable during emergencies and for prevention efforts. Community Engagement: On-call firefighters often have strong ties to their communities. They can serve as ambassadors for the Fire and Rescue Service, fostering relationships with residents, local businesses, and community organisations. These relationships can enhance community trust, as well as facilitate community risk education and fire prevention efforts. Flexibility and Responsiveness: The on-call system allows the service to scale its response based on demand. On-call firefighters can be mobilised during periods of high demand, such as during major incidents, offering a flexible and adaptable workforce. Resilience: Having a broad base of on-call firefighters increases the overall resilience of Cheshire Fire and Rescue Service. In situations such as pandemics, where regular staff might be incapacitated, on-call firefighters can provide a vital backup.
- improving oncall pay and reward for more hours covered by personnel as opposed to flat contract hours pay
- Although support overall reduction, consider improving the placement of appliances and changing some on call stations to day crewed with on call night cover as part of the shift system (DC1 or similar?)
- To provide resilience in covering breakdowns or staffing levels and ensuring the capacity for the Service to meet it 's arrival times
- Public confidence is an important consideration. As someone living and working in Cheshire East I would feel less confident if the number of appliances available were reduced.
- There is a public perception that Cheshire has 30 odd appliances and all of these are available to respond to incidents at any time. However although we have a lot of on call appliances, during the daytime for example, there may only be a handful of these available to respond to incidents. The on call cohort are and have been a important part of CFRS. However from a response and financial sustainability perspective, I believe that increasing the overall time that appliances are available at the expense of losing some low availability appliances is the best option.
- I don't know enough about the data and feel this is too important to reduce to 2 questions
- You might have 50 On Call appliances, but if they all wish to book off to watch the world cup or something there's nothing you can do.



- I would like the same engines but a more effective model for us.
- There are clearly times of the day when availability is an issue and this is causing a significant strain on the operational response capacity. Increasing availability would help to ease this pressure and provide a more robust cover model.
- I think it is important not to dismiss the resilience provided by On Call appliances. Yes they may not be available all the time, but resilience provide during periods of spate activity will be almost impossible to replicate with a reduced fleet
- The on call model doesn't work and will only get worse so it needs to change
- Make wholtime stations 2 pump stations again and this will also increase the safety of Firefighters due to no 5th riders on appliances

## **Q. To what extent would a daytime-only shift system appeal to you?**

### **Staff responses**

- i like the routine of shift pattern
- it depends on the hours and life style this would provide me with. the day crewing systems of 12 hour shifts does not appeal to me due to personal life. i also feel being dual role this would impact personal life as this would create a harder environment for me to provide on call cover outside of works time.
- depends on the hours and the shift pattern?
- what would the hours be? would it be four days on, four days off?
- I enjoy working shift as it affords routine, stability, compressed hours and ensures 24 hour fire cover whereas a day duty system does not.
- Various reasons including health and time with family.
- Because the 2/2 4 shift pattern works well with my day to day life / enables a good work life balance it also enables me to provide good and flexible level of cover at my on call station.
- My shift pattern of 2-2-4 gives me flexibility throughout my working week, allowing me to spend time with my children and drop them off and pick them up from school.
- Night shifts no longer appealing unless responding from home
- reduce hours of availability and loss of wholtime firefighters (dual role)
- I am not 100% clear on the shift pattern. If this system was to suit my home life I would find this appealing.
- Working a DC1 system doesn't appeal to me and the current optimum system currently allows me to have a work life balance.
- I currently enjoy the 2 day 2 night shift pattern as it works for me and my family and gives me a good work life balance. A daytime only shift pattern would be a potential option for me moving forward but only if close to home. I also feel that in a day shift there is more opportunity for community work and other tasks which I enjoy carrying out, but it does add to the workload as on a night shift you are unable to carry out duties such as SSRI's, HSA's and Thematics, therefore I prefer the daytime shift systems where the extra work load is reflected in the pay.
- Work life balance would then shift work work balance. Daytime only would create issues with childcare and create extra costs for many.
- Not helpful with childcare.
- I prefer to do the 2,2,4 shift system
- depends on hours worked, shift pattern used and the pay

- Having worked 2-2-4 I am happy being able to come home to my family every night. This shift system currently suits me and provides work life balance.
- I like working the night shifts and also fits in with my wife's work doing shifts with the NHS.
- I would not mind been day-crewed on my current station and then oncall at night, my concern would be how many would leave the station should the oncall hours available become reduced to nights and weekends only.
- Optimum crewing is the best shift system for a positive work life balance. I speak from experience having worked on other shift systems, although this is only my personal preference. Optimum crewing offers the best possible fire cover for the public and resilience for the Service.
- Not in wholetime
- I work nucleus system which is days only, but maintains shift system of 3 on 3 off. It works, and I prefer that than 2-2-4 as I get to spend my evenings with my family and sleep in my own home I wouldn't want that to change to less hours over more days though as this would greatly impact my cost of living. As an example if we moved to a 9 to 5, I'd have to afford childcare 5 days a week instead of 2. And I would see my kids a lot less, which I appreciate is a personal issue, but to pay more and see my kids less?
- This would not fit my work life balance
- I do not want to work 9-5. my worklife balance is a priority
- CHILD CARE
- My current shifts work VERY well around child care and provide a great work life balance. it would be a massive life disruption and have huge cost implications if this was to change. I would not be able to work a daytime-only shift pattern
- Would prefer not to work nights or weekends.
- I would like to be at home with my family every night.
- Daytime shifts would present personal home issues. The current system supports my home life and provides 24hour fire cover for the area.
- Childcare issues.
- The optimum crewing system is essential to maintain appropriate cover at night
- Would love to do firefighting 9-5 monday - friday
- This would impinge on families who require child care. The current 2 2 4 system gives a good working/life balance.
- I am currently very happy with my shift system, it provides great work life balance and productive hours. Day shift only would impact on childcare, thus work life balance
- Day crewing 4 on 4 off or 224 only in my personal opinion
- I like the idea of spending time at home in the evenings but not the amount of days which the day shifts work. I like the idea of 4 on and 4 off.
- Current shift system suits my family and partners work commitments
- 224 model is in the grey book terms and conditions
- this would result in more days at work, and less fire cover for communities
- I would consider leaving my primary employment should a daytime only shift was available.
- It would make sense to me financially and would motivate others to give cover when they dont.
- Financial incentive, similar to dual role but better paid for a comparable amount of work

- I have worked on two day shift stations, Wilmslow & Birchwood both had different shift patterns. I preferred Birchwood model as I found I was more productive
- I would like to migrate to whole time but daytime only would only appeal as part of a day crewing system when I could provide night time and weekend cover as on call.
- No nights
- It leaves my nights free which is nice for me, but not so nice for a person whose house is on fire.
- it means i get my own bed at night
- If it would secure me a wholetime position it would definitely be more appealing.
- Too restrictive
- i have managed my home life around the shift system
- Let's say it was Monday-Friday 9-5 that would work great. It covers the daytime that's needed, keeps the pump available. And instead of carrying a pager and taking 5minutes to get to the station, it increases response time. It allows ff's who are development more time to train and gain competency, it shares the work load between wholetime staff regarding retention, and allows us to open more doors to do things to be productive within the community.
- I'm a retired W/T firefighter of 30yrs, this would amount to cuts in fire cover. chopping 4 oncall pumps to create 1 pump day cover isn't the answer. pay oncall a proper wage. reduce on call establishments and increase pay for remaining staff.
- While the prospect of a day time duty system is certainly appealing in many respects, the potential challenges it could pose to balancing my personal life are a significant concern. I am a parent to young children and, with no immediate family nearby to assist, juggling child-related responsibilities such as school pick-ups and managing school holidays is a pressing issue. My husband also works full time from 9-5, so we must find a way to balance both our professional commitments without compromising the care and attention our children need.

**Q. To what extent would you prefer working a regular routine shift pattern or one which is flexibly determined on a monthly basis?**

**Staff comments**

- so you can plan ahead and which assist with my on call role
- i like to know what i am doing and when. this helps with my personal life and allows me to plan things in around work and helps keep a healthy work life balance.
- It is easier to plan things with family and friends.
- Not knowing what options are available makes this answer hard to answer, Therefore painting maybe a response which won't be based on facts
- I like being able to plan months - a year+ in advance.
- I have no preference as I would try and make things work around the shift patterns and or watch requirements
- If I stay on my current watch, I can plan things years in advance as I know my shift pattern for my entire career. This allows me to easily plan childcare and helps me arrange my availability through my on call role.
- more flexibility allows a better work life balance
- flexibility is key. This can be managed locally at each station/ watch
- with childcare and general life this is easier to plan a head as apposed on a monthly basis.

- I prefer to know when I am working as this makes it easier to plan ahead. Whether it be for family time away, what outside commitments I can commit to our just for childcare purposes I feel that this suits me and my family.
- Easier for planning around home life and partners employment.
- I have no preference but how will this impact dual role staff?
- self rostering is awful, no good for holidays, no good for work life family balance, no good for anything!
- Routine in the sense I can plan ahead knowing my shifts. However a flexible option would appeal
- Again knowing my shift pattern well in advance helps my wife to work her shifts around me.
- my current contract is 60 hours but the hours i put in can range from 90- 110 hours a week. I lose out on the extra retainer as it allows for me to able to lower my hours where needed rather than not meeting the contracted hours if i were to put them up to a higher amount.
- I could adapt to both, but find a routine shift pattern generally works for my lifestyle.
- Flexibility determined on a monthly basis isn't as good as it sounds. If its on a rotating priority order, its impossible to be consistent with childcare arrangements, and finding nurseries that allow varying days for flexibility are becoming harder to find. Fixed shift pattern allows for stability.
- i need to know when im working i could not change my shift pattern
- child care, pre planning for the year ahead,
- This allows to plan a long time into the future.It gives stability to home life.
- It would enable me to plan ahead and also help with childcare consistency.
- The current routine shift system is proven, robust and resilient, providing 100% cover
- this is better for planning for family life.
- The current shift pattern affords routine, stability, compressed hours which support my home life. It also ensures 24 hour fire cover which day systems do not.
- Absolutely not. The regularity of shifts is a major attraction for this work
- This pattern enables staff to make decisions in their personal life well in advance of a system where it changes monthly. For example :- child care, family occasions ( wedding, birthdays etc) arranging holidays with family/friends who also work and have to arrange leave.
- Again a routine shift pattern allows for stability both in the workplace and at home, it allows for planning both in the workplace and at home, against a flexible pattern which achieves neither
- 9-5 is not a preferred option for me personally
- I can plan in advance
- Easier to plan and have a better work life balance.
- I am open to any shift pattern that is available
- Need to be able to plan in advance, having a rota meaning you can look ahead months or years in advance is important especially when other shift systems have this benefit
- Since moving to WDS I have found this to give me a better work / life balance
- work/life balance
- Easier to plan life/family around work commitments.
- I have a life outside the fire service, this is my job, not my life. I am available for extra shifts occasionally if needed, but I have to be able to plan my work life balance far in advance of a month!

- It would make sorting childcare and life a lot easier to plan.
- Allows planning for family life and partners working pattern
- It would be better for my family life. Work/family balance. And I would be less fatigued jumping from one job to another
- It would be important for me to have a well-structured rota, as well as some level of understanding for emergencies and unforeseen circumstances related to family responsibilities. A flexible system could also be beneficial in managing both my professional commitments and my family life effectively. In conclusion, while I am open to a daytime duty system, I believe it should be implemented with a mindful approach to the various personal commitments that firefighters like me balance alongside our professional duties.

**Q. To what extent would a package of increased financial remuneration encourage you to provide additional cover over weekends, but using a more structured approach to planning and managing availability?**

#### **Staff comments**

- it would encourage more staff to book up and cover more
- I feel as though if there was some form of bounty for providing cover over weekends, bank holidays or calendar occasions like Christmas you would receive a better availability for these times. I feel as though the occars payment is too little and often also too easy to miss out on if you went off on sick or went under your hours due to having a varying life style. I personally enjoy the on call for providing cover in an area i life and where my family lives. however, the money is something that needs to be looked into especially surrounding the retainer fee maybe. the difference between the different contact bandings is nothing and i also feel the zero regard for going above and beyond your contract banding is poor.
- Still needs to have flexibility with regards to booking off for last minute plans etc
- This question should already be in place, maybe the on call retention would be higher if this was in place
- financial recognition for every extra hour given after contractual hours fulfilled would encourage more coverage.
- Depends on how much the package would include.
- Being on call can be disruptive to family activities. It would be easier to justify my on call role to my family if there was better financial remuneration.
- I already try and provide cover through weekends when not on shift, but a remuneration package would help justify this more to my family, when a clear reward can be seen that can help with household finances.
- Pay for availability is a recognised system in other FRS's
- All depending upon the financial package and the structure and flexibility of planning.
- Most things come down to better pay. The on-call is propped up currently by people who enjoy the role and will provide what cover they can but due to the rather poor financial gain will not on most occasions go out of their way to give extra cover at weekends.
- Birchwood only allows for night cover meaning that it is physically impossible to work 2-2-4, give 50hrs and allow for suitable time off

- If 12 hour shifts of OC availability were paid at a fixed hourly rate, rather than retainer and payment for turnouts, then I would probably put more cover up. A set 12hr coverage payment with no turn out/hourly payment would be my preferred option.
- What will be classed as 'additional cover'? out station struggles with availability dependant on the 224 shift pattern which means its not always weekends where our availability is low. what about providing this package for 'additional cover' during week days?
- The retainer fee is not fit for purpose. The difference between the contract boundaries is measured in the 10's of pounds. Making it more financially beneficial to provide extra hours would encourage more to do so.
- Would have to be significant financial remuneration
- The main factor affecting recruitment and retention of on call FF is the poor pay. On call stations tend to be placed in affluent areas and people are not interested in the job.
- The on call pay is not worth it at present for the commitment we provide, a new pay structure would help but overall I think the on call system is destined for failure.
- i feel the managment has lost touch with the oncall side of the family! each time a manager comes to station and staffing is brought up they ask two questions; "what is it that you want" and "put a figure on how much money is enough"" this is not why most are part of the oncall fire service! for some it could cost them more than they make by doing it, but this is made up in other ways eg: experience, knowledge, achievements and future pathways. i feel management has lost touch with the understanding of the oncall side of the family! each time a manger comes to station the same questions are asked; ""what do you want?"" ""put a figure to it?!" this is not what the oncall is about! Knowledge, experience, opportunity respect and gratitude ! ""we"" have lost so many firefighters due to the forced 50 hour minimum contracts i understand the issues around this however; many of these firefighters have vast knowledge and experience and were quite happy to put their line up and turn out for free to keep their local pump available they would probably covered close to the 50 hours without been forced but having to commit to this every week makes the situation difficult. assistance to progress with clearer pathways and equal opportunities for on call as the wholetime.
- I only work mostly for a wage even thou i enjoy the job, but I have given up a lot over the years especially at weekends to keep the station available but new recruits seem to have most weekends off, so a considerable financial increase would be nice for the job we do and the time and commitment we give.
- As I cover Monday to Friday day cover and have done every week for 14 years, I would not entertain covering weekends as well as this is when I can complete tasks in my other role which I can't in the week. It is only fair that the staff that don't cover week days cover the weekend.
- I try and cover at least one of the days of a weekend, if not both quite a lot of the time. Although I do feel some would be encouraged by a financial gain - most people work primary employment Mon-Fri as On-Call so a weekend is usually time to spend with the family/participate in hobbies. I think increasing weekend pay or perhaps offering TOIL as per bank holiday this could maybe help increase availability?
- I give a large amount of cover and feel sometimes it is not beneficial to my home life and also financially.
- I already provide more cover than most at my station. A change to the system to reward hours given when the station is available would be better rather than providing hours when the FF knows the pump is off. Rewarding hours given over the

contracted hours (as long as these positively affect availability) should also be considered as currently this is done frequently and is not rewarded or recognised.

- you do not pay enough
- It also depends on what my wife is working aswell. I work on call around her shifts and my day rota.
- I work 50 hours In the week. And my job is very physical, weekends is for family time.
- contracts need to be reviewed across the board. having a Wm that actually manages and knows what they are doing would help.
- As an on-call firefighter, I'm motivated by more than just financial incentives. My dedication to the role stems from a desire to serve and protect the community that I am a part of. While an increased financial remuneration package would not be the primary driver for me to provide additional cover (I feel I already provide a significant level of cover), it could indirectly lead to an increase in my availability during the weekdays by allowing me the flexibility to reduce hours in my full-time job. As always, my key driver is my commitment to serving the community to the best of my ability.

**Q. Which areas of the on-call duty system do you feel could be improved in order to improve availability and staff retention?**

**Staff comments**

- i feel the management has lost touch with the oncall side of the family! each time a manager comes to station and staffing is brought up they ask two questions; ""what is it that you want "" and ""put a figure on how much money is enough"" this is not why most are part of the oncall fire service! for some it could cost them more than they make by doing it, but this is made up in other ways eg: experience, knowledge, achievements and future pathways. As a service we have lost many oncall firefighters with vast knowledge and experience due to the rigid stance to the minimum 50 hour contract alot of these people were prepared to work for free to keep pumps available most been comfortable with 30 hour contracts and most would put close to the 50 hours availability in but they could not guarantee this every week, also where these staff are dual roll staff there is no extra cost to their training as this is already covered under WT budget. i believe some hours would be better than no hours. where opportunities arise for cover (overtime) staff to do fill in shifts on WT pumps this should be made available to Oncall staff showing available for full duration of the shift, where a pump and RRRU are unavailable or there are more than required to staff the oncall pump. NVQ / qualification is a must for the oncall not only to ensure the same standards are met across the whole service, but otherwise their is no incentive for people to join the oncall to use as a stepping stone into the WT i am aware that it has been said that an ""in house"" qualification would be used but surely once in the WT they will still require to do a full qualification to progress further up thus dropping to an apprentice wage. i believe if the service helped to support Oncall and WT staff with better benefits that helped the genuine needs of staff members day to day living, health and family life this would massively help retention
- i feel management has lost touch with the understanding of the oncall side of the family! each time a manger comes to station the same questions are asked; ""what do you want?"" ""put a figure to it?!"" this is not what the oncall is about! Knowledge, experience, opportunity respect and gratitude ! "we" have lost so many firefighters due to the forced 50 hour minimum contracts i understand the issues around this however; many of these firefighters have vast knowledge and experience and were quite happy to put their line up and turn out for free to keep their local pump available

they would probably be covered close to the 50 hours without being forced but having to commit to this every week makes the situation difficult. Assistance to progress with clearer pathways and equal opportunities for on-call as the whole-time. Losing the NVQ for the on-call I believe is a poor decision as it takes away an incentive to join

- personally non-off these would improve availability and retention at a on-call station, we had people join and when they find out about the work load, training commitment you have to do against the wage you get they leave.
- struggling with number of days required at HQ
- Over the years I have heard many a time the misconception that 'On Call don't do it for the money!!' This may be true for the first 3 years or so but after that, when the role begins to inconvenience other elements of your life, it is the money that keeps the crew doing it.
- Increased flexibility in contracts for cover. Increasing and maintaining on-call staff establishment - more staff provides a shared commitment and increased flexibility in providing cover.
- Being development myself, I feel like the Blue Book is quite a drawn out process. I completely understand that a Competent Firefighter has to actually be competent, but I know some people don't have the time to do so much admin/paperwork towards their Blue Book which puts people off carrying on. I put quite a bit of time into mine, although I have a flexible primary employment and no children. The presentations on pieces of equipment, and the building construction etc. all takes a lot of time and I personally don't think they're relatable to improving a Firefighters performance on an operational incident. Of course knowing about building construction is important, but we have eLearning and Drill Night every week so this can be picked up on this until it is embedded. Writing it up, requesting witness testimonies, chasing those witness testimonies up, then sending them off for assessment is a lengthy process which is all unpaid, so I can see why some people drag their feet with it.
- The training requirements over the first years are very demanding and can cause a lot of strain for what is essentially a part time job that people have chosen to do in addition to their primary employment. The pathway to competence is honestly too large a commitment given the hours and work involved, personally I find it overwhelming and however much I want to gain competence I cannot see me completing it. Surely there should be a way that once past the initial training and Quarterlies, performance can be judged by ones peers and CM/WM/SM and competence awarded that way.
- do not pay enough. we use all our holidays to train. no one cares if we need to leave the fire ground. its a part time job and officers seem to think differently.
- Having the right mix of ppl with relevant competence and mixture of diff watches so not all on or off same day. Might help with our availability.
- Having more drivers, having more OIC'S having more FFC , and then it's a case of having oic and drivers putting there line up.
- it would encourage staff to stay ,due to its a massive commitment to be on call stay at home and not be call out or used
- whole-time dual role staff should be offered a lower contract than 50 if required but also the option to up it should they want too as often firefighetrs go above the 50 hours into the 6 and get no reward for it. i also think the competency takes too long to achieve and causes people who have primary employments outside of the service to loose interest.
- The expectations/workload of a solely on-call firefighter supersedes the benefits of committing to carry out that role.



- Stick to a single banding and give a pay reward for more hours completed on a monthly basis.
- more flexible cover bandings as some weeks struggle to put minimum cover on and others I can go way above but there is no financial award so hesitate from doing so as jobs are few and far between. more flexibility in training day options, being able to attend mid week instead of weekends to courses. I understand the need for pathway to competence and completing the blue book. working another job and then the on call on top I struggled to do so. there is also no financial reward to doing your blue book other than when you get signed off. where as whole time development can work on it during shift time.
- Looking at Birchwood Contractual arrangements that is unique to every other on call station.
- Retainer fees/overall pay.
- Its different for everyone. Some like the training and want the pay, other don't need the pay but need the training.
- Pay needs improvement. More flexibility in providing availability - being able to book a pump available for non-emergency incidents like standbys and reliefs where a turnout of 5 minutes isn't required and could be increase to 10 or 15 minutes.
- - Better pay
- Do away with bandings. Possibly bring in payment for availability instead. Currently on 50hr contracts some may want to provide more cover than the minimum 50hrs, but any extra cover is not rewarded, so less people do extra.
- Allowed to manage my own rest periods between shifts, as i am currently obligated to take rest periods after a WT shift even if i respond to no incidents. Fully on call colleagues are allowed to manage there own fatigue. I would like to be treated as an adult and judge myself if i am to tired to work.
- All these areas can definitely be improved but the main thing is the money, that should be on this list as well!
- Although i believe On call availability will always be an issue, improved pay and more flexible contracts would go a long way to invest in the staff and make committing their time more appealing. Also consider a pathway into a wholetime role by making migration a fixed opportunity on competence in role has been achieved. This selling point can then be used during our recruitment campaigns
- Main issue is the 50 hour contract.

**Q. Are there any new or emerging risks that you think we should be taking into account in our planning for the future?**

**Public comments**

- As there are more housing estates being built there is a need for an increase in the emergency services for the community.
- Flooding and wildfires
- Traffic
- On call status. While offering a second jobs to the community and to firefighters themselves the removal of work life balance impacts
- Arson and Firesetters
- Terrorism attacks

- The use of drones for illegal/arson/terrorist purposes should be considered: 1. CFRS should identify the emerging hazards (from drones) that could result in the need for a response by CFRS (eg. to an arson fire started by use of one or multiple drones on an industrial or business site). 2. CFRS should identify hazards to crews from the illegal use of drones against them while they respond to incidents. 3. CFRS should evaluate the risks from these hazards, and put prevention/mitigation in place to at least reduce the risks. 4. Periodically review the emerging threats.
- Wildfire
- Impact of weather related incidents ie flooding and wildfire
- More flooding / dealing with electric cars
- Probably flooding and heatwaves.
- The ever growing list of new Housing estates
- Electrical car/bike fires - advice needed to prevent/prepare for these
- Increased housing and traffic in and around towns. Warrington for example is developing at a fast rate and cover should be kept up inline with these risks.
- Hydrogen and its possible increased uses and the danger this poses.
- issues around on-call retainment could be viewed as a risk and the impact that has on fire cover and responses. also incidents won't continue to keep going down.
- People who think cuts and ideas of diluting the role are the answers. Those are the most dangerous risk.
- Wildfires
- the risk of senior managers cutting the service beyond its already frail service and not been held fully accountable
- Electric cars
- FRA 's seem to be ignored until after an incident
- Cheshire is growing but you seem to want to get smaller. Cheshire should have a thorough look at all it's activities and departments and see what actually is needed and not just trying to be at the forefront of everything. People want Fire Engines not over staffed support departments.
- Tackling fires involving EV's
- Poor older housing stock
- Lack of experience within the fire engine with 4 riders on appliances. This could be improved by having a 5th rider.
- Arson reduction, lithium batteries, firefighter health
- Terror attacks
- To be involved in all new planning applications.
- Climate change incidents and ensuring All crews have the appropriate PPE
- no mention of the national mobile text for a significant emergency.
- The new building estates making towns bigger, we need the fire engines to reflect the size of our town
- AI - some houses have everything, including heaters and door locks, controlled by computers. These could go wrong and start fires and lock people inside - this is not science fiction.
- Risk that cost is prioritised over needs of the local community and need for a quick response
- Large batteries
- Still no mandatory installation of sprinklers in new buildings
- Commercial fire risk profile appears to be changing with increased fire risk in waste facilities. Changing fire risk from electric vehicles

- 1. Electric vehicle acceleration is rapid, especially through junctions. Increased risk of RTC. 2. Electric vehicle battery fires may need specialist equipment.
- Water safety advice for young people to help avoid drowning
- EVs, batteries in properties, cost cutting in businesses
- Households and businesses are becoming a larger risk to human health. You need to keep up with the modern society and make sure the level of fire cover is sustainable.
- Climate change. Greater risk of flooding during the winter months and greater risk of "wildfires" (horrible Americanism) during the summer months. Whilst flooding appears to have been taken into account, the increased risk of wildfires does not.
- Increasing size of towns across the region
- The building and operation of HS2, a train collision, airplane crash, or biological/chemical warfare.
- Terrorism. Wild fires. Flooding
- "hermal run away of lithium batteries in electric vehicles and also in homes with solar panels. Effects of climate change - extremes of temperatures, flooding, drought. Sustainability - how the service can reduce its carbon footprint whilst maintaining the level of service.
- Drier weather and exponential growth of visitors to Delamere Forest is an obvious disaster waiting to happen. Forestry Commission have seemingly discharged any consideration of risk and, unlike businesses, have no contingency in place.
- Electric vehicles, Cheshire currently has no provision other than standard equipment for dealing with fires involving EV's
- From a personal view only, I'd train up a team of volunteers who would do your fire checks/fire safety at homes. I'd also extend your battery life on the WiFi/under your pillow alarms as we went away for 20 days and it hadn't worked since. Makes me feel very vulnerable when my husband is working nights due to it not working and the potency of medication at night
- Global warming working with agencies to help reduce weather related fires. Exhorting pressure to ban portable bbq's
- I think that with global warming and the possible hotter, summers more education could be needed with regard to grass, fires, pollution etc
- More fires as heat waves become more common.
- The possibility of war. The probability of increased open-grass fires due to global warming. How to provide a service in a pandemic.
- Further number of wildfire resources, additional stingers, additional ability to respond to incident via the oncall duty system, A designated team responsible for crewing
- E-batteries and cars
- Open water swimming
- More a Policing issue but jumping red lights and speeding issues by those who won't behave. Perhaps fire crews could be allowed to report such things and have it lead to a fine if seen.
- The increased incidence of wildfires, due to climate change, needs to be factored in when creating the CRMP.
- Flood management
- Fires/incidents related to climate change.
- New build areas with only one entrance and exit, should an incident happen and inconsiderate drivers partially blocking such areas impacting on response times.
- Parking, I think there should be random checks on roads to ensure fire engines have clear access to incidents the PCSO's could help with this.

- Increased levels of wildfires as a result of the hotter and drier weather and carelessness in disposal of cigarettes and use of disposable barbecues
- Taking account of the likelihood of the effects of more extreme weather events due to global warming
- Drug driving awareness
- Home batteries and electric cars - more electric power use
- Dangers arising from excessive immigration
- Response to electric vehicles / batteries etc. Response to wildfire incidents and terrorist incidents
- Fire risks with electric vehicles.
- Forest and heath fires?
- Climate change - grass fires caused by people taking BBQs out into the countryside - education to discourage this.

### Staff comments

- hydrogen power is rapidly approaching mainstream use both in homes and automotive sectors as a service we should be at the forefront of development in understanding and adapting our approach. Within the next 5 years most vehicle manufactures will have at least one model using Hydrogen.
- The climate emergency poses the single greatest threat to humanity. As a younger person I am concerned by the current direction of the world and don't want to be part of a generation who goes down in the history books as someone who did nothing. We should be a leader in fighting the climate emergency nationally amongst Fire and Rescue Services by taking steps towards carbon neutrality. I think a lot of good work is already under way which is great to see. We need to somehow start accounting for the increased risks that extreme weather conditions pose to the county. Inevitable increased operational activity in one form or another i.e. more wildland fires, more commercial and industrial fires more widespread flooding will require more fire engines and more firefighters to properly deliver an effective Emergency Service during such times.
- The climate over passed couple of years has change .we are getting more spate conditions in the warmers and dryer months of the year which is increasing call out
- More work into electric vehicles and the infrastructure that comes with it
- I am aware of the cloud above our heads currently in regards to red ones and responding to medical incidents. i personally support this and i feel it makes sense. however not without proper training and PPE.
- More resilience for periods of spate conditions. Increase in contingency planning for the rapid development of lithium-ion.
- With the threat of climate change meaning that summers may be hotter and dryer, the risk of more wildfires is starting to increase. Current PPE is too hot to wear during these temperatures when working hard. A set of specific wildfire ppe would be beneficial
- Car fires involving EV's, something needs to be put in place to drop the vehicle into a tank of water rather than having relief pumps coming out to a car fore for over 24 hours
- More inexperienced firefighters are being promoted without any pathways. Currently someone can express an interest in promotion and within a short period of time can be in charge of a watch and station. This has to be endorsed by a JO (Who could also be inexperienced and think it will help their promotion by doing this). Having a

pathway, with modules and sign offs to completed over a realistic timeframe (which can't be rushed like the blue books) Would make a safer and improved Cheshire.

- Fire fighter decontamination equipment and protocols, aging work force, exposure to diesel fumes, fire fighter cancer rates being 3 times higher than the general population risk.
- Hydrogen fuel
- Electric vehicles. Building and expansion of towns and villages.
- anti social behaviour
- Health support at stations. An improved partnership between district nurses and minor injuries clinics operating at fire stations with staff playing an extended role.
- Lithium battery fires. Car charging point fires. Wildfires and flooding.
- EV Transport
- The emergence of Li-ion batteries and use of electricity in vehicles and their impact on existing buildings where new charging points and vehicles are being kept/stored etc. I also think that the Service should be mindful of the drive from government to push for hydrogen to be used in domestic premises. I also think that there are ongoing legislative changes that affect Protection and regulation of commercial/non-domestic and some domestic undertakings. I think that these changes mean that staff need to be trained in more specialist areas and are therefore going to be increasingly difficult to retain where private sector organisations will have an interest in staffs expertise.
- Lithium Ion batteries - fires increasing. wildfires. Population increasing within areas and reduction of appliances. Floodings
- Fire fighter safety, decontaminants and PPE
- More education and focus on reducing RTC's involving young people.
- Changing technology e.g. electric cars and how they are continually being developed
- Electric cars, batteries and solar pannels
- More engagement with our diverse communities.
- Lithion Batteries
- The risk posed by electric cars in terms of fire but also road accidents due to people not looking to check it is safe to cross (not hearing an electric car coming). The risks associated with new gadgets/technology that is available. Target a younger audience so it moves up through the generations. A lot of over 65's at present do not use these gadgets and are more fire/safety conscious then younger people.
- Wildfires across Cheshire
- The complexity of the VP cases dealt with in Prevention - at times need a more specialised focus
- Hoarding, hoarding and hoarding. Also dangerous smoking needs more publicity
- Electric vehicle technology
- Electric vehicles
- Do not reduce the number of operational appliances, there are far to many SM's and above in non operational departments in HQ when the front line crews are at breaking point.
- wildfires
- Lithium batteries.
- The increase in housing is getting faster and faster. This increases the population in those areas which then increases the possibility of the need for the emergency services. It also increases congestion on our roads which reduces our attendance times.

- Further investment in equipment and learning on electric vehicles.
- Cardiac response. But only with.. Professional Training Pay to reflect this Adequate mental health and well being support, more involved than what is currently available to staff.
- staff not being able to physically do the job
- EV's we need a dedicated special which can respond to these incident who have specialist training and equipment and can assist the initial crews. This will become a amassive risk nationwide
- The wildfire unit is now operational which is a useful addition. The wildfire masks should be distributed to all Firefighters so that initial crews can safely deal with wildfires.
- Every station area is having more and more housing estates being built but a complete lack of thought for infrastructure such as hydrants. Some estates don't even have a single hydrant.
- Climate change is going to impact the service going forward with more extremes of temperature/rainfall/flooding etc. There is a mental health risk if local police forces stop going to mental health incidents unless they are life threatening, this could cause a number of situations where the service may be required to attend and may require a revised way of working to ensure safety of staff and vulnerable people. Civil unrest and terror attacks, be it through Russia's actions to UK supporting the war in Ukraine, lone wolf attacks/major terrorist attacks, counter terrorism are now investigating those involved in conspiracy theory's and civil unrest and protests etc. There are lots of scenarios that could require the Service to respond.
- The service needs to look at its driver profile, some stations are dangerously low on drivers. The service currently has 4 appropriately trained instructors plus to deliver the courses but only one training fire engine. The service are currently employing an outside agency to run a 10 day course at a cost of around 4k inc vat. Even though there are available instructors including an associate instructor.
- Housing developments, increasing population and potential demand for incidents
- Skills/experience drain
- Climate change, exploring alternatives to staffing on-call stations as that is a high percentage of time they are off the run for people living in more rural areas. Further develop engagement with farms as seeing more fires in hot weather linked to arable and livestock premises and large majority of animal rescues seem to be farms
- More research into electric vehicle fires and best practices to extinguish them.
- Wildfire risk - burn teams, wildfire PPE (lightweight fire kit) Breathing Apparatus - Telemetry
- The changes in technology around vehicles has skyrocketed and we are lagging behind with our understanding , training and equipment.
- Improve cross-border collaboration and consistency in operational policies and equipment in anticipation of large-scale environmental events such as flooding ,storm damage, wildfires, etc..
- Wildfire will become an increasing problem and potentially more resources, training and equipment will be needed to deal with them.
- Support staff pay grades are very near to minimal wage so recruitment of good staff has become very difficult. The wage structure needs to be looked at in detail to keep staff and recruit new employees
- Cost of living Aging population Climate change
- energy sector, future car technology, building design, poverty in communities.

- Not an emerging risk as such but water supplies are not at all adequate in most settings these days, more needs to be done to pressure water suppliers to improve their service.
- The obvious risks are Lithium and Hydrogen but I think the biggest risk to CFRS is declining On Call numbers. Migration doesn't help as people now see it as a gateway to wholetime then drop the on call as soon as they achieve a full time role. We need to make things better for On call staff if they are to play a part in our future. Are we a wholetime service supported by the on call or are we an On call service supported the wholetime??
- smart motorways - electric cars -workforce being more fluid, risk of not having 30 year FF in the future, increase cost of training ETC.
- Electric vehicles
- electric car fires
- Battery electric vehicles
- Climate change is clearly having a major impact now and in the future ie: Flooding / Wildfires
- electric vehicles and electric power bank storage facilities
- Lithium Ion batteries. They are in everything and I know it is a problem everywhere but I believe we are under equipped to be able to deal with them and behind the curve somewhat as incidents involving these are only going to become more common.
- Electric Vehicles, BESS in domestic properties. Hydrogen Vehicles
- expanding the wildfire capabilities, expanding water bowser vehicles, flooding equipment
- Electric cars, hydrogen vehicles, civil unrest.
- electric car fires will increase and we are not prepared for this type of incident..
- Electric vehicles and lithium battery risks.
- Lightweight PPE for all stations for use during hot weather.
- Electric vehicle and Hydrogen vehicle technology we have no solution to as yet should one be on fire in Cheshire
- New technologies for heating and powering our homes and vehicles. How incidents involving these technologies should be dealt with and the risks they pose to households/businesses.
- Cardiac response
- We currently have no specialist response to electric car or new fuel systems and no specialist FF and BA Set decontamination vehicle. BA holding stations should be provided a BA Set wash.
- Dementia, climate change, technological advancement, increased use of lithium batteries
- Workforce development - HGV/EFAD and special appliance operator skills. Possibly add this to contracts of employment for new starters.
- Climate change, environmental, and electrical battery cars and other installations.
- Ageing workforce, retirement of a lot of Firefighters with a lot of operational experience.
- Safeguarding risk continues to increase
- Runcorn has the mersey and we are close to the weaver canal. Why are we not swift water trained. More drownings are happening. Also electric cars / scooters / bikes etc... are going to be an issue in the future and we need a real strategic plan in place to how we are going to tackle this.

- engaging with the wider younger generation - shift in social media usage of until 20 year olds. Climate change and the impact of it on our emergency services and response to incidents: wild fires, flooding, hot temperatures
- Social media platforms such as tiktok being used to encourage anti social behaviour and unconventional ways of heating the home
- expand the wildfire PPE and equipment across CFRS as this is a growing issue. Consolidate the organisational position on EV's. BESS/DESS sites. Re consider the current command vehicle model to a smaller more flexible response. Consider MTA training and PPE within CFRS - maybe consider one of the Sierra group as an additional NILO cohort to add resilience
- Water Rescue
- Increase in population, increased diversity of population, increase in traffic using the roads & poor road conditions/ road works - creates delays for non-emergency staff to attend appointments. This cannot be measured. Increase in vulnerable residents throughout the county requiring increased casework
- Current interest rate situation on top of existing cost of living crisis may bring more people into deprivation. Potential increased risk of fire in population not previously considered?
- The level of risks in domestic properties has increased since COVID. The work prevention do to limit this risk and take care of the most vulnerable should be taken into account and given more thought and acknowledgement.
- Engaging with the public provides insight to the new / emerging risks
- Electric vehicles but I feel its manufacture issue which we are currently paying for, so investment from them is necessary.
- We should account for the increase in solar panels and battery technology at home within our prevention activity.
- Artificial intelligence. Heightened mobility of people

**Q. Is there anything that Cheshire Fire and Rescue Service currently does that you think it should either change or stop doing?**

**Public comments**

- I selected extremely important for all except the open days as I was unsure of the value - but I don't actually know if all those things need to be covered by the same team/people or if some of those things can be covered by different team members or departments or services?
- Health screaming members of the public.
- Attend recruitment days at school about all aspects of the fire service
- You need to stop with all the Marketing strategies/ Agenda to increase diversity and inclusion. You are going about this the complete wrong way. I am an advocate for diversity and inclusion - I am a Hispanic woman with ADHD; but to Cheshire Fire and Rescue the efforts are not genuine and they are actually discriminatory. Most people who want to be a firefighter are heterosexual, white males and yet they feel as though YOU, cheshire fire, want them to lie and say they are gay, or have a disability, or lie about their ethnicity to get the job. Unless they tick one of those boxes, they will be told they didnt score high enough to get a position, so the majority of them lie for you; so that you can get the right %s on papers and to comply with your marketing Agenda. It's tragic; you should be treating everyone EQUALLY, regardless



if they are gay, straight, male, female... But at the minute, you discriminate against white straight males, making them feel like they have to lie to follow their passion.

- I think we should be more available to attend medical emergencies when the paramedics aren't available
- Centralised training of duty crews is carried out at the expense of removing Fire Appliances from the areas they are normally based. They are then some 15/20 miles distant when needed. Historically establishment figures were set , as was a ridership factor, allowing centralised training to be conducted without taking pumps out of the equation. Recognised establishments need to be reinstated WITHOUT over reliance on shift overtime.
- Focus on emergency fire and rescue response don't overstep past statutory remit I.e. medical response
- Review the societal changes and make the on call more desirable so you can keep the same number of fire engines
- There appears to be a heavy reliance from neighbouring fire services when large incidents occur. This shows the existing cover is not sufficient and looking to reduce fire appliances / stations or availability is not safe. The need for Cheshire to be able to cover its own incidents in these circumstances should be a priority. The On Call system shouldn't be seen as a secondary/ part time fire cover as it has the ability to deliver as a secondary appliance at life risk incidents - a shorter response time can be introduced for example (current 5 minutes reduced to 3 or 4 with a pre- alert may offer quicker turnout times)
- Reduce carbon footprint by travelling less in diesel fire engines.
- re-instate station names on appliances
- Medical, isn't that ambulance? And health services, isn't that doctors?
- Question 16 is extremely divisive. Medical emergencies require an ambulance not an ill-medically equipped fire engine with crews with limited knowledge where as an ambulance has professionally trained staff as well as an vehicle full of equipment to cater for a huge array of medical incidents. A defibrillator is not the answer to all medical emergencies as well as it only works if the heart is in fibrillation and a ruck sack of basic medical stuff kept in a locker full of firefighting equipment does not inspire great medical cleanliness. Anti-social behaviour is another professionally qualified career which should be left to professionals. To get FFs to do all these types of work with limited learning as well as something they cannot fully commit to due to the amount of FF training they require is unfair. It could be seen as this is just senior managers using such ideas to gain promotion or bonuses to further their individual careers and not for the greater good. Don't pull on heart strings saying it may save life how do you think the crews feel if it fails - no respect for staff who are there, then have to go back to say a school visit. Taking other peoples jobs or diluting their professions is a disgrace. Where is the incentive for the majority of children who see those that are mis-behaving being given days out at fire stations seeing all the equipment and even having a go with some of it. So yes to answer the question stop doing other peoples roles and jobs.
- Activities should not get in the way of the core response of the service. Responding to emergency calls should come before education.
- stop answering forced entry until an ambulance is confirmed it is mobile to the incident. The expectation placed on firefighters when an ambulance is not at a medical incident is unfair.
- FRS should never attend medical emergencies as a lone response. NWS are specifically highly trained to carry out this duty and papering over the cracks in the

ambulance service with FRS only makes the problem worse in the long term for the ambulance service

- Need to conduct checks that premises have FRA's better before an incident than after
- Sometimes it seems Cheshire Fire Service have lost their way and the most important thing is a fire engine responds to an incident. There are times when this seems a second thought and they get involved too much in non fire related activities.
- Provide job opportunities across Cheshire instead of it being centralised in Winsford
- If a medical response is required then failure of the NHS ambulance response should be addressed first and then full integration of Fire and Rescue Service with paramedic services should be explored.
- Cold calling people when completing safe and well visits should be stopped.
- Taking appliances out of their own area to cover crewing deficiencies and on call availability issues
- On call firefighters could aid in delivery of safe and wells, thematics and ssri whilst on call within their community. This would aid other departments and aid in retention as they would be getting paid for work and completing key safety work within their community. Not all stations have staff that want to do this but the ones that do could help in improving the community they serve.
- Sleeping provisions for operational staff
- Use Fire Safety and Prevention to carry out a lot of these questions. Reduce the number for Operational crews so they can concentrate on training and incidents.
- It should not lose sight that it's an emergency service 1st of all, medical incidents should be attended by the appropriate emergency services
- Actually engaging on the development of your plan is great, think some business fall for self prescribed plans.
- If your struggling to provide a emergency service, you should scale back on the non emergency work to fund your fire engines and recruitment. It's great you do all the additional work but if you can't afford it then you need to priorities.
- Less about Pride.
- Fire fighters should have more of a presence in the community and recognise their value and importance when serving the public
- Fire cadets, once old enough should be made to do a year of service eg the community outreach work. There should be a specialist diving volunteer diving unit like Mountain Rescue to assist/rescue people from water.
- Relying on over the border fire services when Cheshire can't rustle up a local crew to attend fires. Looking at the 'incidents' on your website you seem to rely heavily on Greater Manchester Fire attending incidents in Cheshire
- Being too reliant on neighbouring fire services for fire cover
- The fire service, in common with the police and ambulance services/NHS, needs to focus on its core duties and functions, and not be drawn into an ever increasing list of obligations that can detract from its ability to provide its core services.
- Stop trying to run the service on a shoestring
- The rebuilding of fire stations normally results in a reduction in available bays within the pump room. This approach does not take into account future building development within the area covered by the station. The station sizes appear to be based upon current needs and not future demands.
- The vast majority of office based jobs are based in Winsford, this doesn't increase the diversity of the workforce or allow opportunities for people that live in the towns the for the most part sit on the edge of the Cheshire boundary. More should be done

to decrease car usage amongst staff and switching to green and more sustainable forms of transport reducing the carbon footprint of the Service. Every station should be able to run on green energy especially those built in the last 10 years

- I'd leave the prosecution of businesses to the police or a H&S Inspector. Community Engagement and Fire Prevention, I'd personally train a team of volunteers to undertake that for you. Due to memory problems, I can't recall the rest of the questions – worry.
- Promoting people who haven't done long enough and their ability doesn't match their confidence
- Over responding (in terms of vehicles) to animal rescue incidents
- Nothing needs changing as long as the crews are fully available 24/7
- Leave the medical emergencies to the other service and stop attending incidents involving animals
- I think there should be an improved system for estimating the risks involved in a call-out and does a fire appliance and full crew need to attend? Do you/could you have smaller vehicles with more specialised equipment for certain tasks - like the specialist paramedics for example.
- Rescuing animals isn't an essential service - for instance if a team is out rescuing an animal and a house is on fire the animal should never be a priority!
- I think engaging with local communities, especially young people, and giving them advice and information could help to reduce numbers of some incidents
- Allowing pumps to go off the run because of crewing issues. You've determined that you require a certain number of appliances; ensure their availability
- Fire safety advice during shifts and Safe and Well visits could be delegated to advocates and other 'green' book staff, while perhaps introducing possibilities of supporting NWS / paramedics with response to medical emergencies.
- Leave road safety to the police and DoT.

### Staff comments

- look at how many supporting appliances attend incidents with specialist units and whether these can be condensed. Offer WT overtime to oncall where it will not affect their oncall pump availability. Reassess their current recruitment processes and Questions for both WT and oncall where applicants on the oncall just miss the mark, allow watch managers the opportunity to (sponsor /Support) an application where they believe it beneficial. Give mentoring to Oncall staff looking to progress to the WT with Cheshire so not to lose them to other services.
- Taking this question in the context of the above list. I think all of the roles we carry out as an organisation are important. We are privileged to work for an organisation that does so much good for the community and society at large. Obviously our core functions stand out as our most important against say community work. However all of the above functions offer value.
- Pass out of recruits and on call mod 1 dinner. use HQ instead of expensive hotels and the money saved can be used for training or front line staff or for equipment
- STOP FITTING SMOKE ALARMS. DURING COVID IT WAS CEASED FIRES STILL HAPPENED AS MUCH AS THEY EVER HAVE DONE. SINCE COVID ENDED AND SMOKE ALARM FITTING RESUMED HAS THIS DRASTICALLY REDUCED DOMESTIC FIRE INCIDENTS? IF NOT THEN THAT TIME COULD BE SPENT MORE PRODUCTIVELY.

- On call stations were great years ago but with towns getting bigger, roads getting busier, availability down something needs to be changed for the community to be safe.
- Creating so much admin
- the RRRU project does not work and they are not used often enough. this money could of been better spent elsewhere like on specials or upgrading crewing systems to improve availability.
- Relying too much on neighbouring FRS to attend operational incidents within Cheshire.
- we should only attend NWAS gain entry incidents when NWAS are in attendance and requested CFRS.
- Reduce the delivery of Safe & Well visits, small targeted delivery group would product the best results.
- The organisation is financially and resource inefficient, a cost saving review should be carried out
- school/college engagement. Need to promote the service to young adults. Inclusion school days, promote the service diversity within infant schools to show children anyone can become a fire fighter and promote the services inclusivity
- There's a business case for each activity it undertakes but some are far stronger than others. Perhaps there should be a Cost Benefit Analysis process for some of the events.
- An Introduction of a band system regarding pay for those working at a station where there is specials. basic salary for normal role map. an addition in pay for every extra skill set which is above the normal role map. It allows specials to be single crewed. This increases the risk to the driver who has to get to an incident in HGV on their own. It allows staff to rest on out of date, not fit for purpose, reclining chairs on a night shift. Neighbouring brigades have personal pods with proper resting facilities.
- I think that providing health advice is beneficial for our Prevention Department but blurs the lines of the Fire and Rescue Service and it's main focus where I feel that the resource could be better utilised elsewhere. It seems confusing from speaking to individuals as to why the Fire and Rescue Service are offering this service as you wouldn't expect information on fire from healthcare services. I think that the Service works well to care for both young persons and an older demographic but neglects those who are considered vulnerable in society between these ranges. I think that the Service could do more to engage with this group where this forms a large portion of Cheshire's population too and ultimately comprises of those who work within the Service also.
- Look at changing the On Call system. It isn't very productive in my opinion.
- I think things like good sickness records and going above and beyond in role should be recognised more.
- Promoting community rooms in Fire Stations, as we receive many requests. If this continues we need a robust system in place. We could charge a small fee to provide a regular income for the Service, even ask for this to be given to the FF's Charity.
- We do too many things to an average standard, strip some of this out, focus on what is important and do it well
- Faulty smoke alarms should be replaced by Fire Angel either through posting them or through their staff unless there is a heighten risk. Look at the quality of the smoke alarms - amount going faulty - not last anywhere near the 10 years.
- Home safety assessments carried out by firefighters should take 15-20 minutes plus time taken to prepare walk sheets, travel, find an occupier who is in, and input data

onto SAFFIRE. The current targets that are provided to watches are so high that this is an impossible task. HSAs are therefore completed as fast as possible (generally 1-2 minutes) to ensure numbers are maintained. As a result, the quality and effectiveness of the advice and support given is inadequate.

- Firefighters are extremely frustrated by this situation as the targets are unachievable without compromising the quality. The system of targets should be investigated and reformed to ensure the appropriate standard of these interventions are maintained."
- More focus and budgeting for operational needs and not admin departments Prevention etc.
- Visiting Nepal for Apprentices when there are many worthy causes that would benefit more locally to home.
- I am not sure what value to the service is provided by some of the youth programs we run. I feel these resources would be better targeting schools, those who have been actively setting fires and families who are at risk of homelessness and causing antisocial behaviour. I know some of this will be captured within the youth programs but im not sure what overall value the service itself gets from running these things which take up a lot of staffing and resources which dont normally have anything else to do with the wider service.
- HR have far to much power, when it comes to operational jobs interviews promotions etc, HR seems to be for the service and not for the personnel
- If expected to respond to mtfa give training, ppe and remuneration for crews and agreement with rep bodies
- Additional safe and well activities which DO NOT relate to fire and or other safety. I feel these activities should be undertaken solely by a dedicated department possibly in partnership with the NHS (draw funding from them and use this as an opportunity to fund HSA's) Thematic inspections being carried out by ops crews - this should be outsourced or protection should have staff who can pick these up they are not prudent and are a draw on ops crews time which could be spent elsewhere. Resting facilities are behind 95% of other fire services and when raised to management their eyes glaze over and it is not up for discussion despite the points raised by staff in my opinion this shows short-sightedness as all neighbouring services have addressed this and we are losing talent to these services. CFRS is a productive service and the staff should be rewarded for their commitment
- Stop asking staff about additional work which is currently being negotiated into any future pay deals. This is part of a national discussion into the Firefighter role-map and should be left for the time being. We should stop cold calling people when completing Safe and Wells. All Safe and Well visits should be booked in as an appointment.
- Current HSA targets are not realistic, taking time away from operational learning and development. SSRIs, community work, hydrant testing etc. Every year crews end up diluting the quality of HSAs to meet yearly targets. As more and more community based work is being done by crews it's creating a bigger problem with regards to time
- It should continue to reassess its priority activities and pivot where a new risk emerges i.e. the Covid-19 Pandemic.
- A review of the on call duty system
- Stop reducing the Comand Training opportunities for providing quality training / assessments.
- Minimum 50hr contracts for On-Call.
- Putting up smoke alarms
- Look at the work carried out by support staff and pay accordingly. Management pay is not in line with operational management.

- turning up to force entry for the NWS - completely ridiculous and not managed well at all, resulting in pumps tied up at incidents for no real benefit when family, friends, neighbours - or the actual responsible body - NWS could be there.
- With the staff we currently have i believe that the service needs to be more robust in saying 'no' to non essential or statutory activity. With our resources we cannot accommodate every request without it negatively impacting our staff who already have a full workload.
- As mentioned previously, I think skillsets are a big factor of the on-call. A team of floating OIC/Drivers providing cover would benefit retained stations and improve percentages by quite a considerable amount. I also feel like the Blue Book process is extremely time consuming, and with it being unpaid it is enough to put people off. I think speeding the process up to competence, then again to drive/become an OIC would really help all aspects of the on-call model. Financial gain to encourage more hours available would also be a significant step to getting availability up in my opinion.
- I think we need to stop expecting On Call staff to achieve the same admin work as their Wholetime colleagues. Many On Call FFs state they resigned due to workload
- Thematics - has turned in to a tic box exercise and more often than not visiting premises year on year. S&W- think we should do but target should be reduced and managed on workloads. Pumps into training- brilliant new training centre however think more training should be held on stations and in local clusters. reduce travel cost-reduce time pump OTR-Better for environment
- I feel the service should complete more training or allow operational crews to undertake further fire protection qualifications.
- we have protection and prevention departments that rely heavily on operational crews. I believe we all work for the same team but having KPI's/performance targets for operational crews in these areas is something that needs reviewing or restructuring
- NWS Gaining entry. Slight grey area for me and with the time and resources it takes from the service I believe our efforts could be put elsewhere. Ambulance staff could be trained in basic door entry techniques to be able to free us up from this current commitment. I also believe that HSA's are too numbers driven. Rather than concentrate on how many visits we complete shouldn't we be concentrating on the quality of the visits we do conduct. HSA's are hugely important to our role and I would much rather carry out 2 thorough visits then 5 rushed ones. Thematics - Don't feel that these are necessary for crews to carry out.. I believe Protection should carry these out as they are more in the know.
- In terms of Safe & Wells, the current method this year could be improved due to lack of available data.
- Stop doing the health parts to Safe and wells
- virtue signalling and pandering to the latest political buzzwords. Stop creating new 'groups' and 'networks', as every time you create a new 'network' for a specific group you, by definition, exclude every person who is not a genetic part of that group. This creates more discrimination, not less. We are here to respond, enforce, and inform. Everything else is just a nicety if we have the time.
- I feel that the specials need a review as we have a lot of specials secured on one station. this puts all our eggs in one basket and when one special is used the others are unavailable.
- Putting such high targets on engagements such as S&W. Currently seem to be prioritising quantity over quality.

- Less of a focus on how many community activities take place (S&W for example), and more of a focus on the quality of these activities. Less to complete freeing time for those that are completed to be of a better standard.
- I personally would like for the shift times to change. I would like to go back to either 9 hour days and 15 hour nights or 11 hour days and 13 hour nights. I also feel that the service should get rid of the blue resting chairs and allow staff to manage their own risk assessment and to allow them to bring in their own resting platform. I also feel that the service should introduce smart polo shirts with service logo's on to wear instead of the duty rig shirts during the summer months.
- Should concentrate on the main emergency functions that we provide rather than functions that are good publicity
- Reduce the safe and well targets. Less is more as being driven on meeting targets which are raised every year means a reduction in quality.
- I think we should stop animal rescue
- allow on-call staff to live further away.
  - making job descriptions with ""operational experience"" on them when the role could be filled by a green book member of staff. This seems to be a deliberate act to give retired firefighters an opportunity to return to the service at the disadvantage of other employees."
- all of the areas above that I've identified as somewhat important are exactly that but the issue for many years has been the target led mindset which totally contradicts the underlying reasons for engaging in these activities. Target led culture has to go and should focus on quality engagement not quantity.
- More of an emphasis on training, lots of new people in the service. Attendance of medical emergencies (only if the correct training is provided & Firefighters are rewarded appropriately for the extra responsibilities)
- I think if there was more staff , let's say wholetime and a day crewing system. Retention could be shared out, and more of us could be getting involved in more community events and organising events. And increasing training on stations to make sure nobody gets skill fade.
- Change of tactics when it comes to dealing with anti-social behaviour, specifically arson. Driving arson routes in my opinion antagonises people and sometimes encourages this behaviour. Working with local groups who know the individuals and building relationships would help improve this.
- consider specialist FRS units for falls, cardiac arrest etc to remove demand on the red fleet and improve local resilience.

## **Q. Any further comments**

### **Public comments**

- The job of the fire service is a difficult one. I commend all those firefighters who deal with tragedies and dangers on a regular basis. They need all of our support.
- I hope the staff are paid well for the service they provide, and fully supported from a mental health point of view. I'm sure there is considerable risk involved and the potential for psychological trauma
- Security and moving back to whole time stations
- I think that operational staff should have beds of their night shift. It's unrealistic for them to be suitably rested at night without these provisions.
- not feeling safe, opposed to lone working as vulnerable due to lack of station security; lack of on call pumps during the day; single crewed and switch crewed

specials are not working and depriving fire fighters and the public of essential equipment and safe systems of work. We need to have personal space facilities - all other FRS's are doing this and CFRS are not going to be an attractive option in terms of recruitment or retention as a result

- Cheshire has some really rural areas. The risk assessment for these areas will not likely support full time crew, but the impact of a house fire with people trapped, is no less in a rural area than in an urban area. Retained/on call provision seems the obvious compromise and a difficulty in recruiting and maintaining those should not be a reason to stop doing it. I am not involved in the fire service myself, but do know people who are and it seems to me that existing retained fire provision could be better managed by holding individuals to account to meet the availability target for rural retained provision. It seems there is little in the way of challenge at the moment when retained staff remove themselves from availability when they should be on-call. Providing retained firefighters with response capable equipment (as ambulance does for officers) to get them to station, would increase the catchment area for crew to live/work thus creating a greater pool to recruit from.
- A group of people prepared to put themselves in harms way for the community are admired
- Thank you.
- Keep the on-call available across the county, ensure they have dedicated support and focused attention. Implement changes to the recruitment and marketing of it as a role.
- Be there when needed to do the job but not do the police or ambulance job
- A fire and rescue service authority and management team that is publically not afraid to stand up and tell the truth to government that cuts are not the answer. An authority that truly shows it holds its senior managers to account and not continuously award bonuses. Q30 should allow more than 1 answer. Q31 to Q35 have no comment box so surely must be seen as a direct vote not a survey as it will be used as such. Hopefully everyone will say lower by maximum amount this will show again that management will ignore public choice and do as they wish showing the poor lip service they provide.
- Don't cut fire engines.
- Stop using a failing on-call model to cover up the fact that cutting whole-time staff and diluting terms and conditions is crippling the service
- To increase the availability of On Call appliances why don't you offer recently retired firefighters day shift cover opportunities at their nearest OC stations, 8-10 day shifts per month payable as a day rate of a competent FF would see huge improvement in appliance availability without the huge cost of a FTE post
- The current service nationally, costs more, works less and is far less attractive to employees.
- All added previously.
- Living in Macclesfield I'm seriously concerned about the lack of 24/7 wholetime fire cover
- Tech / AI / to support zoning off an area during a crisis.
- You provide a great service, please recruit more and maintain your fire engine cover
- Could have mentioned cross border co-operation with other county fire services.
- The firefighters are crucial and need to feel that they are supported by higher management as well as immediate line managers
- Train all firefighters to drive the vehicles



- An excellent service in a challenging environment. While it is good to see levels of community engagement through civilian roles, there remains a strong need for governance and compliance from suitably qualified and experienced fire personnel to reduce community risk
- As you mentioned above, society and its demands, expectations change. Adapting, improving and meeting future challenges will maintain the public's respect for the fire service.
- Thank you for your hard work
- They do an amazing job.
- Why are there no female Senior uniformed managers? Have you never heard of 'see it, you can be it'?
- I want to thank you all sincerely for everything you do and have done. Full respect to you all. This consultation couldn't have been easy which is why you deserve nothing but the truth. Hats off to you any day :)
- My nephew is an on call fire officer and I am very proud of him, he's 24 and often tells me about his role, I think all the firemen in my town are heroes
- The service like many others is stretched with small budgets. ? apprenticeships for school leavers may help with retention and future manpower planning
- I think the fire and rescue service do a valuable vital brilliant job.
- I would be prepared to pay more for an excellent service
- Worrying future when a 12 pump fire, Roberts bakery puts the service into special measures
- Increase wages for on call firefighters reduce their weekly hourly commitment. May need more people
- We really appreciate the dedication and professionalism of the fire service. Thank you.
- Don't downsize, de-man or close stations. Keep providing a professional service
- They do an excellent job.
- Thankfully have never needed them in an emergency but had occasion to report an incident and the response was very fast.
- You allow FF to work in day crewing stations for the final year of employment increasing their pensions by 20% . This does not represent best value
- Thank you for all that you do