

## SYFR Public Consultation Responses – Spring 2010

244 responses

<b>1. Using the funds available, is it better for us to prioritise:</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Maintaining as many services as possible by working more efficiently:</b>	<b>56.9</b>
<b>Still maintaining essential services, but removing some other services to save money:</b>	<b>43.1</b>

### Responses:

As long as working more efficiently does not mean fewer Firefighters on front line duties. keep frontline service's as they are, cut other parts of the service  
Concentrate on main line fire and rescue services and streamline back of house staff - share across Yorks,Notts,Derbyshire - though not regional controls, they need to be local. Things like HR, procurement, H&S management. Your structure seems very management and division heavy.  
I pay my taxes to ensure we have an emergency service on call if we ever need it

Prevention is better than cure. So despite the common mantra to protect "frontline" services at the expense of "back office" task - i believe it is vital for SYFRS to continue its educational role to the public  
Please continue to educate people on Fire Prevention.  
Non essential support services need to be reviewed. Equality & Diversity, Human Resources, Corporate Communications departments have exploded in size over the past ten years and this needs to be reviewed.  
Obviously it is essential to work as efficiently as possible anyway - that goes without saying. Therefore in order to make significant savings you should be prepared to stop doing some activities which are high in cost yet are low in value to the public e.g internal "business with yourselves" such as equal ops paperwork. Equal Ops policies written into job descriptions are sufficient in this day and age.

e.g. CFS. Pick one course which has proven to work e.g. Life course and make sure we are best at it. Don't weaken the course by spreading ourselves to thin across too many areas

Charge for some services, thereby generating income and maintaining employment.  
I know the Fire Station Open Days are used for the Benevolent Fund but, could they not be used to draft in extra funds for the brigade as well?

The service needs to concentrate on maintaining its operational capabilities and its assets. There needs to be less number crunching and allow back office support services to maintain services more effectively. Uniformed staff should be more accountable where damage occurs.  
What services. This question is far too vague!  
reaching out to public with services offered is essential

Initiate a full review of services from someone impartial

It is better to maintain our essential services, and put on hold others until the financial situation improves.  
The removal of the TRU, Command Support & some non essential Appliances ie Darnal 2, Barnsley 2, Edlington 2.  
Look at replacing these Appliances with small fire units (staffed By whole Time FF).  
Have a top box on a Appliance to do rope rescue like the water rescue top box to help the removal of the TRU, & have the command support Veh on a station staffed by a CM & FF who are trained.

Merge and have a Yorkshire Fire Service, with the same boundaries as Yorkshire Ambulance Service and share resources with them.

the fire service in sy is so top heavy in backroom staff hr springs to mind, why do cuts have to affect front line? please tell me the % increase in hr dept compared with the % increase in frontline staff over say - the last 10 years.

It is good management to keep working practices under review along with equipment technology, to ensure that the most effective use is made of personnel and equipment.

Difficult to decide on this one unless you specify what your Core Functions are. No doubt there are somethings that you do that are not really within your Core Functions and you should withdraw from these.

Cut all Chief Officers pay. They do mtoo little for too much.

Cut as much red tape as possible

Abolish sending fire trucks out and about, having firemen fit smoke detectors etc. Thus you save on fuel costs. The general public is quite able to fit smoke detectors themselves!

Why are the options for answering this question presented as one option or the second option. Maybe it would be better to try to do both, hence why I have ticked both.

make general public more aware of the services you provide i.e education in schools, one to one work with potential fire starters, postcard scheme etc

As in all public services so much money is wasted on Management and added costs whilst frontline services suffer.

Front line staff should be protected ie fire fighters but as efficiently as possible like the ongoing shift saga if 12 hour days and nights are needed do it stop messing about

additionally removing services that do not provide value for money or by providing it along with another partner

How can we answer the second option without being told what other services are able to be removed?

Lessen the growth in civilian staff. Have more momey for those that ride fire engines rather than desks.

You will lose public support and trust if we have to pay more to get less from you. Why does SYFRS need a "Chief Executive" on such a salary? Cut the salary of this person, you will still be able to recruit "the right calibre" of person, but someone who is motivated by an ethos of public service to SY communities and not someone on the Corporate Gravy Train that is swilling around the UK

less daystaffers and more people back on the front line

Protect the provision of fire cover.Try charging for all special services

Cut the number of corporate staff, remove the civilians masquerading as watch & Station managers without a station or watch and employ people on civilian wages for those rolls.

Use firefighters time more efficiently by having them do maintenance and training overnight rather than sleeping in the absence of any call outs.

Front line services should be the last thing to be cut: if the fire service can deliver more with the resources it has, then that should be the first priority.

This wording looks like a double negative.. damned if you do damned if you don't

If we needed these services 2 or 3 years ago, why wouldn't we need them now?

Maintain all services. We the public deserve the service no matter the cost. Lives have no price.

remember that saving life is the number one priority and should not be sacrificed under any circumstances. Operational efficiency is your duty, whatever the time of day or night. Hiding behind a corporate shield is no longer an option.

More funds should be made available to the fire service.

review all senior management posts and cut from the top down.stop community fire safety and increase training so reducing the current trend of firefighter deaths

early retirement on full pensions should be stopped, there is only the public sector which offers this and to my mind would save money not just for the fire service but other government bodies i e councils,police

your trucks running round town for nothing  
we have to pay for this

Keep Fire crews at a suitable level, but reduce the amount of officers and headquarters staff.

remove perks such as company cars for managers

Front line 'operational' crews are what the Fire Service should be about, not the Large Non-Uniformed Corporate side show we seem to have. Who do we tick boxes for....Not the tax payers of South Yorkshire!

keep stations like mansfield road to 2 pumps. not 1. Cut down on buying unnecessary things e.g expensive cars. expensive and useless fire engines.

I think it's more important to maintain essential services but ensure that these services work more effectively. Do we know clearly what is meant by 'essential' bearing in mind that prevention is proven to be much better than cure.

You probably work as efficiently as possible at present so the second option may be better.

would using consultants save any money? having a joint venture where consultants are used to provide third party reviews of complex fire strategies

We currently provide services such as attending to help with bariatric patients, in my view this should be a service that is provided by YAS and they should provide specialist lifting equipment. If we did not provide this service this would help save the organisation money and help us to focus more on our essential services. I would also question whether or not SYFR or the RSPCA should be providing specialist equipment to deal with animal rescues. If the RSPCA provided the specialist equipment to deal with animal rescues then again this would save SYFR money and we again can focus on the essential services we need to deliver to protect the public of South Yorkshire.

It is crazy to cut down on these essential items.

Save on partnership working & cut management costs

Difficult question, but I think there's only so much you save using the 'efficiency saving' method.

best to maintain all essential services and other services that can reduce emergency intervention in the future, some other services may be removed if they are not efficient / not achieving an outcome

being involved in rescuing animals should incur a charge for the owner

Without any details of the 'other services' that could be removed it is difficult to answer this question. Having said that, I presume your organisation is already working as efficiently as possible, so I would probably go with the second option.

Frontline services must be maintained.

Local council & taxpayers should decide how to budget & spend funds. Local management is better placed to "Keep their finger on the button". They can adapt and react more quickly and adapt appropriately. Why is central government in charge of apportioning funds?

Still maintaining essential services with full staff operating teams.

A- But above all frontline services must not be touched, more money should be got from the government, M.P's should take a pay cut because they are not an essential body?

Cost of smoke alarms (waste of money) for all scheme

If you were working at maximum efficiency you wouldn't need to ask this question

How often do you check fire hydrants?

Prioritise – maintain essential services first.

In an ideal world (A) would be the answer but the country's financial crisis means that (B) is your only option

Could we be asked to make donations if using the free services eg. Home checks, smoke alarms. Perhaps an envelope or form could be left at the end of the visit.

Maintain essential services and save money by not giving away smoke alarms, cancelling the unnecessary T.R.U and removing the extra payments to senior officers on flexi duty system

Essential Services should be maintained throughout any financial crisis, as a taxpayer and resident of South Yorkshire I would prefer that SYFRS spend money on frontline services and if cuts have to be made there are many other areas that should be looked at first. Cutting costs by getting rid of valuable employees is a drastic measure, which may cost more money in the long run. Once an employee is terminated, the cost of replacing that employee can easily cost more than a year's salary of the previous post holder.

Perhaps with the superb reputation of the training facilities that SYFRS have invested in more could be done to increase extra revenue by offering to train other FRS or other companies

Increasing investment in training to ensure all firefighters continue to operate effectively and safely and stop the "Divide & Conquer" approach by having small elitist cells that are not cost effective

Identifying necessary efficiency savings by streamlining your support roles, consultants etc.

Look at your maintenance contracts and renegotiated them

Voluntary Reduction in Hours: You may have employees who would like to work on reduced hours. Even if you can get a number of people to cut their hours by only one or two days per week, you can achieve savings. And, you have saved the jobs of people who you have invested in (recruitment and training costs)

Allow Employees to Job Share

Cut temporary and contract staff

Are you doing work you don't need to do? Are you duplicating and repeating things? Analyze all jobs/roles /processes

Ask staff for ideas, involve all staff, they may have some good ideas about cutting costs. You should trust the people you work with because they care about the place and they care about one another, they are on the front line every day, they may have a better idea of what can be cut

Eliminate corporate parties, luncheons, and events. Eliminating (or reducing) corporate events can provide a much-needed boost to your budget. In austere times, luncheons and parties are luxuries when it comes to choosing between them or keeping people employed, this is one obvious place to save money

Turn off equipment when it's not being used.

If appropriate, use laptop computers. They consume less energy than standard desktop computers.

Use You Tube, it is a great free way for you to promote your service.

Offer early-retirement packages.

- 2. We believe that the scale of the likely reductions mean we must look at all our expenditure to find savings. There is not one area of the organisation which can be protected entirely from the required savings. Do you agree?**

	%
<b>Yes</b>	<b>57.8</b>
<b>No</b>	<b>42.2</b>

**Responses:**

I disagree -FRONT LINE SERVICES i. e. FIREFIGHTERS AND EQUIPMENT need protecting.

---

All departments must contribute to making savings.

---

High risk buildings and activities could be taxed or rated to reflect the cost. After all, insurance companies rate risks in this way.

---

Given the cuts across all public sector, nothing is safe anymore unfortunately.

---

Front line fire fighting and rescue activities are high value to the public and should be protected and prioritised over all other activities. This is your core business.

---

Fire Cover and maintaining this is paramount. A review of senior officer salaries should be considered as well as whether some staff are essential to the provision of adequate fire cover.

---

emergency response should be protected at all costs

---

see comments to q1

---

The front line staff could be adapted to deliver other services as well, as they do already in fitting smoke alarms etc. thereby retaining the amount of cover already available to all persons that live within South Yorkshire equally.

---

All areas should be scrutinised, particularly those areas that could easily be transferred to factoring services (Finance and Payroll). Project management department needs to be trimmed back - the service operated perfectly well before this department was created. Corporate Communications has expanded from 1 person to a team of 4 or 5. Why is this necessary? However, support staff should not necessarily be sacrificed to the benefit of uniformed staff.

---

The frontline response service should be maintained regardless.

---

Emergency response should not be touched. The core business of the Fire Service is to respond to Emergency calls so if this is to be jeopardised then other services should be sacrificed first.

---

Frontline services should be protected.

---

frontline service's are at an all time low, cut other service's before front line service's

---

Front line services shouldn't be reduced

---

The numbers of senior managers should be reduced and front line firefighters increased

---

The numbers of senior managers should be reduced and front line firefighters increased

---

this includes all the management structure. Like all public services the fire service is top heavy.

---

Firefighters and Fire engines cannot be reduced

---

Can you make better use of your more specialised vehicles?

---

Sensible and informed decisions need to be made by impartial people in conjunction with those working within the service.

---

All areas must be looked at from the top Down, the reduction of some officer posts, HR & Operational see above.

---

Would like to know what 7% 'other costs' includes.

---

front line services should be the last to be affected. if i dial 999 i want a fully manned fire engine to attend, not a small vehicle of 2 people followed by a car full of pen pushers in sheffield working on projects and smoke alarms.

---

Protect fire stations and staffing of front line appliances first

---

The priority must be to have sufficient well trained operatives and fully serviceable equipment to meet the needs of the emergency being dealt with.

---

as long as savings are not the same as cuts

---

Your Core Functions must be protected. Other Non-Core Functions can be removed.

---

Reduce the size of the human resources department why do we need such a massive HR department. What do they all do.

---

Front line services should be protected ie. Fire Engines.

---

The one area which must be protected entirely is the number of firemen themselves. Cutting manpower will reduce efficiency. Instead look to savings at Manager level. There are too many Managers who have risen through the ranks on academic merit only. Send them out in a fire situation, and they would more of a liability because of lack of fire-dealing experience.

---

Public safety can not be compromised for Government savings.

---

focus on areas that the public perceive as failing

---

The fire-fighting training and fire prevention work should take priority over other services

---

Fire prevention through education and information should not have budgets reduced

---

Fire station staff must be kept at present numbers. Cut the civilians and those at HQ.

---

I don't believe that you won't cut frontline services. I think you will make these cuts, while leaving pen-pushers and desk-bound managers alone and reducing those people who fight fires and perform fire-safety in the community

---

savings can be made, by having more frontline staff on the run as opposed to sitting in offices creating work for the already overworked ff's

---

Fire cover must be protected

---

As a Tax payer i expect to see fire engines arrive at my door within the old time scales and enough firemen to put out fires and rescue people and not to see firemen struggling because of cuts

---

if i ring 999 i want a fire engine with firefighters on it, office staff should reduced

---

Any commercial organisation will look at all costs and aim to minimise them: there is no reason why the fire service should not do the same.

---

front line services should not be touched

---

Sending smaller appliances to some fires may have adverse effects as those experienced by North Yorkshire Fire and Rescué when attending a house fire in Malton rported earlier this year. Sending such smaller appliances may as such lower customer satisfaction and overall confidence in the service.

---

the response to emergencies has to be maintained

---

Fire cover must be protected

---

The core function of a fire and rescue service is fire and rescue, the new top heavy management structure of recent years should go before the core function is cut

---

A duty of care is placed on essential services, you have to fulfill that duty.

---

The maintainence of operational readiness and weight of attack are not something that should be subjected to savings. Administrators can not and will never be able to save life at the point of service delivery.

---

Front line fire & rescue calls must not be compromised

More funds should be made available to the fire service

Sort out all the head office staff and all the high priced non-firefighters first, then look at cutting the lads who do the work

keep frontline service and no reduction in posts. I pay my taxes to get a fire engine to my door as quick as possible

protect the emergency respons side

Front line Fire fighters should be protected.

There are too many managers and too many back office staff. I believe that whilst the number of Fire Fighters have reduced over the past few years the number of back office support staff have increased. This is not right. The whole point of the Fire Service is to provide a front line service to the tax payers of South Yorkshire

front line response should be exempt

please dont forget the core purpose ie to respond to emergency

Need to maintain emergency fire & rerscue

Perhaps if the hierarchy took a cut in pay or you cut back on the deadwood from there there would be adequate savings.

you spend our money.like water .because you use fear as a way of getting what you want

Charge at fault drivers' insurers for RTC work.

maintain front line appliances

I refer to the answer above. You need to make savings, that's obvious. However, when a member of the public dials 999, that member of the public is not interested in how many awards the 'Corporate Communications' section has received. They require & pay for a prompt, effective, response from a dedicated & motivated group of people.

Lower management and office staff wages, the extortionate pay checks are not acceptable. focus more on frontline services and engaging community

Yes, but weighting must be considered against whether expenditure is linked to 'essential' functions and outcomes.

you MUST be able to be prepared for and effectively respond to the threats that no other service can.

Reduce management/cars/allowances etc  
Save all the firefighters - they are needed more.

isnt your principal role fire and rescue? therefore these areas are essential

I agree in principle but there needs to be a co-ordinated approach when looking at things such as shared services, so the process is fair and each section is looked at in order that they provide their percentage of efficiency savings together. It would not be fair for one section to offer up their identified departmental efficiency savings before another. This may lead to some sections suffering a reduction where other sections don't because the target for overall reduction in costs has been identified in advance. Each section needs to submit their identified savings and the costs entered into a spreadsheet which would only be complete once every section has identified efficiencies and not before. A deadline needs to be placed on this and each section should be made to comply.

With all the fires and death in fire we should be increasing these services not reducing them.

Number of firefighters must be maintained to ensure safety and services.

you will know that some areas cannot be cut any more to give a vital service

essential services must be kept and minor services and overtime monitored and cut where possible.

Fire cover should not be compromised at all, and manning levels at the stations should be maintained if at all possible.

Again, without more information it is difficult to answer this question. Initially I might say that responding to a crisis situation (fire or accident type of emergency) is the priority, but I am well aware that some of your other work (e.g. on prevention) might be just as valuable in saving lives.

front line services need to be protected.

Frontline services, Firefighters and Appliances are the reason we pay our council tax, not for Middle managers to swan around in expensive cars!

No, I think frontline services should be protected. There are other areas such as company cars, (£706,425.61) and all associated costs that go with maintaining & running them which could be reduced.

Large salaries should be reviewed for Principle Managers and wherever possible a pay cut/pay freeze should be applied to those on the largest salaries

Bonuses should not be paid to public sector workers-these should be stopped immediately

Travel costs and other non essential expenditure needs to be reviewed

Do you have an energy-conservation program in place that includes the temperature at which thermostats are to be set in all SYFRS building, this would help cut costs and reduce your carbon footprint at the same time

Instead of sending a fire engine (which must have an increased cost for fuel/maintenance etc) and 4/5 firefighters to carry out home fire safety visits perhaps resources could be better organized.

Trivial as it may seem, uncontrolled office expenses can add up to serious waste, you'll be amazed how much stationery is sitting in cupboards and drawers in all departments

Sometimes the best cost-cutting tips are the most obvious. Use both sides of plain paper in the office and introduce as many paperless systems as possible. This simple change will half your paper bill overnight

Have you explored the feasibility of video conferencing? It could help you to reduce travel costs? Do you really need to send an employee cross-country (or anywhere) for a few hours of face time, or can they meet by phone, Internet chat, or video- conference? There are many meetings that take more time to get to than time actually spent producing anything meaningful. This cuts cost on travel subsistence and work time.

Do you have a program for monitoring usage of fuel as these costs have increased substantially

Are vehicle-maintenance costs monitored and controlled for each vehicle?

Have you evaluated your company policy to determine whether an employee car allowance is better than a company-car program? Taking in to account all cost associated with company cars including taxing, testing, servicing, etc

Don't cut people, cut tasks

Discourage personal phone calls.

Keep equipment longer (freeze capital expenditure)

Are Part time employees working overtime. If you have employees who are budgeted to work part time but they routinely work overtime there is an opportunity to save money without cutting jobs

Reduce pension costs, for example, implement a salary sacrifice scheme,

Yes – Every industry & business is doing just that

The fire service like all public services is top heavy. Thinning out middle and senior officers and not letting the chief officer pick his own wage and perks package would save a fortune

Having been to 2 local fire stations it is clear that there is minimal spending on premises already. Staff, training, equipment and vehicles are all essential to your service

I agree that clearing rubbish should not be left to the fire service to contribute feel it is the councils responsibility and councillors can afford a pay cut in their expenses claimed

Yes, but ratio proportionate to % expenditure

Free smoke alarms should be cancelled + made compulsory to every house + properties. Legislation needed

Full time firefighters and their equipment must be sacrosanct

Think is firefighters took their own sandwiches to work instead of weekly grocery bill, this could save quite a bit of money.

No. As I've stated in question 1 frontline should not be cut. Look at management structuring. And I'm not anti-managers

Maybe you need to look at what support staff do and "other costs" to see if some reductions can be made. Also based on the number of fires, reducing f/t staff to p/t in some areas

No dealing with peoples lives cannot be put at risk, I would sooner put the rates up and cut back on other areas of the civil services

As with any cost cutting exercise, all areas of expenditure come under scrutiny. I would say the cost of this one off? Questionnaire/consultation costs? However, we should never be having to "fight" to keep one of our VITAL services wholly intact. Unprecedented times indeed!

**3. As long as we ensure we respond as quickly as possible, is it fair to review our target time to make it more appropriate?**

	%
<b>Yes</b>	<b>55.4</b>
<b>No</b>	<b>44.6</b>

**Responses:**

What is more appropriate? 20 mins, 30 mins" If I am trapped in a house fire I need help as quickly as possible- the shortest time possible.

---

consider benchmarking other emergency services and other FRS

---

The existing target time is too challenging and is unlikely to ever be met.

---

An analysis of the costs and benefits may show that response to city flats should be faster than the response to a

---

country barn.

---

Not all targets are appropriate or work in the real world, so might be time to review.

---

The fastest possible response time is critical to saving lives, so is high value to the public.

---

Often circumstances prevent targets from being met.

---

Having unobtainable targets diminishes public credibility

---

As quickly as possible doesn't necessarily mean that you meet the target for a particular response. By reducing front line staff and appliances means that the provision of adequate fire cover could be compromised and as a result, public safety.

---

as quickly as possible is far too vague

---

depends what you mean by appropriate, If life is definitely not at risk then a longer response time is acceptable. but a longer response time is obviously not acceptable for life-threatening situations.

---

I expect you to get to me as soon as possible whatever my situation as this can only get worse and intervention by the public can sometimes make matters worse and cause more harm.

---

It is fair as long as the service required is a critical need.

---

If Fire Stations are closed and the nearest is 30 miles away then I would assume that the response would still be as quick as possible but this could be 20 to 30 minutes. This could be the difference between life and death.

---

Public safety is obviously paramount.  
Response times could be critical and set ALARP.  
'Respond as quickly as possible' in my opinion is not good enough.

---

How can slower target times be more appropriate?

---

This is our main area of work. Working towards this goal is the drive we need to maintain sufficient fire cover and service for the people of SY.

---

It is important that we get there as quickly as possible with the appliances as they are, as speed is essential to all fires as the first five minutes are extremely important

---

80% is a good target but is it demotivating if it's unachievable?

---

Yes but what data will you use to check travel times? Old data is based on the old button box press times. We have not had AVLS long enough for data to be robust for use.

---

as long as "more appropriate" means quicker. It is potentially lives we are talking about here.

---

There should be more flexibility in your target times. Given the amount of traffic on our roads now, it can make achieving those times hard and at times almost impossible. I can recall seeing an appliance on Twos and Blues

---

held at a level crossing for 14 minutes a couple of years ago.

---

Less focus on targets and more focus on effective managers and results

---

We seem to waste too much time with targets would it not be better that we go on complaints received if any how often do people praise emergency services for the work they do, instead of thrwoing targets at them.

---

Such a vague statement really makes it very dififcult to give an answer !! It totally depends on what 'as quickly as possible' and 'more appropriate' actually mean ?

---

I do not agree as responding to emergencys is what we are here for, how ever we may be able to change what we resorces we send to different types of emergencys ie small fire units.

---

It is fair to set a realistic goal but I wouldn't want it set too low as I feel there should still be some target to aim for.

---

Government targets rarely reflect the true performance of services in situ.

---

response times are a cornerstone of your service. You cant just mess around with them at will. If the risk is reduced then response times can then be reviewed. You have to put the cart before the horse.

---

A tough one, but fire prevention is much better nowadays and so response times should be reviewed.

---

a fire is not going to wait is it? are you serious? have you who wrote this questionnaire ever attended a fire?

---

There must be minimum standards of intervention as a benchmark for any fire and rescue service

---

Responce times are dependant on time of day, weather conditions, traffic conditions and location of incident. The service should be aware of all of these and any other local problems like diversions, road closures and access difficulties to incident.

---

Again you must be realistic and prioritise your response times. A fire response is an emergency whilst a cat up a tree, excuse the choice of incident, does not require a quick response, if any at all.

---

if this target has never been achieved perhaps it is unattainable

---

As quickly as possible? that is a missleading question. who decides what is AS QUICKLY AS POSSIBLE

---

Time can cost lives. Look at the state of the ambulance service now.

---

Target times will not improve if the Fire Service closes stations. By saying they are saving costs, by closing smaller stations, they will actually make respond times less effecient, as fire trucks will have to come from a further distance

---

One persons idea of 'as quickly as possible' may be different to another persons. To say 'as quickly as possible' is not quantifiable and therefore cannot be used as a measure against performance.

---

As long as the management team are willing to accept the consequences when lives are lost.

---

you should be constantly looking to be more efficient and effective

---

As quickly as possible is not really good enough. If certain things are cut back, that may extend the response times possibly to unacceptable lengths.

---

High targets are incentives to continue to achieve improvements and encourage further excellence.

---

This statement means, can we take longer to get to the fire. No, you cant. Bring back national attendance times.

---

You respond "ASAP" is a convenient way of masking your response time. It needs to be a specified Response Time like NHS Ambulance Service Cat A call in 8 mins for 75% of responses.

---

stats show the you have 5 mins in a fire if that, people should expect to have a fire engine within that time(in built up areas)look at the police you phone them and they turn up whenever, fire service are the bench mark, other services should be coming up to there level, not them dropping to other agencys ie police ambulance

---

What does as quickly as possible mean, nothing!  
Take a look at T&W stats 90%+ first pump attendance. almost the same for second pump.

---

there could be danger to life property etc. A fire is a fire afterall no matter how small it could escalate.

---

as long as life threatening incidents are not affected

---

Target times could be reviewed to ensure they are appropriate, HOWEVER, all individuals in the city have the right to expect an emergency crew to be present in the same timescales. I would not expect the target response time to be different in different parts of the city (even though the actual time of arrival will depend on where the incident is). From a taxpayer perspective, it would be wrong to state that if someone lives in a certain area of the city, they should expect a lower standard of service than someone living elsewhere.

Immediate incidents however should always take priority where life and limb may be at risk.

---

Appropriate to what?

---

all you will do is make times longer to hide cuts in service

---

I believe that the timings are good enough, concidering many of our streets are difficult to navigate fire engines through when there are cars parked either side of residential roads

---

Time is essential, if anything attendance times should be improved

---

the target times have fallen from what they used to be, they should be reviewed and 'repaired'

---

How can you decide to cut times to fires when you have literature telling us that fires kill in minutes, indeed seconds.

---

HAVE WE LEARNED NOTHING FROM YEARS OF STUDYING HOW RAPIDLY FIRE CAN DEVELOP IF LEFT UNCHECKED.

---

You must maintain your response times. As quickly as possible is not good enough. You must meet minimum targets.

---

A minute or two can kill, that's what I learned in school for fire drills. We need fire appliances quickly when we need them

---

first fire engine asap and backup soon after. it's what I pay for, not smoke alarms for others

---

only if you are looking to reduce the target time. What is appropriate?

---

new target times can not mean quicker response only slower

---

There is little point in the current target if it is never achieved

---

With all the cutbacks already made I believe that the firemen already respond as quickly as they can.

---

target times shouldn't change, as it should be assumed that when they were first implemented the safety level was assessed then, surely if they were changed then there would be consequences.

---

target, respond .just do your job

---

what does this statement mean in plain english

---

I find the question ambiguous & needing clarity..... Does the question refer to someone in an office, looking at the maintaining target levels, making a decision based on numbers as opposed to a common sense approach & needs of the public?

---

consider the bigger factors like: if fire engines are taken away from stations due to money cuts then how long it will take for more appliances to attend an incident which will help save more lives.

---

It is important to have a challenging target time but this must be coupled with crews who can deal with the issues quickly and effectively when they arrive. What are the factors that have reduced effectiveness since April '06 and what has been the impact on safety?

---

However you NEED to get with the idea of risk management. If the Police call you back and say "No persons trapped " or we are on scene and it's not a car fire it's a burst radiator then you should accept that and return to base. learn to manage and take risks like the Police have to.

---

Target Time is a priority

---

time is an element to consider, but if the fire service arrive quickly but are unable to perform their duties due to lack of resources then you are no further forward. time and resources are both essential

---

I would expect that target times are always reviewed due to increase in the volume of traffic on roads which need to be taken into account, any roadworks or diversions also need to be considered, as these factors would have an impact on target times. The target times should be fair and realistic and adjusted accordingly year on year in my view.

---

As long as it is not the main focus or a burden they are only targets, getting there safely and quickly should be the priority.

---

Priority should always be to respond quicker if possible

---

back to the old system of response times

---

I think fire-fighters do the best they can and reviewing the target time seems reasonable - their not superman and can't be expected to meet an unrealistic time.

---

respond to emergencies ASAP and lesser urgent call outs at road speed / arrange appointments if possible?

---

fresh eyes can look at things differently consult and evaluate

---

Target response times must be upheld, and improved on where possible. Longer response times cannot be tolerated when lives are at stake.

---

I think that 'target times' are a political nonsense and should be scrapped. I guess there is far too much time and paperwork involved in target times.

---

The target times are there for a reason, fire kills in minutes, smoke kills in seconds!

---

Does this impact on

No not at all, target times should not be changed from 6 to 8 minutes as proposed in the SYFRA meeting on 26/04/2010. SYFRS should concentrate on achieving the current targets that are already in place instead of changing the goalposts to achieve new targets. Time costs lives and this should be a target that you are continually trying to achieve, perhaps the type of cover you have (and are proposing) is adding to your inability to achieve this current target.

You can try but where does this end accidents? I do not know of many accidents involving fire engines

Absolutely if you have consistently been unable to achieve the target it should be reviewed. Non-achievement can often have an impact on both staff morale as well as public confidence. Achieving a more achievable target consistently may be a huge boost in confidence for all concerned parties

Maybe one needs to work with council highway depts over routes/traffic light mgt to increase response time. Also drivers need to be educated on getting out of the way quicker

I thought that was done automatically. Just a thought why not open doors for volunteers? To use as eyes and ears in different areas?

Targets eventually become unrealistic, if you had managed it, it would no doubt have been reduced to 5 minutes. It needs reviewing by station managers taking account of the area they cover

Absolutely. We do not need constant targets to work to. Everything is monitored to within an inch of its life. Perhaps, costs could be reduced here! A hands on management team knows what is happening. I believe that has always been the case, in our fire service. No need for a belt and braces approach. Let people do their jobs without filling out constant target reports. They are still held accountable at the end of the day with or without them.

If it is working now why change

The public have always thought your response times are excellent. You can only do your best that circumstances allow.

No. this is where money could be saved. I feel that far too much time/money is spent on target setting + evaluation of what we do in the workplace. I would think that anyone in the fire service is fully committed to do their job quickly/efficiently to help keep everyone safe as possible. Don't waste resources by considering/setting/reviewing targets!

Already many incidents are attended at normal road speeds so this question is one to which a decision has already been made

Most people in Sheffield & South Yorkshire are confident that you will do this.

**4. We believe we should base our fire station profile on actual risks in the community and actual incident statistics from previous years. Do you agree with this?**

	%
<b>Yes</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>No</b>	<b>27</b>

If not, what should we base it on? Plus other comments

**Responses:**

The Fire and Rescue Service is like an Insurance Policy. We pay house and other insurances to protect us if we have a fire or accident Fire and Rescue Services are also to protect us . Just because we have not needed the srevice this year does not mean we will not need it in the future!

I would question whether SYFR fleet of response vehicles is the most cost effective and feel that other response vehicles appropraite to the risk should be considered

Not entirely clear on how to interpret the data in this section, but think that services should reflect what is needed in the community currently, than reflecting on past too much. Activity of course only gives an indication of where things are at/able to benchmark with others, so really its the difference on the ground that counts.

On previous years in conjunction with forward planning - new developments etc

Actual risks, incident statistics, response times and reponse effectiveness. Cost savings could be made by making Fire stations have a multi purpose usage e.g base for ambulances, police etc also - and the facilities of other emergency services should be considered in the same way

provided you have the capacity to cope with the unexpected - including MAJAX scenarios. A drier climate will mean more fire risk.

You can analyse as much data as you want when it comes to incidents within a given area. But providing adequate cover for those big incidents that occur every so often should also be taken into consideration. e.g. those large fires we've been having recently in industrial units and tyre fires. These tie up resources for a considerable amount of time. Calling upon the assistance of neighbouring brigades might be a drain of their resources too.

It should be based on actual risks in the community but if you also base it on statistics from previous years and the rate some are falling eventually there will be no firefighters in South Yorkshire as the figures can be manipulated to suit, as with all government departments.

---

Whilst looking forward and projecting possible levels of risk is valuable, it is an unknown until it happens. Previous data should be analysed and actually used more effectively, rather than just published in glossy documents and charts.

---

I liken the Fire Service to an insurance policy. Hopefully I would never need them but I want them near enough to be able to provide a difference. This may not be possible if they are coming from many miles away.

---

Risks need to be taken into account but recent large and long standing fires have proved that to reduce service would endanger fire fighters and the communities they serve.

---

If in the years to come community risk and incident stats 'move' will we resite our fire stations to suit.??

---

What is it based on now?

---

But we we should also look at future demands and risks e.g. planned new housing estates and industry.

---

Unfortunately incidents of any types can happen at anytime you can't rely on statistics, appliances should be able to deal with all incidents not waiting for other specialist appliances attending from other station's

---

I'm impressed that your accommodation strategy is linked to demand

---

Yes as long as there is enough quality data on which to base the profile and the people interpreting the data understand the process and its potential impact on community safety

---

To some extent, but depends how you use data, which can be used to demonstrate any outcome.

---

It would seem obvious to only have operational Fire Stations in locations of greatest risk. However the Capital costs etc of new Stations needs to be bourn in mind before the closure of more Stations is considered.

---

Not necessarily you need to look at population numbers, mix of industrial - commercial - residential densities etc. Statistics from last year use is just being reactive not proactive

---

Unless you are telepathic how on earth can anyone say what the following year may bring is it not summed up in the word accident.

---

The fire service is just that, a service, and should best meet the needs of the community.

---

Yes. But you can work on reducing the risk which then enables you to increase attendance times and so reduce the level of cover

---

risks do change constantly so this should be addressed but to base anything on statistics is extremely dangerous as statistics can be and are manipulated to suit any purpose. for instance the last 3 years have probably been the wettest on record so i am sure statistics will say fire engines can be removed from lots of stations, this is dangerous as soon as normal conditions resume because services will be stretched. do you people not understand? peoples lives depend on this service.

---

But depends on which data you use and from how recent, CFS has reduced some incident data but for how long will this remain in a recession

---

No argument with this one. However changes within the community may necessitate a review from time to time.

---

Difficult one this. No one can predict where a crash or fire can take place, but you could have your tenders stationed at strategic locations, similar to how the Ambulance deploy now. Can be time waitful if nothing happens but if you statistiacally deploy then your reponse times and therefore lives saved does pay back the costs.

---

no point having resources where they may not ben needed and if the response time is still high in the national average then this is ok

---

Statistics can be fiddled with so those who have ownership of the stats can make them say what they like for their own ends.

---

Only if the statistics are transparently accurate and have not been manipulated to suit.

---

But this does not mean closing stations on the call-out rate only. Obviously smaller communities will not have as great a call-out rate as busy towns, but they still need a fire station within close proximity

---

Yes up to a point. It should also be a priority to look at why those areas have a higher incidence of fire and then try to reduce it.

---

seems a common sense policy

---

You can never tell when emergencies may happen working myself for the local authority I know this more than anyone. Who could predict the floods?

---

Not at all.

My local station used to be Ringinglow. That station was removed on spurious arguments based on statistics and to "improve the service in SY" by taking our fire engine to Doncaster! With 2 very large secondary schools in the local catchment, the dangers of RTA's on the Ringinglow Rd "racetrack" etc none of us local residents accepted the argument put forward on actual risks and statistics. We were "reassured" the crews from Rivelin or Low Edges could reach here within Govt response targets: now I read that these 2 stations are also under review.

---

This is empirical data and easy to use. Harder data is that which is qualititative based. Life risk areas must be protected first.

---

fires happen at night.anywhere.

---

Yes in theory but all to often we see lives lost because of statistics, a fire service cannot be run be pounds savings, fires are unpredictable

---

I see the fire service as an insurance policy. If we move/close stations then we have a spate of incidents in that area we have removed good cover to average cover.

---

Only proviso to this is to ensure that there is a minimum level of coverage across the city: i.e.: to ensure that a response is capable of being delivered in the target timescales set.

---

communities are changing all the time years gone is not whats going on now

---

To some extent this may be true however the fire service and I believe the ambulance service should use geographics to plan where fire stations should be based. Previous years and incidents cannot provide a true reflection of what may occur in the future as most incidents are spontaneous.

---

you cannot absolutely guarantee what will happen tomorrow despite previous years

---

on a personal basis, I like to see how the brigade has performed the previous year and see if improvements can take place

---

The perceptions of what will happen in the future and changing needs of the community,

---

Postcode lotteries are unacceptable in the NHS and policing and fire services.

---

**A FIRE CAN OCCUR IN ANY COMMUNITY AT ANY TIME AND THE CONSEQUENCES CAN BE DEVASTATING. STATISTICS CAN GIVE AN ENTIRELY FALSE IMPRESSION AS YOU KNOW, AND AS FOR COMPUTER MODELLING, THIS IS NOT A GAME.**

---

I do agree, but you must also be able to deal with unexpected situations.

---

Just because someones house has not been on fire before does not mean it will not be on fire in the future, statistics are only relevant for the past not the future in this case.

---

statistics cannot predict 100% any property will not catch fire or be struck by lightning etc

---

The Fire Service should provide 24/7 fire cover to all the public of South Yorkshire. I strongly disagree with closing / amalgamating stations and / or designating some stations as low activity, which in reality means cutting the cover provided

---

if it isn't broken why fix it.

---

you must provide resilience for unforeseen incidents. It is no good to drive a car without a spare tyre just because you didn't use it in the last two years,

---

No fire station should be closed as that puts the response time for that area at a greater level.

---

how much money you waste

---

Risk categorisation as was done in the 1990s

---

this would only target the poor areas to the detriment of the careful ratepayer

---

The use of annual statistics in my view is a dangerous game to play! during the floods of 2007 it was obvious to all that recorded grass fires would be at an all time low.

The use of Statistics as an overview, is a help, but they can also be twisted & abused to give a false picture!

---

Its a difficult question to answer as the percentage of arsons and number of fires is everchanging

Work needs to be done to tackle public perceptions and improve prevention.

with the buffer of some ability to cope with the unexpected or exceptional incident

statistics can change from one minute to the next .

This should also be fluid, as the risks may change

I don't agree with this because everything changes year on year and this should always be reviewed, you cannot expect the station profile to be based on statistics from previous years and this figure and the type of incidents attended are not static and will change each time. The environment is constantly changing, who would have thought we would be facing possible terrorist attacks, this is just one example of the type of incident that cannot be ruled out but may not have been accounted for in previous years. Each station profile should be based on real time incidents up to and including the present date where possible. This may feed into the IRMP in terms of location of resources according to what is considered to be the latest high risk areas.

Broadly agree with this, but we still need the flexibility to respond to a changing world for example climatic risk or risk from terrorist attack. Both potentially unseen until it happens. afterall who foresaw the june 2007 floods coming

station areas

As long as the stats haven't been fiddled!

as well as proactively identifying current issues which may cause a new problem

there are always other things to take into consideration and plan for

incidents in the last few years are a good guide, statistics can be manipulated to read anything.

Stats plus prevention work in area. If prevention work is removed will the incidents go up

It might also need to be based on changes in the community, e.g. increased population, building of factories etc that might be more of a risk to the community than previously.

Statistics can be made to say what you want them to say. If you could predict where fires and accidents will occur, you could already be in place to deal with them, negating the need for any emergency service.

Statistics are too readily used when looking at cutting services, and how do I know that SYFRS assessment of 'low' and 'high' risk areas isn't flawed as was mentioned when there were plans to close Ringinglow Fire station.

As we are all aware statistics can be made to fit certain circumstances and can be shown in a positive or negative light depending on what the preferred outcome of a plan/proposal is. I am always sceptical when using statistics to cut essential services.

Areas can change within a short period of time, I am sure you are not in a financial position to keep moving your fire stations everytime your statistics show that an area is declining and there are more incidents within a certain period. It would make more sense to ensure your staff are fully train to attend any incident that occurs within their area.

I can see this needs to be the case but it can leave some people feeling its rather unfair. We all pay towards the service yet those in high risk areas will get the stations near to them.its high risk linked with carelessness/vandalism/arson and neglect. Carefully people still deserve some cover but just use it less often!! Perhaps hugh risk areas could make bigger financial contributions – like care insurance!!!

Although industrial incidents are excellent for media coverage and statistics, Fire stations in residential areas are of greater significance as lives are more important than buildings.

You are the people on the front line and therefore have the hands on knowledge to make this decision. Its easy to criticise without experience therefore I agree.

Who was responsible about Division Street shutting & building magnificent new one Wellington Street then desiding in a short space of time it wasn't suitable. Its things like this that count! Its deplorable!  
I agree, however, environments change and new risks naturally occur as a result, but our professionals within the fire service are best placed to assess this and act accordingly. Historical events are there to be learned from and should not be disregarded

Predicted risks in future areas

The old saying is, we learn from history but some bright spark (sorry about the pun) always comes up with new ideas

Why gather statistics in the first place if you are not planning to use them to make decisionswhat about if the risk alters? How soon can you build a fire station 5 mins look at the local hospitals that have closed in some areas putting lives at risk

#### 5. What is better:

	%
<b>Keeping more fire stations open but staffed differently (but still providing 24/7 coverage)</b>	<b>83.4</b>
<b>Keeping fewer stations open, but all staffed under the current arrangements?</b>	<b>16.6</b>

#### **Responses:**

This is a loaded Question. We need as many Fire Stations as possible, staffed properly. If we have fewer stations spread out across the County it will obviously take longer to reach any incident.As traffic levels rise this could cause more problems in reaching incidents .

---

Need to look at other staffing arrangements for the quieter single pump stations.

---

Have to be mindful of factors in city/location. If stations were to close, could the buildings be used in another function by the community/training rather than being left derelict/sold off into flats.

---

**THIS IS A LEADING QUESTION AND DOES NOT REFLECT ALL OPTIONS.**

Neither - you should protect front time services and keep station and staffing levels the same UNLESS it can be proved that response times and the effectiveness of the response are not detrimentally affected. See above comments on Q4 about sharing facilities with other emergency services.

---

It all depends on the services you provide. You should not alienate your staff.

---

Would it be better having more wholtime stations day manned and retained at night, or even having some stations with retained appliances changed to volunteer staff instead?

---

If stations are closed, this will probably result in increased attendance times. I would rather have the present coverage but adapted to suit risk.

---

I dont really see the point in paying fire fighters to sleep away large parts of their 'night shifts'. Staffing should match demand in this area.

---

Keeping stations open as they are and under current arrangements. More disruptions to workers and families is unfair and upsetting.

---

What about keeping more stations open and staffed under the current arrangements?

---

Neither all stations should be kept open and staffed under current arrangements, how many times can this be reviewed.

---

You should know how best to man this, but may I suggest that you employ different man management tactics than during your recent staff changes. The way you made changes was neither inclusive nor respectful. Your HR advice seems inflamatory and rather naieve and Mr Smitherman hardly a leader that motivates or inspires loyalty. Clearly, there are challenges ahead, but there are manifestly better ways to lead your staff and the public you serve through them than last time.

---

"Community Fire Stations" are very important in getting the "Fire Kills" message out into Communities. As you know, most citizens have great trust in "their firemen". This is the best way to reduce all sorts of fires and get the young fire raisers to do work with you in our Communities.

---

still believe there is no need to close ;more stations but that keeping them open means reductions in numbers (and lets be honest - this is what you are talking about). Check the amount of managers working comfortable 9-5 type hours - they are not the ones at the front line. Having worked in management I am 100% certain that you could get rid of a 10% minimum with no detrimental affect to the service whatsoever.

---

As long as Firefighter/Engines are available and not more through part time

---

Whilst it might be seen as a backwards step, perhaps more use of Retained Fire Fighters could be appropriate to augment their regular colleagues, much like Special Constables. An idea could be to give Retained Firefighters the same status as Territorial Soldiers and use their time much like the T.A. do with their personell and sending them on 2 weeks (or more) work units.

---

Maybe if the council looked at saving in other areas like narrowing roads then we would not be looking at making someone as important as a fireman redundant

---

We must not reduce our abiltiy to respond to large incidents & spate times by reducing the number of operational FF's & Appliances on duty at any one time.

---

This should be judged on a station by station basis, considering cost effectiveness and meeting the needs of the area.

---

only if the fewer stations doesn't have too big an effect on response times

---

maintaining community presence and involvement is vital to ensuring long term community safety

---

i won't give an answer here because the tick box is not there. why do stations have to bear the brunt of cuts. they are there for 999 calls, any cuts should be to projects and backroom staff. when i dial 999 i want a fire engine, not a suit throwing a form at me.

---

Seems like a Catch 22 question interesting you don't have any alternative answer to this question available, very biased.

---

this question is biased as does not address the issues around SYFRS recent industrial action. and therefore misleads the responder

---

Statistics support the "Yes" option.  
Changes to working practices are difficult but probably inevitable as we all become more aware of our responsibilities.

---

Although closing some fire stations may be controversial, I think it is about increasing response times and having modern equipment to tackle any problem.

---

not sure - need to see costs/benefits of each proposal. Industrial action around severe changes could cost and use valuable budget

---

Neither there is nothing wrong with the way it is. You want to change the staffing at several stations in the south and west of Sheffield what madness having the fifth largest city in Britain with the whole of its eastern and southern areas without and fulltime fire cover. ARE YOU ALL MAD

---

Staff safety and morale MUST be maintained at all costs, as well as best service to the community

---

Both. Keep more fire stations open, and staffed as currently. Less firemen means less efficiency in the event of a fire

---

I think it should be the most cost effective way whichever that may be without cutting jobs and maintaining the safety of the community it serves

---

Keeping us the public of South Yorkshire safe. I for one witnessed a house fire in my local village where it took 10 minutes for an engine to arrive devastating and distressing for the resident of the home bearing in mind there is a retained station less than 1 minute away.

---

accept change

---

SYFRS would find it hard to be forgiven by the community if a station was removed, only for there to be a tragic incident on its doorstep afterwards and the response/arrival time was too late due to distance.

---

Having equipment and staff closer to fire scenes could be more beneficial

---

Neither. A terrible comment designed to make me choose. It is like asking me how I would like to die, by shooting or strangling, when actually, I would rather choose to live.

---

providing a true work life balance can be given, this is not the case in other brigades who have changed the shifts to

---

a 5th watch, there is no work life balance on this compared to the 4 watch system

---

You have weighted these Questions in favour of your required response

---

There is no option for remaining the same. Cuts should fall behind the scenes. The customer facing dept ie stations should be the last place for cuts, but there still could be efficient savings

---

As long as the fire service is able to guarantee a minimum level of service (i.e.: a maximum arrival time), then I do not care how it is staffed - the service provided is more important than how it is provided.

---

Depends on the outcome of assessments under 4 above, fewer stations might be needed?

---

Depends on 4

---

this question is as bad as number 1 .. it is a double negative and excuse to cut no matter what answer

---

I do not want any fire stations to close  
employ more ethnic men and women that might be interested becoming firefighters

---

use fewer stations but have standby points

---

This is a loaded question

---

re-allocate resources, more 1 pump stations, managers that manage, not interfere, (there is a huge difference)

---

Both questions are flawed. Cutting services to the public is not acceptable we pay for it and deserve the service.

---

WHATEVER WORKS BEST WITHOUT LOWERING YOUR STANDARDS

---

How about keeping the same amount of fire stations open, staffed under current arrangements.

---

This must be done, taking into account of all employees needs and agreement with associated representatives.

---

Staff cuts should not be an issue the fire service has to contemplate due to to cuts in funding.

---

What about keeping all the fire stations open with all the current staff and cutting the non operational staff.

---

If you could prove that you could provide enough fire fighters quickly to deal with a fire in my home I might look at the other option

---

keep it as it is .it works

---

This is an unfair question and answering it is a lose / lose situation

---

niether! keep the same amount and staffed the same

---

neither, 'keep as is' must be an option,tax payers never get a refund from cuts only less service and more waste

---

paper through their door

---

Keep all full time operational jobs Neither is better

---

I think that all firestations should be kept open but also still staffed under the current arrangements

---

I realise costs increase yearly, but so does the funding, so why do fire stations have to close? surely the more stations we have the better the response time! (unless of course the population decreases in an area where a fire station is set to close)

---

Neither, taxpayers are entitled to professional fire cover.

---

'Staffed Differently'...Retained Stations?

'Keeping Fewer Stations Opened?'

Are the questions ambiguous for a reason? What does the above mean?

We need an operational service that can respond to it's paying public & not be used to test various methods of saving a 'penny or two'.

---

Neither really. keep things the way they have allways been. sometimes change isnt allways best. start with changing pay and hours further up the management chain.

---

Need to provide more flexibility in order to respond to incidents guided by analysis of peak times/ days/ times of the year.

---

what about shared call handling with the Police?

investment in training could save the need for two separate control rooms. a single South Yorkshire Police and fire and rescue service incident handling and communication centre?????

---

Both of the questions above can only be answered when high risk areas and the need for resources in each station area has been identified and considered. I would expect each station area would be reviewed to identify that where there are areas of low risk and fewer incidents are attended, is there another station nearby that could attend incidents in that area, thus reducing the need for two stations, again I feel this would be looked at as part of IRMP and response time targets. We need to ensure all resources are allocated appropriately so efficiencies are identified.

---

Getting there quickly would be affected by travelling further distances and if fewer stations were available this would happen.

---

Cannot agree with either at the least we need the stations & manning levels we have, cuts should come elsewhere - not front line - do we need as many diversity officers ?

---

New methods are always seen as controversial because people want to cling on to what they know. It seems a more effective method so thumbs up from me.

---

Only if safety and jobs are maintained.

---

if fewer stations are open than less geographical area's are covered menaining more people potentially at risk, unless it can be proven that there are hotspots where stations are better positioned than others.

---

Can't really answer this as I don't know what the current arrangements are, or the possible implications of changing these arrangements. I think you ought to be deciding this.

---

Neither choice - why not reduce the senior management staffing levels and invest the savings on maintaining fire cover.

Why are there only two options, this is a very narrow outlook. I think you would find that there would be opposition from the tax paying public if you tried to close/merge even more fire-stations, you closed Ringinglow and we were given assurances that this had only happened because Rivelin and Lowedges were covering this area. Yet there is talk in the media that these 2 stations could be changed to provide only retained cover in the evenings.

When I have looked at fire fighter fatalities in all FRS the majority of deaths are that of retained/part-time fire-fighters, this should tell you that this proposal is not the right solution

- **As per Sheffield Star**

- The report describes as "poor" the failure to have 67.5pc of its on-call or retained fire appliances available to respond to calls, A spokesman said: "We already have six fire stations staffed purely on a part-time basis, plus further secondary fire engines manned part-time at some full time stations.

"Availability of our part-time fire engines at many stations is well above our target, but we continue to experience difficulties in crewing part-time fire engines in some areas, at certain times.

I'd expect response time to life threatening fire is most important, if budget cuts force changes and a station closes provision for response time to be kept low should be made, maybe an engine based at a police station, ambulance station or petrol station?

This one is difficult do it by consultation with the staff and a few members of the public who like to know the real ways of working with the fire service

I am not really sure on the best option here

I'll state again, more money should come from government. The fire service is like nurses, soldiers etc. vital people for the country, better PR should be taken

Bigger is not always better, or to coin another phrase "don't put all your eggs in one basket". One big station staffed to capacity cannot always be in the public's best interest, nor the staff who work in them. Access problems from the station? Where else can staff respond from, busy roads? Perhaps a helicopter? More money!

We must be guided by your experience

A – Trialed over 12 months, review costs for savings.

It is better to keep more fire stations open but staffed differently. South Yorkshire police have already tried closing small stations and have found response times to incidents unacceptable and have had to reopen the out lying police stations although some have been sold off eg Armthorpe

It would be nice to keep all stations as they are at present but, realistically several out stations could work as day manning or alternative shift systems. But only after negotiation and agreement

My view would be A but with full consultation with all parties especially the fire fighters

## **6. How can we do even better at reducing fires in your community?**

**Responses:**

Information, Education-Front Line Firefighters being visible in the Community.

---

continue to work with other agencies and broaden out the education agenda

---

Continue working with partner agencies and safer neighbourhood teams.

---

Provide a phone number for reporting combustible material or fires E.g. on public land. Fire debris could then be removed before it was re-lighted. This might require an agreement with local bodies such as Sheffield Street Force or Parks Department, but it might be worth involving them because they are sometimes the source of the combustible rubbish.

---

Not really a problem (that I know of) in my area (S8), but not had any leaflets/info recently on how to access fire alarm assessments etc.

---

education, mandatory installation of smoke alarms in all new / council / business properties

---

Put fire safety on the curriculum in schools. Work with sheltered housing schemes for elderly. Work with health visitors to target new parents.

---

By linking with other agencies and helping them promote fire prevention. Also there are demands from other agencies - e.g. putting bins out overnight - which create risk.

---

Realistically I don't think the SYFR can do anymore at reducing fires than they are already doing. Education within the schools and fire safety campaigns as good as they are, don't always seem to be working. Especially considering the amount of chip pan fires the SYFR are attending. At the end of the day, people will always have accidents and you will always have certain people setting fires. Unless punishment for such crimes can be made more severe and detecting arsons better.

---

as much educational / awareness work as possible, using various methods, including social and traditional media

---

By educating effectively at an early age and interaction with members of the community.

---

I am fortunate to live in an area where I feel fire risk is low. However, education for all the community should be used, rather than just targeting socially or financially deprived areas of the county.

---

More public safety information. Maybe in the form of local tv broadcast or flyers?

---

I believe it is very difficult to change all attitudes as some peoples lifestyles will mean they are at a greater risk than others. Apart from banning alcohol and forcing people to remove rubbish from their properties I can't see what more can be done.

---

Community liaison

---

Budgets may dictate otherwise but I would say more of the same.HSC's,school visits,partnerships etc. and as important a functioning Technical Fire Safety Section

---

Change of government to promote better parenting and more individual responsibility

---

We are doing all we can

---

more info at school level

---

Continue to deliver awareness and safety training

---

SYFRS should inspect risk areas on a regular basis. This should be done by WT/DC firefighters so they know the layout of the area if an incident was to occur.

---

Work collaboratively with other agencies more effectively, particularly in areas of deprivation where vandalism contributes to this wilful damage

---

Having a team of community fire fighters paid to work on this within the local community. Fire prevention work within schools

---

Continue/ prioritise the work that you presently do with young firesetters to try to show them the dangers for themselves and others in some of the things that they do.

---

More front line staff working with the community

---

More community events in local parks on weekends, at amateur football/ rugby events.

---

Expand the role of the Fire Cadets who can then deliver good advice at Peer level.

---

Visit infant, junior and secondary schools using powerful tactics about how fires wreck lives.

---

In schools educating children how serious fires can be and more open days for the public but with better advertising. This doesn't mean more money has to be spent when no jobs are on the best way of promoting is word of mouth

---

Education and working with partners

---

Continue funding the fire safety sections (community and commercial) at the current level by diverting funds away from areas such as public relations, awareness days for minorities etc. With frontline cuts imminent, and at a time when whole-time recruitment is likely to be frozen or drastically reduced, how can the service justify continuing to spend tax payers money on initiatives to attempt to recruit a handful of firefighters from minority backgrounds ??

---

Keep up our current CFS & partnership working as we can all see that it has had a positive effect the past few years.

---

I don't believe you as a service can. Government legislation to truly punish youths and adults setting time-wasting and malicious fires is needed.

---

Have fire safety info and even smoke alarm fitting service that we would pay for advertised in libraries, GP surgeries, dentists etc

---

monitor how many

---

Enhancing the already good fire prevention/education work.

---

cuts cannot reduce fires.

---

Intervene in social deprivation, but then again that's not your responsibility is it!

---

By reducing management and civilian staffing levels while maintaining front line emergency crews

---

Remove unnecessary firefighters from fire stations and relocate them into preventative work

---

educating the young in schools on the dangers of starting fires. Also there is a need to keep supplying alarms to the elderly

---

By meeting with local community groups, schools and arranging local demonstration days on fire prevention. In any community there are WI groups, Probus clubs, scout/guides, church groups etc. all would probably welcome a visit from a local FP officer. Advertise and educate.

---

more talks held in schools, especially with young children and those at most risk of involvement in fire related crime etc as well as more door to door visits within the local communities

---

provide information on how to prevent fires especially when the weather is very dry/in the home environment.

---

Continue community & home visits to provide excellent education & awareness.

---

Education, smoke alarms. stricter rules for fire regs with regards to all materials used for buildings, toys, furniture, and ban open domestic chip pans

---

Give more talks on prevention to schools, community associations, general public making them aware of prevention

---

Education and proactivity in schools and community forums.

---

By working with local community and voluntary groups to provide support and information to the most vulnerable.

---

keep up the ongoing education programmes and possibly look to up the programme in areas where fires show no sign of being reduced

---

education and prevention

---

Assist the communities in Wheatley, Doncaster in obtaining funding for alley gates to be installed.

---

Education, reduce anti-social behaviour, substantial sentences for offenders, let chief officers lead the way by getting out and treating firefighters with some respect.

---

more engagement with young people & the elderly

---

More should be done to educate the young, more back up is needed when the "fire raisers" are caught - there is not any real deterrent for the young vandals. Try to get them involved in community projects.

Higher profile with the public

You can't. Enough has been done. Its a matter of social engineering.

I don't think you can. People are very aware of the causes of fires, i.e. chip pans, electrical gadgets. Continued press information, and visits to schools, colleges

Be realistic with the public show the worst incidents I am a detached worker working on the streets with young people we carry some nasty photos of burns to try to disuade young people from pinching wheelie bins and setting light to them. More enforcement on people/ shop owners leaving rubbish out were it is easy to pinch and burn.

By identifying risk factors and through education.

More firefighters and better education

Take pictures of burns victims into schools and other premises to show the consequences of reckless and stupid actions.

More awareness for home owners.

i found the fact that i had fire alarms fitted was very good i had bought fire alarms in the past and was not able to fit them myself

I feel a massive amount of work has been undertaken in mine and the local communities that I work within. Any further work in its current format does not reach the dis-interested and dis-engaged in our communities which is the real risk.

Have deterrents to stop poeple from arson wheely bins fires a sustodoiial stentant for delibirate fire a must.

educate communities

i think you do as much as you can already

make people more aware of the possible risk's that may cause house fire's

Other than Educational input in schools, and regular on-site visits/checks to large establishments with large numbers of people in confined spaces, I don't see how you can!

Continue with your current strategy.

Community Awareness Sessions  
Visiting Schools and Nurseries

I believe there's a lot of good work going on already which should continue to be supported and resourced

Education

More fire station staff.

Public education in schools and within the community - raise your profile more within communities.

more things for teh kids to do, harder real penalties for those caught wasting fire brigades time.

Education of local children. Working with police neighbourhood teams to identify problem areas.

Educating the very young and youth more about the real dangers of fire

How do you stop accidents?

educating the public

more police action in catching and prosecuting

I have never seen any evidence of the work that is done in this area, so I would expect that it should be more visible.

Educating the public on a regular basis through (tax payer owned) BBCTV/Radio Channels with regard to, IE: Gas and Electrical safety surveys and WORKING Smoke Alarms.

educating the public more

Increase smoke alarm awareness and useage.

Better education and safety advice

stop playing politics and Chief Fire officers actually say what's needed not what Politicians tell them

difficult to answer this question

I don't think there is any ways of reducing fires

This is multi agency problem, and not something that can be addressed by the fire service alone.

more community engagement

Ban under 21's from buying lighters and matches

looking at the way deaths have increased, re-wind your tactics to your core function.

More education, high profile in the community.

Use IT systems to identify at risk groups to target Community safety initiatives and work with partners

YOU HAVE TO ACCEPT THAT THERE WILL ALWAYS BE FIRES AND PREPARE ACCORDINGLY

Start the education early and accept that people should start to take responsibility for themselves.

Just keep trying to raise awareness of the danger of fire to the general public.

Fire stations on every corner

Lock up the little thugs who start them!

more firefighters

more education for the public

More community engagement. More front-line fire fighters.

make people responsible for their own lives more people get hurt in the kitchen or on our roads than in fires 1 in 3 people will get cancer we need a fire service and we need fire bosses to stand up and stop helping councils save money at any cost to public safety

More recent home visits to inform people about fire risks and inform residents.

Concentrating cover in areas of greatest risk/highest incidents.

Continue education of risks and elimination of rubbish

More education - particularly aimed at teenagers/ deliberate arson

Our firemen already do a sterling job in my community.

educate people including children on how to keep safe and reduce risk of fire perhaps on bill boards or on tv giving examples of the main cause of injury or even death, shock tactics sometimes work.

you cant it happen thats it

prison sentences for arsonists & any criminals. Too many get away with minimal punishment.

work with police to target known offenders and rigorously pursue them

Put the costs of civilian advice onto the local authority as you do when charging businesses

If we are to believe all the numbers, fires are on the decrease because of educational work done by operational crews & the community fire safety teams...Keep it up. But as we all know firefighters do more than put out fires

Do more to organise events that people will ACTUALLY turn up to. instead of the usual '10 people at a pub for 2 hours'

Working more closely with partners on prevention.

I know this sounds crazy, but a water wheel generator at Rivelin Fire Station, will not only save money but could possibly make money, look into you may be surprised, get Radio Hallam or Sheffield involved with a sponsored event or something

By educating the public about the causes of fires.

Prevention rather than response

Keep up the good work of community fire safety

through education and looking at active fire safety systems in domestic buildings

Better fire safety education and awareness needs to be delivered. There could be open days at community centres specifically around community safety education, rather than just going into schools or attending TARA's. Partnership working with other services is another way to help reduce fires, targeting age groups involved in small grass and bin fires and engaging with those age groups, helping them think about becoming involved in healthier activities such as fire cadets, after school clubs, voluntary work etc. Of course this will depend on funding but through partnership work this would help in accessing funding rather than each service doing it in isolation, especially as funding in the public sector is being cut.

Educating people on fire, but this is done superbly.

education. Chip pans, and the combination of these and drunkenness. Education through schools re nuisance fires in partnership with police/other agencies plus more rigorous penalties/charges for people who abuse the system/waste services time.

higher profile

More education with children & the wider community. Adopt a more robust approach towards arson & arsonists galvanise the Police in to proactively & without compromise hit Arsonists very hard - the more draconian the better less engagement more enforcement

A really good advert on TV, money allowing, that really gets to the nitty gritty of it like those road traffic accident adverts - they make people stop and think.

Not having ever been involved in a fire situation I have no experience and therefore do not feel able to comment.

Proactively identifying potential and current risks, working with other agencies withing th ecommunity to create a better awareness

education of people especially schools and the continuation of fire alarm scheme

More school interventions & education

You can only educate people on safe ways of exiting a serious fire in a building, leaving any lost pets or property.

more fire engines n more men on it

education but will the morons listen

More prevention work

By continuing the programmes of education with schools and working closely with all partners to ensure fire safety is given the focus it deserves,

I don't think it is a problem in Owlthorpe, other than I am very concerned about the potential fire risks in the home when residents have to store waste paper indoors in blue boxes in future. Many disabled people such as myself will have no option but to keep the blue box immediately inside my front door, creating a fire hazard and an obstruction. I really don't think the Council and Veolia have thought about this.

In other parts of the city I would suggest the following:

more info to the public on siting and securing of (Palladin?) extra large bins, e.g. around blocks of flats;

Continuing work in schools, hopefully reducing arson;

monitoring of factory sites where risks may be likely;

compel all public buildings to train their staff more frequently, and to be aware of what to do when there are wheelchair users and other disabled people around.

Spend even more time going into schools and educating the young.

Local education

more work with children to reduce arson in the future

Education in schools

Spend money on advertising the fact that you carry out fire safety, i.e. radio and local newspapers.

Continue the education process – the fire service is its own best advocate when interviews take place on local TV etc

Continuing with educational work in the community – schools, youth clubs, young mothers clubs, library talks etc. I've seen several talks in schools and they have been brilliant – educating staff and students

Education

By educating people – to be more aware when smoking, frying etc. as I said previously it is the council refuse dept that should be responsible for moving abandoned cars and rubbish, more foot patrols by the police would keep down nuisance fires, they cannot hear what is going on at night riding around in cars. Anyone guilty of nuisance calls should go to prison and be fined with the fine going to the fire service.

Local authorities should be responsible for removing abandoned cars. Local businesses eg B&Q, Wickes to drive a safety campaign for cheap purchase of smoke alarms & CO2 alarms. People at risk supported by social services

Make smoke alarms compulsory and tests twice yearly & paid for by all clients

Not a lot

Ignorance as well as carelessness and accidents causes fires. people should be educated, especially children in this regard. Families and the elderly who cannot afford to equip their homes with smoke alarms, should have the fire service advise and supply them with these. If government say we can't afford them communities should fund raise and help.

Higher profile in the community. Once a year in primary schools has limited effect. What do community fire officers do for the rest of their time?

Education should start, where else but schools and to have a stern deterrent when the nutters are caught.

Continue your education work, go door to door on evenings to catch people in to do fire safety checks

Keep pushing the HSC's – since having one myself I have nagged family + friends to do the same. Smoke alarms save lives – fact! Continue/ensure you're educating kids at school for example hoax calls and the devastating consequences

More police on the streets looking after the public (including nights)

Free alarms and batteries, better awareness in schools – turning youths into fire inspectors in their own families with access to alarms and advice etc

I think SYFRS are doing a good job in the community, and engaging with young children is a wonderful initiative, however, I think work with teenagers should be a priority.

**7. We believe we should consider a greater use of specialist vehicles built for the job they are attending, as well as maintaining a full fleet of traditional fire engines. Do you agree? If not why not?**

	%
<b>Yes</b>	<b>78.3</b>
<b>No</b>	<b>21.7</b>

**Responses:**

What do you mean by "Specialist Vehicles"? How many of these vehicles could be stranding on station waiting for a "Specialist" incident. Would the provision of "Specialist" vehicles affect the number of traditional fire engines? How would the Specialist vehicles be staffed, would it be safe for fewer firefighters to attend these incidents and what would happen if the incident turned out to be more serious than first reported?

---

see previous comments

---

It might be that traditional engines could be used to attend the bigger incidents. Also if smaller vehicles, then may be better at getting around the city/through traffic.

---

Purchasing procedures should be radically simplified and overhauled, and the purchasing departments possibly amalgamated across a number of regional fire and rescue services.

---

smaller vehicles may also be able to base away from formal fire stations.

---

Although, to obtain greater value for money, specialist vehicles should be designed with a multi-function role. A good example is the Decontamination / B.A. Unit and Water Rescue Pump. A bad example would be the CARPS. These didn't work years ago and haven't done this time round, nice as the idea was. I think the SYFR should look at whatever means it can to recover as much cost on the CARPS and put this back into the budget, then do a better job at sourcing appliances in the future.

---

a fire engine should carry enough equipment and trained personnel to deal with every eventuality. To put your eggs in one basket is foolish and increases response times across the county

---

It is not the vehicle which makes the difference but the individuals capabilities in them. I would train the individuals to a better capability standard.

---

If smaller, more fuel efficient vehicles can be used and still provide an effective service, so much the better. Sadly I feel there is a reluctance to move away from the established norm of a 'big red fire engine' as this doesn't look as effective. Again, education and information to all areas of the community should dispel fears and suspicion

---

that service delivery will be compromised by a change in equipment, etc.

---

I think this is an unnecessary expenditure at a time when money should be saved. The current fleet of vehicles should be maintained at the high standard already set and used to attend all incidents. Also I would assume that if a smaller vehicle is used then this would be crewed by less Firefighters meaning job losses or non replacement through natural wastage.

---

Thus reducing the costs of having traditional engines sitting around idle for large amounts of time.

---

Why should people wait for specialist appliances, fire appliances should be able to deal incidents with incidents without waiting for smaller appliances. Look at that fire at Malton where two people died a small fire unit was sent first without even a ladder if a traditional/normal appliance was sent would they be alive now?

---

Puts lives at risk - see the fire that killed two jockeys in Malton, and note the massive amounts of public money you wasted on those combined vehicles that aren't roadworthy.

---

Make sure specialist vehicles are well researched though to avoid costly mistakes. Be prepared to share them across fire services.

---

the risks in the community are changing and everyone must understand that the traditional ways become out dated.

---

The debacle with the previous appliances that weren't roadworthy doesn't inspire confidence.

---

Does this also mean that using specialised equipment for call outs will have the knock on effect of reducing fuelling costs?

---

I believe this is an excellent response to changing needs.

---

A fully kitted and staffed fire appliance is what I require when I ask for a fire engine. Not two men in a van.

---

but depends what extra costs are entailed, may be cheaper to maintain trad engines, what effect on efficiency would the extra expense produce?

---

how many lawsuits can you afford when the wrong type of vehicle is sent to a fire and someone sues? if you had a full fleet of "traditional" fire engines, would the extra specialist vehicles and staff not incur extra cost or do you plan to remove some "traditional" fire engines quietly?

---

I'm afraid SYFRS does not have a good track record on this issue does it? According to recent press reports you have not got the first tranche out on the road yet!

---

Fully agree. Important that you have the resources to do the the job right every time.

---

Absolutly, see comment to no. 5.

---

You have already wasted millions on useless appliances that dont work and will not fit down many streeets in Sheffield.

You can save money by sacking those that made the decisions to by useless equipment.

---

Depends on the cost/benefit ratio.

---

As long as they are fit for purpose.

---

yes, if you mean air ambulances? What other specialist vehicles do you mean?

---

if it makes the job easier for fire fighters and safer for everyone then yes

---

No I have heard many complaints from the communities I work in with regards to the use of the small vehicles that were sent out to supposed small fires last year.

---

Not if the cost significantly impacts on other areas of the service; eg more closures/part-closures of existing stations.

---

I heard a fire engine had been purchased but could not be used because it was too heavy for our roads. Who made that decision and was that person sacked/demoted. Also what happened to the vehicle. Such catastrophic errors of judgement should never happen. If such an engine was purchased then "lessons will be learnt" is not a good enough answer.

---

Full sized fire engines only should be used, as the smaller ones cannot stop an escalating fire due to lack of crew members.

---

arp/combi pumps dont work.proven htey are a cost cutting exercise and could cost lives as well as wasting taxpayer money.

---

Again a question without detail, if you mean a van or a motor bike then this should be stated

---

Consider purchase arrangements in the light of the wasted money on fire appliances too heavy for British roads. In the lights o expected cuts this is a ridiculous situation that should never have been allowed to occur.

---

A CAT 2 vehicle would be more appropriate for a biin fire for example when at the same time there could be a major incident elsewhere that requires the normal appliance.

---

given south yorkshires record on purchasing specialist vehicles that are not fit for purpose i disagree with the comment

---

Agreed. As long as the incident is dealt with properly and they have all the necessary equipment, I do not care whether a fire engine or transit van turns up.

---

a fire is a fire and a car crash is a car crash a fire engine can cope with them all

---

multi purpose vehicles give a range of solutions through one unit

---

Focus on specialist vechiles is at the risk of having not enough fire engines.

---

greater safety is afforded if sufficient people attend, not just the bare minimum,

---

Needs more detail to be able to answer

---

specialist vehicles are limited to one or two tasks. Properly equipped and trained crews can deal with most incidents. Specialists are there for support of existing crews.

---

as long as these are not used to replace what we have or how the current fleet operates

---

You have already procured some of these vehicles and have wasted millions in public funding. These vehicles are not fit for purpose.

---

a traditional fire engine can do the job of any specialist small fires unit and the like, but not vice-versa, why limit the usefulness of your fleet by replacing excellent fire engines with overblown jet wash vans?

---

a fire engine is a specialist vehicles it is the people that crew them how we trust what do they say about specialist vehicles? how many front line posts does it cost to have these vehicals rotting away in workshops?

---

anything which may reduce risk has got to be a better thing.

The specialist vehicles should be properly staffed and located in all areas of south yorkshire.

but why did you purchase the new appliances that you cant use due to being too heavy, who was sacked as a result of this

C.A.R.P. The appliances have been an expensive blunder. Small Fires Units seem to me to be very limited in thier capabilities to be used safely. The use of managers to do selected non-emergency work when trained crews are available, just seems to me to be - playing with those Target/Statistics again.

because there is no need. they dont get called out to jobs enough.

It makes use smaller more responsive vehicles- a good example is to use them as 'spotter' vehicles to prevent build up of material that may be set on fire, or respond to issues of wheelie bins being left out etc. Perhaps more information needs to be extracted from callers when a fire is phoned in, need to rely on public judgement to a certaing extent and guage the emergency in a graduated way, assessing how quickly it needs to be dealt with.

Only experienced fire fighters can comment of this

If you bought a decent CARP you would not need to keep specialist vehicles as well as pumps

We should consider if a full fleet of traditional fire engines is needed if we have a greater use of specialist vehicles that are built for the job. It may not be necessary to maintain a full fleet of traditional fire engines.

It is always important to have the right equipment to keep our fire fighters jobs safe they do an amazing job, and it is only when you need them to value them most.

also greater use of specialist vehicles may allow for less use of traditional engines, therefore reducing costs?

Not if this means cuts to the fleet of larger appliances

must ensure the correct vehicle attend each job.

How many Fire engines does it take to extinguish the average fire. Look at the money already wasted on vehicles

not suitable for purpose!

I think certain specialist vehicles could be an asset, however the recent management of the Carps vehicles has left a bitter taste in the mouth of many taxpayers and you will need to ensure these are working before you even try to implement any other initiatives. I hope you have not spent any more tax payers money on other vehicles until the CARPS issue is fully resolved (£45,967 has been spent to date just on legal costs this is a terrible misuse of public money)

Some of the initiatives SYFRS have implemented such as the TRU is in my opinion a costly function (£1,230,617.61 in salaries and overtime) and I think they are not producing sufficient results, as a citizen in Sheffield I find it quite infuriating to see that you have spent a huge amount of tax-payers money for a service that is only provided from a location in the Dearne Valley. The cost of this unit is not cost effective for the amount of incidents they have attended (602), it costs £2,390.57 each time they have been called out (in the last 12 months and this does not include vehicle costs). And for each successful rescues (70) they have been involved in it has cost £20,558.87 this seems excessive taking into account that they were involved with other appliances for the successful rescues. I also feel that you are diluting the skills of all the other firefighters to produce a few elite staff and this in my opinion is not good practice

Yes and focus deployment to areas of most need i.e. motorways for accident vehicle, estates for bin fires type vehicle

Where ever possible, it is far better to have the right tools for the job in hand as opposed to being under or over equipped

It is a case of getting the balance right. Maybe one should look for different types of fire engines which do all the work of the larger one but are smaller in size. Also one could consider setting up specialist teams for small fires which use only a couple of fire fighters using adapted estate cars. Maybe the work of firefighters to "save" animals should be done by local councils

I agree, to send the right vehicle and team to a job is always good practice

You don't use a sledgehammer when you need to break up toffee! More cost effective, keep the traditional engines as well. You might need tanks if we endure the flooding of recent times again. Or even more inflatable rafts

I do agree! But if you spend more time on road traffic accidents do motoring units and insurances help fund this?

If smaller specialist vehicles are more appropriate for some stations – why maintain a full fleet of traditional engines? Surely this is not cost effective

I agree but do not know if this is possible with reduced funding. Council tax will be increased anyway so why not allot a sum of money for this purpose. Better spent this way than wasting resources on town twinning

Specialist vehicles can be ideal as long as the fire fighting capability is not reduced i.e. CARP which can only be used as an aerial appliance or as a pumping appliance but not at the same time! And the TRU which costs a great deal but achieves nothing more than a fire appliance

With an increasing range of vehicle types becoming available this should be increasingly possible

**8a. Home Safety Checks - if funding is tight in the future, should we continue to provide this service free?**

	%
<b>Yes</b>	<b>75.9</b>
<b>No</b>	<b>15.6</b>
<b>Other</b>	<b>8.5</b>

**Responses:**

Emergency response to life threatening incidents yes but review all other areas of intervention and include commissioning models

We already pay for the Fire Service in the Council Tax. You can't expect people to pay for a service twice.

If possible

Charges should be made for all AFA calls that come via a monitoring company, they make money out of it why can't we?

What service? I assume that HSC means home safety checks, if not then no.

Look at charging insurance companies for attending RTC & car fires.

Yes but strongly ask for donations

Business levy should be considered, but it won't be popular

We already pay for this service through our council tax!

It should be free to all but business and corporations should be charged for the service

Depends on the circumstances

I think that vulnerable groups should be a priority and funding should be used to ensure that these groups are covered first, however everyone who pays tax should receive this service as they are paying for it.

To vulnerable groups only.

It's funded by the taxpayer. If you charge, then I wish to opt out of my tax money to you

Only if the fire is not caused by some gross irresponsible action / neglect

What service - another poor question- are you talking about fires or different special services?

it is not FREE it is paid for by tax payers where else do you get your money?

If cost effective. Analysis needed on money saved in reduction of incidents in an area where HSC have been carried out.

We were surprised that the service was free. Should be free to those in poor circumstances only

First response should be free

What service? please expand this statement

Free to vulnerable groups. Financial contribution from home owners and businesses and partners, particularly landlords.

A small charge should be made. I recently had a free smoke alarm fitted but wouldn't have minded paying £10 for the item. I would have had to buy one and fit it myself otherwise.

Yes, unless it is a malicious call or false alarm that could have been prevented ie faulty alarm that an organisation should have repaired and syfs have been called out to continuous false alarms

I believe the fact that it is free encourages people to take it up

No not if we all pay the same contributions to the service. People could be either charged a small contribution/fee or told how much things cost + given chance to make a voluntary contribution. Is it now law that smoke alarms are fitted in new buildings? If not could this be considered

Without giving away smoke alarms 99% of people will not be interested in a HSC so this question is pointless

It would not be unrealistic to introduce a small charge. I purchased a fire angel smoke detector and asked for advice how and where to fit it. It took a fire engine and 4 staff to come out and fit your free fire angel alarm. I gave a donation but cannot see why the 1 I had bought was not used and why 4 people were required to fit it

Only to vulnerable groups

TRANSFER RESPONSIBILITY Make it mandatory for councils to provide co2 and smoke alarms in all council properties and private landlords to do the same in privately rented properties

Prevention is always better than the cure

Fire service should be able to assess vulnerability of groups and provide what is required. Communities should also be involved in caring and provision

What evidence do you have for this ? – vulnerable do not follow up with recommendations

Free to everyone. A thought, why is the fire service funding from council tax lower than the police? Your response is by far quicker than the police and that's a true fact

It should be free to vulnerable groups and in fire-prone areas it should be law that all homes have a smoke alarm on every level of a building

A tough one, if only to vulnerable groups it should be a wide group. These people, lone parents like myself, often have limited funds and buying smoke alarms and the usual 9v battery can be an expense put to the bottom of the list

Charge the public £1 for smoke alarms which is still very cheap at the same time helping with costs

Everyone, once charging starts people will die from delaying calling to save a few quid. Time is critical

#### **8b. Should it only be free to vulnerable groups or to everyone?**

	%
<b>Vulnerable groups only</b>	<b>11.2</b>
<b>Everyone</b>	<b>56.9</b>
<b>Other</b>	<b>31.9</b>

#### **Responses:**

intervention prevention work should be based on risk groups and prioritised

---

The service could be chargeable, but high risk areas could still be blitzed with free alarms.

---

can be difficult to define vulnerable groups - vulnerable properties might also be a category.

---

we should not chase people to take advantage of this service

---

It should be charged for at all levels.

---

As now..Prioritise

---

Yes - those who can afford to pay, should pay for this service

---

Free to residents but charges to certain businesses and incident types.

---

Only to vulnerable groups but perhaps mean tested and subsidised where needed on this basis

---

Everyone. However an option should be available for people to give a voluntary contribution. I believe a large number of people would donate.

---

ask for donations from everyone but if not in vulnerable group ask for min donation

---

For the general public it should be free

---

Everyone as some people would be put at risk either by tackling fires themselves or not responding quickly enough due to the cost.

---

This is a difficult area, who decides vulnerability? It has to be free to all.

Hous calls should also be charged at least double and names made public

as long as you don't class the unemployed as "vulnerable" then it should be free to such groups

everyone its a public service for the public funded by the public

To everyone, although you could look into charging for the actual smoke alarms

Free smoke alarms etc should not be available to those with the funds to purchase themselves.

Free to no-one, or free to everyone.

Yes to vulnerable meaning mentally retarded and very old, otherwise as the above.

To everyone. The service is paid for by council tax.If this is to be funded it should be met by the government.

all are equal when a fire comes

Everyone, however vexatious and persistent false alarm calls should be charged for via telephone companies.

vulnerable/ elderly only. why provide free items to people in £250,000 houses?

no, all people pay taxes of one form or another.

the use of the service is paid for out of taxes, how can you charge for it

Everyone. Who makes the decision as to who is Vulnerable?

your stats might be able to target your free service

No. Of course, hospitals, schools and public buildings should be fitted free but individuals should be charged for the actual smoke alarm.

**8c. Please suggest ways in which we may be able to gain the confidence of these people to allow us to perform HSCs**

**Responses:**

Personal contact with Frontline Firefighters with fire engines on show!.

---

crews need to be visible in the communities in which they work, this will build confidence

---

Working with Social Services, Local GPs and other agencies to encourage data sharing.

---

Attend BME community forums/lunch clubs/link up with voluntary groups and community leaders

---

What is an HSC?

---

door to door visits especially after an incident in the area - education at infant/junior school level, incorporate into tv programmes - basic checklists / information

---

Health visitors / midwives incorporate as part of visit after baby born, sheltered housing wardens to arrange and be present for elderly

---

More partnership working with agencies. Fire Service is very identified with police (and may be overlapping in other countries).

---

N/A

---

we shouldn't, if they are interested they will come to us

---

what are hscs?

---

Advertising, education, information at all levels and areas of the community.

---

Local Community Work. Maybe linked to GP lists of elderly/vulnerable people?

---

If it is a rented (council or private) property then it should be made compulsory as part of the landlords obligation.

---

Show examples of how useful fire alarms are for everyone

---

I believe we are doing a sterling job. Just more of the same.

---

The partner's we work with should inform these people that we will be making them safer, ensure we do what we are trained to do and not cross into other fields that we are not expert in

---

Continue to work with community groups, use doctors surgery's and community centres to reach elderly

---

Fire safety displays in the community

---

HSC's how do public know what this TLA is??

---

Is that your job? I don't think so

---

Start by arranging to visit 50+ Groups throughout Sheffield/South Yorkshire

---

what are HSCs - don't do a public consultation and use terms the public may not understand

---

HSCs should be carried out with carers etc.

---

More community Involvement.

---

What's an HSC?

---

Be more honest with people figures are good but it becomes debatable on how true they actually are

---

Not sure but the answer is NOT to spend a disproportionate amount of valuable resources on BME community engagement.

---

Prevent some barriers by providing bi-lingual information in leaflets etc

---

I don't think you can. The fire & rescue service is a very visible organisation & if people are reluctant then at some point a line must be drawn when trying to persuade people.

---

work with and through their carers

---

What's 'HSCs'?

---

which people? and what is a hsc?

---

Improve your reputation amongst council tax payers as an organisation.

---

what is an HSC, this is a badly devised questionnaire. do not use abbreviations lay people do not understand

---

Don't know, you can lead a horse to water etc.

---

Target an area by involving SNTs, Neighbourhood Watch etc Leaflet drops?

---

n/a

---

send out leaflets to offer safety checks/ do certain areas at the same time/target vulnerable people eg the aged over 75s

---

What are HSCs

---

Working in close relation to other Services and being seen in areas not just on emergencies

---

Work with community groups and visit together

---

ATTEND LOCAL PACT COMMUNITY MEETINGS FOR DISCUSSION

---

Educate them

---

what's a HSC?

---

use of partner agencies to identify & open doors eg:OAP Wardens, carers etc

---

Stop trying to reduce the number of fireman. Halt recruit for a period of time, if necessary.

---

Give the bill to arsonists and people who cause malicious fires, Fire crews getting involved with the community events as they do in our area.

---

Gain the confidence of which people???

---

More staff locally, not in the public eye enough

---

using other service users i.e council, social services as a way in

---

Ask them to give you the answers instead of all the pressure being on you to provide solutions.

---

Partnership working with other agencies.

---

what is an HSCs

---

Contact carers/relatives/Health Service personnel to arrange suitable time

---

Send literature explaining your role a few days before your visit. Make it clear your service/equipment is free and it is only for their benefit. .

Perhaps stress that HSC's are free and non-judgemental? - they're about reducing risk and securing your safety

Build stronger partnerships with 3rd parties that support these groups

By using community leaders and getting invites from links with other organisations which already access these communities.

give the responsibility to social services

Utilising support from partners organisations

non uniformed staff as they seem less authoritarian

Don't know what HSCs are?.

HSCs???

invite them to the fire stations to have informal meetings, show the public what actually happens

train people in the community

WHAT PEOPLE?

Existing partnerships should be developed further.

HSCs ?

By finding the time to mix with these people.

As a member of the public. What is HSCs

Take their benefits away if they won't cooperate the lazy so and so

proper funding for hscs and proper trained staff. not firefighters

more advertisement

What are HSC's

some people will always refuse help, accidents will always happen, do what you can but don't waste time and resources in areas which you can't have any influence.

turning up unannounced puts people off more, you cant make people have something they dont want, instead of hiding fires from the public put colour photos of the devastation in local press then at bottom offer free checks

"Advertise" more the services you offer

Advertise the service more eg in Council circulars, rate bills etc

TV / radio / newspaper advertising to let people know what the service is all about and the reasons for doing it.  
Prior appointments rather than drop ins?

work more closely with the police

By holding local authorities responsible for safety in their properties.

what are you talking about what is a HSC not in the dictionary

Educating/Station Visits for Community Leaders/Workers so that they can offer support within their communities.

Show them the hard consequences of fire.

Need to find out if these people are receiving any other support, i.e. from Social Care etc. HSC should be part of a wider package of support offered to vulnerable people and coordinated with staff assigned to care for them.

Let the press publicise this service in newspapers. People would rather have a smoke alarm fitted properly by the right people.

Education

More frequent open days at stations to engage with vulnerable groups and set up HSC appointments, specific contacts through the staff groups etc.

Engagement with carers social workers , canvassing and visiting them in their community groups

Friendly and open is best (but I know the guys that came to fit in our fire alarm were so just persistence I guess)

more money from government

Visit schools/summer fetes etc to raise profile and services

education

by explaining the risks of not having a HSC

Improved communication with the community

at meeting and explaining to the people what you think it best for your fire services

not sure

What are HSCs

better use of volunteers and 3rd sector partners. Community engagement and regular attendance at key meetings such as PACT

continue to work with community groups

Raise awareness, advertise HSCs in jobcentres and benefit offices.

Involve other agencies to gain access to vulnerable groups

Turn youths into mini HSC officers through education in schools. Offer something free incentive

Pass a law on HSC, voluntary never works. (the same as a ban on smoking in public places)

Another tough one – some people will always be reluctant. I was very satisfied with my HSC and as mentioned previously “spread the word”. Perhaps councils/housing providers/landlords should be legally required to fit/check smoke alarms with a 10 year battery on their properties which would mean a cost reduction for SYFR. Although the HSC isn't just about fitting smoke alarms is it. Good advice given too.

Work with local community groups which are ethnic-based and also social workers

The use of police special constables is one idea or council wardens to go round with your officers

Higher profile

Appoint/seek help from community and people who have already taken advantage of HSC, to make initial contact with these vulnerable groups. Maybe a female staff member from SYFR might be more trusted in these times of cold callers and fraudsters, that are threatening and fearful for them.

Get their leaders on board

You can't help ignorance. Parliament should legislate for this

Suggest that reluctant ones invite friends, family or neighbours to be present when you complete HSC's try and connect reluctant ones with someone who has had HSC to reassure them – providing both parties agree it is feasible

Make the fire engine visible so people believe you are firemen

Try advertising in the free papers as to which day and which area you are targeting. Get a uniformed police officer to accompany you. Almost everyone feels safe if the police are around. I would have thought you commanded the same respect. You risk your lives every day

Give away smoke alarms (catch 22)

Have talks in community centres, old peoples day centres, disabled group meetings, libraries etc + advertise them in job centres, infant/junior school windows for parents to see when taking children to school, newsagents, post offices, medical centres

By using community groups, continued work in schools and with older youth groups

#### **8d. Other comments**

##### **Responses:**

Most people trust firefighters, they enjoy chatting to them. Make use of these skills at public events, schools at the local supermarket etc.

---

Should charge for more Special Services.

---

Research may show that charging for callouts to fires is a good way of getting people to install alarms

---

People can be reluctant to allow fire service visits, especially in older houses, for fear that they will make recommendations which require significant expenditure and which, if not carried out, may affect insurance etc. So they prefer to live in ignorance. Also experience with smoke alarms can be difficult. Cheaper varieties are set off by ordinary cooking and are often hard to turn off without disconnecting battery.

---

You might consider charging people for the service if they have an RTC due to speeding or Chip Pan Fires. That might reduce both incidents then.

---

we live in a nanny state forever trying to target certain people. put the information out there and let them contact us

---

As soon as you start to charge someone they will no longer require the service

---

The fire service is used by the minority not the majority, maybe fire fighting costs should be factored into house/car insurance and paid for by the people who use the service.

---

Top management could forgo big bonuses and wage increases.

---

This question isn't clear that you are talking about home safety checks

---

What are HSCS, no abbreviations should be used in a survey

---

Contact Sheffield Homes and TARA's

---

Most premises are covered for fire damage by insurance. Could you claim costs back from those insurance companies. Whilst this would increase premiums it would give you more money to better equip and train your personell and thereby reduce the damage caused which they will have to pay out on.

---

Stronger fines for timewaters and abusers of 999

---

Charges should be made for fighting fires to commercial properties

---

Fire Service have done a great job in promoting smoke alarms and home safety. Its time to move on and make smoke alarms an expectation. It is now neglegent not to have one. (we dont fit rear seat belts in cars that dont have them) People must take responsibility for themselves and not have an expectation that the Fire service will do it.

---

what i have read, heard and gleaned gives me little confidence in the "leadership" of this organisation. why are you asking the public these questions?it should be obvious to a fool.when we dial 999 we want a fire engine not a form to fill in.

---

Your service should be free for Emergencies only, other issues should be at cost

---

why not use this as a way to generate profit and charge those who can afford it ?

---

Reduce chief officers pay

---

malicious fires eg.in waste receptacles should be billed to the resident for not taking measures to secure such items

---

The Fire Service Management will never win a public vote with regard to reducing the number of firemen. To the general public they are 'heroes' based on the job they do, risking their own lives for others. No other profession puts their own lives on the line for others. Firemen undertake to do this from the moment they join up.

---

what do you mean by free surely every contributor through the rates qualifies for the service what areas do you feel need additional contributions?

---

Maybe put up posters in the area and also approach U3A groups or other relevant groups/meetings

---

If community awareness sessions are carried out then perhaps a charge to individuals who still remain ignorant to fire safety

---

please don't use acronyms - what's a HSC? Hang Shen Corporation?

---

Why not encourage people to have external water taps with long hose pipes at the ready such that immediate diy action could be performed whilst awaiting the 'professionals'.

---

what service? the F&RS? what are you suggesting, Firemarks on buildings?

---

**CUTTING FRONT LINE AND SUPPORT STAFF IN THE FIRE SERVICE WILL COSTS LIVES.**

---

push for further legislation that compells land lords/councils to provide SDs and advice, support from crews only if requested by tennant, passing responsibility to those services that already exist rather than trying to double up/emulate all other agencies.

---

The trouble with Government department is they don't speak the same language as the man on the street. How much was someone paid to think up HSCs

---

stop dictating and start listening to fire fighters they joined to save people,so listen to them

---

Actually its not for free as it is funded by the council tax

---

the Fire Safety Advice and plan is important for everyone

---

what service are you relating this to, all incidents or just a few, who wrote this qestion

---

look at what the police have had to do, joint working with multiple agencies, some cash rich some assest rich, share responsibility

---

charge companies for calls with good intent if it becomes regular

---

It would be crazy to cut this service at all

---

Provention of fires is better; it means you can reduce the amount of fire engines because they (hopefully) wont need as many

---

Anyone charged with arson or similar offences should be made to pay for the damage and harm caused.

---

Charge the insurance companies where possible for the cost of callout

---

What are HSCs?

---

The most vulnerable people seldom pay council tax, why should those who do receive less?

---

**9. Should we investigate more closer working with our neighbours to save money? Or is it more important to keep services and staff based in South Yorkshire, even if this costs more?**

	%
<b>Work with neighbours</b>	<b>54.6</b>
<b>Remain in SY</b>	<b>45.4</b>

**Responses:**

Again I can't give a straight answer because I think both are important but not to save money. We should be working closely with our neighbours but we MUST keep our own essential services in South Yorkshire

---

Human Resources, Payroll, Equality & Diversity, Corporate Communications should all be reviewed for this.

---

Keeps jobs in SY which is important to the region. Too much gets centralised and shipped out to Leeds.

---

Absolutely no need to keep support services separate, e.g. one Equal Ops team, one HR team, one purchasing team, one IT team for larger region achieves cost savings and ensures consistency of approach across fire and rescue services.

---

The consultation document says further merger is not being considered and I think this is right.

---

Working with its partners will help SYFR drive home its message on Fire Safety.

---

we can work closer with neighbours and keep services and staff in south yorkshire

---

Whilst the drive may be for joined up working, control should be retained within SYFR as the projected savings may be greater for the neighbouring brigades who do not operate as efficiently as we do.

---

Local Knowledge is key to the success of the service.

---

Senior management costs could be reduced by having managers running different brigades. One Chief for 2 or 3 brigades. 1 area manager running 3 areas etc.

---

If working with neighbours does not affect the current staff and families adversely then it may be an option. It would be far better to keep services based in south yorkshire.

---

Has any attempt been made to share resources with the police or hospitals?

---

More functions should be shared regionally. Finance, property services ,procurement and especially IT should be contracted out.

---

Yorkshire service makes perfect sense and would enable a better wholetime/retained balance. Should also reduce procurement costs.

---

I would be surprised if you find that our neighbouring F&R services are "better" at HSC's than SYF&R. But you and they should share and strive for BEST practise not how cheep can we do it.

---

except possibly 5/10 miles either side of a boundary

---

Already you have in place contingicy plans for cross border aid. I feel that we should retain existing services within our county.

---

Shared services and shared facilities can only strengthen neighbouring communities

---

There is nothing wrong with working with our neighbours but why should south yorkshire suffer just to try to cut costs in the wrong sectors

---

Look at pooling training, Workshops, Stores, IT, Transport with other Brigades or other services.

---

work more closely but I wouldn't like the fire service to become regionalised as I wouldn't feel that Sheffield's needs would be met appropriately within this.

---

I recognise the reasons for considering joint working but believe in the long run it could potentially cause more problems making it in fact not cost effective.

---

Bit of a No brainer this one. If this is not the case already then why have you been wasting money in the past?

---

One Yorkshire wide service and share resources with YAS.

---

obviously if this maintains service but areas can be shared it should be progressed. an obvious area to me is equipment and training.

---

It is not working with the ambulance service merged together, we need good local services.

---

where is the report that syAS THIS WILL COST MORE?

---

Shared interests are worth following up particularly in the use of specialist equipment.

---

expensive specialist equipment could be shared instead of each force having to buy it /with each force having access to it

---

some things could ie helicopters, but most should stay local

---

Same as Policing, local service leads to better service.

---

investigate and maintain agreed response times and LAA

---

Organisations from outside the area will not have the pride and concern for this area.

---

Administration tasks can be carried out regionally.

---

Services and staff in South Yorkshire, should be kept. There is no harm working with neighbours but not if it means reducing manpower, or not achieving quick call out times. We should maintain the level of services and staff in South Yorkshire necessary to keep the general public safe. Reduce Managers if necessary, to save money

---

lives are at risk

---

rationalisation looks good on paper but does not always fulfil practical working arrangements

---

Yes, in areas bordering other providers of cover: for example SY Southern border area... Dronfield/Chesterfield?N Derbys , or rural areas when cover is not readily available

---

but continue to work with your neighbours.  
We must not lose our own base.

---

Operational staff need to know their area really closely eg. to minimise travel time when an incident is reported. There might be scope for joint provision in back office functions such as Press services

---

Only where large conurbations butt up against each other

---

Forget a Regional Fire Service. It won't work well - look at the shambles that's happened at Yorkshire Ambulance Service - and all so predictable and all so obvious to the public - but not the fat cats and politicians who wanted to build a regional empire. Shame on them.

---

smaller brigades yes, but response times have to come back and be maintained as Scotland are looking at presently

---

another dilution tactic

---

Again, as long as there is a fire engine there when I need it, I am not concerned whether it has come from South Yorkshire, Derbyshire or Humberside.

---

sounds like an attempt to regionalise which was dismissed by residents of UK

---

A county based fire service echoes democracy, are you suggesting it should all be controlled from the centre?

---

Especially back office such as payroll, HR, Legal, Property, ICT, Finance

---

LOCAL KNOWLEDGE IS A PRECIOUS RESOURCE

---

It is quite probable that local staff will have better knowledge. Some parts of the service could be joined eg purchasing.

not if it means reduction of firefighters or fire engines

a local service for local people

don't spread too thin things never go back in place once mistakes are made and bosses move on to other things, serve the public not your own interests

Investigate pros & cons before deciding

All emergency services should be regionalised for efficiency reasons. There is no valid argument for such small organisations.

Sheffield has the best firefighters. They are a great team who are friendly and helpful.

There should be a base in each county, as for example somebody answering a 999 call in another county may not be familiar with towns, villages etc in another county thus endangering life (and possibly making the person answering the call feel inadequate).

A shared 999 control room would be workable with police and ambulance. The calls are basically the same anyway and trained staff can share expertise.

have a national fire service and remove a lot of managers in the process

I believe that the need to maintain effective Knowledge, Understanding & Training in safety matters is key to the overall success of a safer community & passing responsibility around only 'muddies the water' & becomes less effective.

keep it local, bring more money into the area to gain respect and possible investments into the fire service.

Has it worked elsewhere? Have other emergency services across the country done this?

They might do a better job than you are

This happens any way

It's important to keep providing local services by local people who have good knowledge of the area. If staff are based in other locations or we work in shared premises with our neighbours, this would mean a reduction in staff and the local knowledge and expertise they possess would be lost.

Keeping our professional local is always important.

The South Yorkshire fire service is something the people of South Yorkshire are really proud of - I would not want to lose that by merging with other fire services.

Joint working doesn't always result in savings - what about the call centre standing empty at Wakfield costing taxpayers millions.

Local knowledge and expertise wins everytime. Areas of vulnerable people, ASB areas & affluent areas are known to all Firefighters in SY and dealt with accordingly

There are certain areas that can be "centralised" in order to save money, similar to what you have recently done with outsourcing pensions to West Yorkshire, however the roles that could be centralised or outsourced are mainly administrative/technical/HR/PR/E&D Health & Safety etc, however certain departments such as emergency control should be kept local, there is a wealth of local knowledge within such areas which enables firefighters to attend emergency incidents quicker, which in turn helps you to achieve your "response time" targets.

Response times should be maintained, closer working on boundaries of regions may improve this but sharing resources resulting in longer response times should not be allowed

Work with other areas but keep it local do not let Doncaster play second fiddle to the big cities

Working for a government dept, mergers etc can be detrimental, but having working forums to share good practices or problems encountered can be useful

Maybe, where its practical share some support services but nor 999 services as operators cannot be expected to know all areas

If talking to our neighbours means lives are saved then we should talk. Our neighbours might be closer to some of our jobs than any of our people

Should investigate possibilities

Communicating with our neighbours is always a good idea, but it takes time to travel for staff, vehicles. If you staff from one area then you are also depriving people of local jobs and being a face to see. Trust and confidence will be lost with the general community, always a bad idea. We like to hear sirens for the right reasons and are proud of our local brave firefighters

I believe in a national fire service

Keep it in South Yorkshire – that's a banker but I am open to expert views on this matter

It is a national fire service- if closer working relationships with other counties prevents waste of resources than that is a way forward

Big is not always better. Keep services and staff in SY for SY but with co-operation and assistance if requested by a neighbouring area

Already some services are farmed out to other brigades (pensions to West Yorkshire) so if it is cheaper perhaps other civilian posts could also go that way

Depends on costs – working with people from outside the area will be costly in terms of time + money. You have to look if the benefits justify this. Only people working the service will know this

**10. Should we look at options to work more closely with our partners, where we can, in the future? Does it matter which organisation puts a fire out, or gives emergency first aid, or clears away rubbish, as long as the job gets done?**

	%	
<b>Yes</b>	<b>80.2</b>	<b>163</b>
<b>No</b>	<b>19.8</b>	<b>40</b>

**Responses:**

Yes it does matter who puts a fire out .Working closely with our partners is important but it is also important that highly trained and motivated firefighters are there to deal with fires large and small and other emergencies. If I am ill I go to see my doctor or other medical staff. Someone who understands the problem. The same measure should be used for firefighting and other emergency services.

---

No it does not matter.

---

Think that all the services work well together to do all the above and am sure there is cross-over at the moment. All are specialists in own field and if all tried to do each other's jobs then mistakes might occur over time.

---

The important thing to the public is that the person doing the job is the best trained, skilled and qualified for the job. Some jobs make more sense being connected than others. There is a close connection between the F&R service and the ambulance /paramedic service because they are providing emergency assistance. It would make sense for some Firefighters to have paramedic skills, but not to have law enforcement responsibilities. Or paramedics could be based at the Fire stations and attend incidents with the Fire appliance rather than hving to have own transport. Savings would be shared between the F&R service and the ambulance service.

---

Not especially - there should be more generic training about simple incidents. There is a problem with bins though if you don't know what is in them. Fire prevention should be part of the training of many frontline services and fire staff should be prepared to broaden some of their work. More partnership will assist all local organisations to work more efficiently.

---

of course it matters , that is a quite ridiculous question on so many levels

---

have to be careful to not make staff jack of all trades and master of none. but do agree there can be more overlap

---

The above statement does not convey my thoughts as a resident in South Yorkshire, I believe fully trained staff are more efficient and better able to deliver the publics expectations of these services.

---

By all means look and examine, but ensure that ALL sections are included and that all relevant experienced and qualified staff are included, rather than populating meetings with project management and finance staff. I think it is wise to leave fire to the service together with first aid services, but rubbish clearing etc should be done by local council/waste disposal teams.

---

The service needs to be tailored to the area. Maintaining a area based service means that fire officers have local knowledge and also build up a rappor with other agencies in the area and the community.

---

I think the link between Fire Service and Ambulance/First Aid should be stronger. The USA do this very well with the joint rescue services they provide.

---

I believe the Fire service should remain an emergency response organisation but it could amalgamate with the Ambulance service. Firefighters may not be to the standard of Paramedics but they could be trained up to Technician level.

---

Training and experience of dealing with situations is needed when completing jobs such as this. If this was the case then anyone could go around arresting people.

---

I think more partner organisations, authorities can be utilised to spread the work among the local community. This may generate private sector employment through creation of new businesses which support the private sector.

---

We have people that give first aid, clean rubbish etc. We should concentrate on preventing and putting fire's out. How can you allow refuse collector's to put fire's out i hope not people will get killed and what quality of training will they be given? injured

---

Has any attempt been made to share resources with the police or hospitals?

---

Specialists for each job not a " Jack of all trades"

---

No it does not matter which agency does it. However this should not dilute skills to provide cheaper services. A jack of all trades is not master at one. I would prefer trained firefighters to turn up at my house not bin collectors!!

---

Of course this matters, a firefighter shouldn't be providing first aid at a road accident, specialisms should be directed to the job in hand, not a case of the first on the scene. Come on, how would you motivate and train people to do any even more difficult job than they already do.

---

Yes, the Community want the job done by the best people for the task. Fire and Rescue staff are well known and trusted to do what they do in the most professional way. If that is rescuing a motorist and administering emergency aid or dealing with a large fire, you have the skills to do a "good job". It does matter that YOU do it !

---

stop trying to put a good spin on the fact that you are looking at cutting front line numbers

---

The most important thing must be the preservation of life. If this means basing Ambulance and Council rescue/Clean Up personell at Fire stations then just look at the American system which seems to work.

---

As long as the specialist service does the specialist job. I wouldn't expect fire fighters to clear rubbish

---

Lets be honest the Emergency service which are most talked about are the police and ambulance crews. I do not see any reason why trained fireman cannot assist ambulances where they have short falls as long as this does not effect their main job role the basics in first aid can save lives

---

There is a level of expectation within the community that believes it doesn't really matter how things get done, just that it get done. Personally I don't care who fits a smoke alarm to my parents house I just care that it get done. Using 'outside' contract is cheaper and more cost effective - and in case of a fire that equipment will still work no matter who fitted it.

---

No, and in the future more civilians should be recruited into certain roles that are currently given over to officers (fire safety, water, managing enforcement etc). The current situation where a uniformed officer is put into a role which could be filled by a civilian with greater experience, knowledge, qualifications etc on a smaller salary will become increasingly difficult to justify.

---

Have Ambulances accommodated on the Fire Stations reducing over all costs by sharing running expences.

---

I feel it is important though that the core fire service role should remain with the fire service.

---

But only if it was safe. Would it be?

---

First aid no problem. Should be part of a firefighters job anyway. As for clearing rubbish or other council jobs then I wouldnt rule it out in an emergency but It neds a lot of thought as it does not seem appropriate for a professional Firefighter to clear rubbish an there must be more appropriate things for them to do.

---

very important that only expert firefighters put out fires, any one of the 999 services can give first aid until the ambulance service arrive, clearing away rubbish should not be done by emergency services it would be good to do crossover traingin and working together though

---

It doesn't matter who does it, as long as they are appropriately trained and have the right support.

---

of course it matters, no disrespect intended but do you want a binman or a paramedic to give first aid?do you want a paramedic to get dirty outing a fire then treat you trapped in a car or would you like an ambulance driver with no rtc training to cut you out of a car, or do you want the properly trained people to do their jobs properly. what you are suggestingsuggests to me somewhere in central africa, not in a so called advanced country.

---

Of course it does any dilution of identity and training leads to worsening service, you cant wear all the caps

---

No it does not - except they would all need the same level of training and equipment to respond. To send someone who is not up to the job is to endanger more lives.

---

WHIC PARTNERS? WHO ARE YOU TALKING ABOUT

---

Of course it matters whether a professional crew of highly trained firefighters turns up at an RTC or a fire. How ridiculous and unprofessional to even suggest otherwise.

---

encouraging others to be involved can only lead to better things

---

Shared expertise can be useful as long as the bounderies are clear. The objective must be to keep the public and property safe and secure.

---

no it shouldn't matter who does the job as long as it is done

---

No the object is to get the job done as quickly and effectively as possible, teanwork can save lives

---

depends on specialism involved, but in all honesty if my life needs saving im not picky who does it

---

It should be specific jobs for the best service deliverable

---

Your can be a Jack Of All Trades but you would be a Master Of None! You need you specialisms to give excellent service.

---

FIRE ISSUES SHOULD BE DEALT WITH BY THE FIRE SERVICE.

---

You need professional highly trained services to do the job properly. Reducing standards help nobody and you end up with sloppy, unmotivated, transient employees doing a bad job that they do not own or even care about doing

---

Yes absolutely! Look at the number of Firefighters that have been killed recently. Training would be a massive issue.

---

I would rather have a trained fireman rescue me in a fire, than a first aider, or a refuse collector. I want my first aid treatment from a first aider, not a refuse collector. And I am happy having my refuse collected by a refuse collector. Keep specialist people doing their specialist subject.

---

We have safer neighbourhood teams in our area and we all work together but have our roles i wouldnt attempt to put a fire out i would probably make it worse its about partnership working towards reductions, but courts fixing penalties to fit crimes,

---

I think the fire service should primary respond to fires and specialist areas rather than looking at other areas. Other agencies should be covering the other work, the fire service does not exist to clear away rubbish.

i think we have to be careful that the expertise doesn't get diluted and everyone becoming a jack of all trades master of none. I think the fire service are working well having the community teams out raising awareness etc but then the fire fighters themselves are specialists in their field let them keep that they are our unsung heroes

specialist expertise is always required and cannot be left to untrained people

No as long as the job gets done.

This survey is beyond surreal! Every organisation has its specialism so lets stick to it, let me do what I am trained to do within the local authority and firefighters do their job. Or perhaps we should sing a song if our mobile phones go off!!! Yes I do watch local authority webcasts and find them most un-professional at times.

as long as they can get to the incident in a timely manner

Yes! - The Fire Service are a highly professional and dedicated group who know what they are doing. Paramedics are the same.

no not really aslong as they are comepent in doing the task working together helps

no as long as yhe job gets done safeley

yes it does matter who puts out a fire you need professional and well trained people

Abswer to second point no but again I believe we should retain our own fire and rescue service. The last thing we want is for the service to be based in say Leeds covering a huge area. Staying local means you get to the scene much quicker and retain close contact with the local people.

Working for a partner organisation means that I support common approaches and services, as long as there is still clear accountability to the public who pay for the services

Again, what an awful comment. Bin men putting out fires, hang on, I'll get my postie to operate on my leg shall I ??

No it doesn't matter who does it - just that it gets done. But unless statutory organisations are accountable, then the job won't get done - meanwhile my wages are raided each by the taxman to pay for all of this - give me my monies' worth, please.

we have seen group4 run the prison service, private contractors run the cleaning of our hospital, our hospitals are filthy and prisoners escape frequently, fire/rescue is for the fire brigade, policing is for the police and medical is for the NHS/ambulance

no

yes if i want a tap fixing i wouldn't call an electrician

The outputs are the key priority: if you can work better with others, then do it. It does not matter to me who puts the fire out, clears up etc - as long as it is done. On this theme, I seriously believe that the ambulance and fire services could be merged.

we already have the right people for the right job

no

of course it matters who puts a fire out.. I have never seen such a ridiculous statement and I have to trust you to make the right decisions?

This comment is derogatory, all agencies have their specialist roles!

Doesn't matter who.

no

Why not amalgamate the Fire Service and Ambulance service into one. They sometimes attend the same incidents anyway.

Fire crews do an excellent job serving the communities in all applications, and long may it continue.

well, it would seem bizarre if you tasked the binmen with firefighting and vice-versa

Jack of all trades don't work, keep our emergency services professional, I cannot see ambulance personnel emptying bins, or firemen arresting drug dealers

IT BEGARS BELIEF THAT YOU COULD EVEN ASK SUCH A QUESTION. IT IS APPARENT THAT THERE IS A TRAINING NEED AT THE TOP OF THIS ORGANISATION

leave the rubbish to the environmental services. To save life, protect property from fire and render humanitarian services is the concern of the fire service. Stop trying to be all things to everyone and concentrate on the core duties.

It is important to keep the service separate from other businesses. It may be prudent to look at other services you could undertake without affecting your ability to carry out your prime duties.

Ridiculous question

Yes it matters. Each job should be left to the organisation trained and equipped to do such jobs.

You are never going to get the Bin men putting fires out and I don't think the paramedics would empty any bins, so yes it does matter which organisation does it. Was that a serious question?

Managers can clear the rubbish and attend medical emergencies if they think they have time. Any spare time for firefighters should be used for training

People trained to carry out specific jobs. Not jack of all trades

Firefighters are skilled workforce and should be treated as such. I would not want an unqualified person attending a fire at my property, just like I would not want an unqualified person acting as a paramedic.

Are you seriously suggesting that firefighters should collect rubbish? What errant nonsense! First aid and emergency care are closely linked with fire service core values, rubbish collection is not!

Would you take your poorly child to a vet? Would you let a bin man represent you in court? Let's keep training people to do one job not create jacks of all

Prefer each organisation to keep its speciality.

Should not be a way of getting jobs done on the cheap, possibly sacrificing standards for profit or "efficiency savings"

Fires & rescue should be your main priority

Providing those involved are appropriately trained and do not put themselves at unnecessary risk.

Fire and rescue and ambulance service should combine

Yes it does matter I feel that taking a service out of one area and basing it in another to cover a larger area could in fact lengthen response times therefore putting lives in danger.

It doesn't matter who helps in an emergency situation, but it does matter if their performance is hampered by being too far away.

Fire - dealt with by Fire service,

Paramedics for first aid

Refuse by Refuse technicians.

If you want FFs to clear rubbish away you are completely on the wrong page.

Continuing to attend a call when the police have said it is unnecessary is not cost effective and is just an example of fire personnel just protecting their jobs.

however the correct person to give emergency services is a firefighter

as long as they are trained properly but once again a poor question for the lay person to understand

We should always look at working closer with our partners, however I refer to my answer above, it matters that the people doing the work have the Knowledge, Understanding & Training in what they are doing, otherwise why have any trained service providers at all?

Keep to putting out fires. this would over complicate the fire service.

No.

as a police officer i can use a fire extinguisher to put out a small bin fire or rubbish fire. I am able to tell you that i dont need the SYFR at a scene, but you will never turn back! Train to asses things for you to grade or cancel you response. I think a joint control could be worth looking at

Just as long as the fire service doesn't get charged for this work.

Firefighters are specially trained in this type of work and that is what you spend your money on - good training. The country could not operate without firefighters.

Its vital that the appropriate services attend the appropriate incident, as each incident is different and people need to possess specific skills and training to tackle the incident type. That is not to say that the ambulance service for instance can't share our premises in order to cut costs.

People should stick to there profession, you want a qualified person to help you when needed not a jack of all trades.

it is important the job gets done, but also who does what.

The working arrangement should be looser not tying us to being seen to be working in tandem. SYFR puts fires out, SYP lock people up, deal with crime, the NHS looks after peoples health; we should share information or even share bases where possible but we should mainly stick to our specialist areas.

Lives matter more, but as I said I would not want to lose the South Yorkshire fire service, it brings pride to the people it serves.

It matters greatly that specialist organisations undertake specialist tasks.

yes it matters. Fire services should put fires out.

discussion and flexibility are imp but specialised training is paramount

as long as the agency undertaking each taks has adequate resource to provide a full and correct service

leave it to the trained experts

No but appropriate training does.

There may be some opportunities but the core role of the Fire and Rescue service is to improve fire safety, protect the public and save lives. I doubt that other services could do the role as effectively.

Work more closely with your partners, yes, but don't expect them to put out fires!

Which ever is the nearest, or could arrive the quickest

No - its getting the job done that counts

Of course it matters who puts fires out! well trained and equipped Firefighters! If I want rubbish cleared I'll call the council!

It is very important that the right person is deployed to carry out the job that they are fully trained to do, I would not want a refuse collector trying to put out a fire or give me first aid (unless they are fully qualified) neither would I like to see our frontline service staff removing refuse, that would be a dreadful misuse of resources. However I see no reason why other organizations cannot use fire stations as their base thus reducing the need for many different buildings. Many Doctors surgeries now have an on site pharmacy, so I see no reason why paramedics/police/firefighters cannot share a building. Perhaps we could have just one "Multi Service Chief "and fewer principle managers over all three emergency services therefore reducing huge payroll costs, pensions etc, and these services already seem to be working together to reduce such things as malicious fires, RTC's etc.

Let the fire service do the highly trained business of putting out fires and saving lives, less skilled tasks can be delegated

This is just another way of cutting back on manpower I am sure the fire service would not let a person bleed to death

Yes, definitely work closely. Each organisation needs clear terms of reference/remits. We have an ambulance service and councils should be responsible for rubbish clearing etc rather than highly trained personnel from SYFR

Yes and no. it is a matter of how well trained is the individual. Maybe local 999 services should be within the same centre and possibly all emergency services share the same buildings

Yes you should who knows the future might bring a service with multi-skills ie fire, police, nurses etc

Specific training is needed. Will all employers receive training for this. How much days/cost would additional training cost

There is always room for improvement and more efficient methods up to a point. I always that firefighters put fires out and rescued people from crushed cars etc. doctors/nurses give first aid and local authorities train refuse collectors. This has worked for centuries. Many people can multi-task but people that have a vocation and have been trained to be in a specific profession do not need their talent diluting or insulting. If it aint broke no need to fix it! Cut costs somewhere else!

"Too many cooks spoil the broth" "Jack of all trades, master of none" Yes full co-operation but each to his own

Yes of course it does unless health and safety sticks its nose in know what I mean (PC) political correctness

As long as a response does not take longer from another service it does not matter

If everyone does everything – this has training implications and further spending. All services should be able to do the basics but specialist teams should deal with specialist areas

It should not matter but in times of financial restraints then it does matter who is picking up the bill

All services should stick to what they are employed to do, not doing other peoples jobs and in the process reducing their ability to perform their own roles

Not necessarily but we do need specialists and putting out fires can not always be straight forward. What if gas cylinders/explosives/chemicals are suddenly discovered at the site of a fire. If specialists are not on site and disaster could happen whilst requesting additional support

Yes it does matter I feel I would be more confident that those with the right expertise undertake the right role

**11. Have you any suggestions as to how we could make careers in the fire & rescue service seem more attractive to under-represented groups?**

	%
<b>Yes</b>	<b>32.4</b>
<b>No</b>	<b>67.6</b>

**Responses:**

Mixing within the under-represented groups to show a physical presence and that the service offers a good career. BUT we still need the BEST PEOPLE suited to the job whatever their background.

---

SYFR is a good brand however it needs to market itself more

---

This is not a priority. the public sector in the UK is already doing more than enough and wasting far too much money trying to attract people who don't want the job instead of hiring those who do. There will always be careers that people self select themselves out of because they do not want to do it either because they perceive the job is too "blue collar", too underpaid for the tasks required, unpleasant work activity etc etc. As long as you ensure no discrimination is taking place during recruitment, then that is sufficient. The public just want the best person for the job irrespective of gender, ethnicity, age etc.

---

See earlier answer about the image of fire service (and connection with police) in other countries. More community working and a broader role potential (which does not dilute fire fighting capacity) may assist recruitment.

---

I think it should be the right candidate for the job, standards should not be lowered or compromised just to allow a certain person access to the Fire Service or any other form of Emergency Response job. I believe this could potentially put lives at risk.

---

stop social engineering. We don't need more under-represented groups in the fire service to make it better.

---

We should accept recruits who go out of their way to join. This way we know they are interested.

---

People either want to be firefighter's or not regardless of gender, ethnic background.

---

Contact schools about doing talks and roadshows with children of a certain age to spark their interest. Including safety awareness and showing video's of fire damage (particularly what happens when a wheely bin is set alight) could deter kids.

---

Only the right person for the job, not just a tick in a box for employing an under represented group

---

Does this matter? Do I really want an 8 stone woman trying to get me out of a first floor window? Let's be honest some jobs are better done by stronger men! Also, please do understand some BME communities don't see this kind of "manual" job as an acceptable job for their children, here you are fighting a losing battle.

---

stop being politically correct. The public dont care what colour, sex etc fireservice employees are as long as they are physically capable of doing the job. If they are under represented that is their problem. You should not change a job significantly to attract any particular group

---

I think that we should accept that underrepresented groups, whoever they might be, might never be proportionally represented, and not spend money trying to make them so.

---

Minority officers should be stationed in areas with high ethnic minority populations to provide a positive role model

---

like in all jobs there are advantages and disadvantages. Men are physically stronger than women but women mulit task better (sorry but it is true)

---

It's not about representation from different groups. It's about the best people for the job. If I'm stuck in a fire or trapped in a car I don't care who helps me, black, white, male, female, I just want them to be the best person for the job. Recruit the best, not the best which fits a profile which will change over time anyway.

---

With recruitment frozen and likely to be for some time, should resources really be given over to this at a time when front line services may be reduced ??

---

School talks in BME social areas, open days

---

By all means promote the service but I vehemently oppose positive discrimination.

---

rolemodelling from within the community at community events

---

More positive role models (although your publicity does already appear to be good)

---

advertise any jobs(which it sounds like there are not going to be any) in the job centre and the press where everyone can get a fair and even chance of a career they want to do instead of weighting the job in favour of certain ethnicities or sex. the best person for the job should prevail,not someone who can tick a box for the pc brigade

---

Improve your managements reputation as you are seen as an autocratic and intransigent. There have been numerous press claims of corporate bullying

---

YOU ARE TRAINING TO BE A FIRE RESCUSE PERSON IRRESPECTIVE OF UNDER REPRESENTED

---

## GROUPS. WHAT RUBBISH!

---

The job like any other should be made equally as accessible to ALL in the community and not just minority groups. If they want to join the fire service they should apply in the same way as everyone else.

---

positive discrimination for under represented groups.

---

You have to engage with the community through the local leaders, get them involved in putting your message out.  
They do have influence and will respond positively.

---

I am a female and interested in a career in the FRS however until I actually did research i was unaware women actually did the job, there needs to be more advertisement and help available to those from underrepresented groups more positive action events and possibly talks held in schools from serving women/BME firefighters to engage children/school leavers

---

visit secondary schools to talk about careers, offer work experience, encourage youth fire service groups in the community

---

its a job and a good one at that , that should be all that s required to make it attractive to the best candidates, wether they be black, white, male, female is of no importance to me

---

You should not positively discriminate. You should recruit the best person for the work being done. It has to be understood that sometimes people who are small in stature cannot perform some of the work that is required. Providing that the candidate passes ALL the test required then they should be a possible recruit.

---

Work more closely with young people from different groups and genders to encourage them to apply for a career in the fire service.

---

## ATTEND PACT MEETINGS AND LIASE WITH LOCAL RACE RELATIONS AGENCIES

---

Treat each prospective employee equally, instead of giving special treatment to certain groups. Have a proper recruitment process that is fair to everyone. Scrap your ridiculous PC recruitment process. We need firefighters not social workers.

---

It should be the best person for the job that is important. That said, invite more community involvement - not targetting specific groups

---

Enough has been done already, in all public sector organisations. Its about getting the BEST people for the job no matter what creed or colour! If people want to join the Fire Service, they will.

---

Not necessary. Waste of time and funds. If people from those groups want to join, it is quite easy enough to apply.

---

Put your vacancies out in the community not just on your website

---

By going out to communities and talking to people.

---

Well publicised recruitment target the under-represented groups.

---

its all about the best person for the job not whether we have the right ratio of women or ethnicity

---

why are service groups always pushing to employ under represented groups/minorities to the detriment of people who want to enter the fire services.does this just tick boxes or does it get more funding.. ! its laughable.

---

the best people for the job colour sex or creed do not matter why should minority groups get special help to get a job just because of who they are

---

Get the best person to do the job end of story. I think people from under represented communities are well aware of the positive recruitment campaigns to recruit to government bodies.

---

Attend career fairs and local community events.

---

do not place an emphasis on representation  
we are individuals. emphasise the qualities and aspirations can be achieved by individuals of any background

---

Develop further any existing links with primary schools: approach them openly to try to link a station visit, or a visit of an appliance to school, directly to one aspect of their curriculum, rather than wait for them to approach SYFRS.

---

I take it you do attend the careers service and also at colleges and youth clubs etc. Otherwise adverts in the press and TV.

---

I think if someone wants to join then they already have an interest and you can't really do any more than that without being accused of discriminating against another minority or majority.

The best person for the job. Advertise that only those committed to excellence should apply, irrespective of race, creed or colour.

break the union stranglehold, that's male-dominated, make the service less "military", do away with all the bull and drill. Mountain Rescue Teams are highly effective but they don't rely on peaked hats with braid, pips, squares, whorls, and stripes and silver bars to do the job.

the fire service is being swallowed up by diversity and equal ops, if these people wish to work for your organisation, they should have no extra favor, and have to pass the fitness tests of years gone by, fire service is a physically demanding job, and the personnel should reflect this.

Why should we. advertise in all areas and languages then its up to them and choose the best not the colour etc

The ethnicity or sex of a firefighter should not matter and it appears you are discriminating against white males from the tone of this question.

better pay

A career in the fire service will be more attractive to certain people than others. As there are already a queue of people wanting to work for SYFRS, I don't think it should be made "easier" for certain target groups to join: that implies that you are willing to allow certain staff to achieve lower standards: the key priority here is to get the right person to do the job.

The Armed Forces use TV to advertise, why not you for free via BBC.

Does it really matter which group staff are from. Surely the main thing is are they up to doing the job?

my answer is neither yes or no

The fire service already does enough to encourage applicants from all walks of life.

The starting wage is a little too low for people wanting a change in careers but have family commitments, preventing a change due to lower starting wages.

you should employ the best person in terms of ability, potential and fitness regardless of colour or creed, open recruiting to all.

Advertise in local papers, under represented groups may not like the job due to cultural differences.

Use of role models and outreach work, especially in career fairs

ADVERTISE A WELL PAID JOB WITH CAREER DEVELOPMENT AND A SECURE PENSION FOR THOSE THAT ABLE TO UNDERTAKE A PHYSICALLY DEMANDING JOB THAT IS INHERENTLY RISKY.

Taster days - more information available for women.

It must be realised that there are some members of our society that simply cannot be reached, this notion that all LGA's should reflect the society that they serve is costly and unrealistic. The best person for the job, regardless of gender, colour or religion...the fire service is an emergency service available to all and should be free from pc restraints regarding recruitment

It is a fact that some under represented groups see the job of firefighter as a very poor job within their culture.

Start paying a better wage and think of the conditions the staff currently doing the job are facing. You started this consultation to find the best way to cut the service without upsetting the public and at the same time you think it might be a good idea to use it to recruit. That's like standing on the sinking Titanic and trying to sell Tickets for a cruise, Treat you staff better and more people will want to work for you.

i am a human and believe that I should choose what I do .a reduction in the workling week would be good,better wages,less aggressive management

Treat your staff with dignity. Do not treat them as commodities. The powers that be seem to think that Fire Fighters are the lowest of the low rather than the skilled and brave workforce that they are.

for decades now the fire service has been breaking it's neck to become representative of the community, WHY? no-one, and I mean no-one cares who rescues them, black, white, male, female, straight or gay. Niether does having token representatives from any groups assist in breaking down social barriers.

the new shifts that you bring in are unatractive to every one.

the pay is poor compared to the risk of death how many firefighters died in the last 5 years compared to the better paid ambulance sevice?

I think the fire service just like hospitals or police have a special calling and only a certain person will apply, choose how much the job is advertised, I don't think standards should be dropped to attract people who may not in the end be suited to this type of career.

give correct level of pay commensurate with the skills and risk associated with firefighting.

Yes\_\_\_STOP PUTTING LABELS ON PEOPLE\_\_\_you want firefighters, advertise for firefighters. I pay my taxes, I want the best response to an emergency not a fire appliance full of 'ticks in a box'.

Please don't forget the ordinary WHITE CHRISTIAN MAN. I feel public services try to push for women and people from an ethnic minority background more and forget about white men. I understand you have to fill a certain amount of female places and I am very open to diversity but sometimes it can be taken to the extreme

Give talks in schools about a career in the fire service and give out application forms to young people to join the fire cadets and then follow it up from there. (A few years ago, my grandson, now 22, sent off an application form to join the fire cadets and never had any response which was disappointing to him.

Well considering there is a recruitment freeze this question seems inappropriate at this time however, if SYFR did consider recruiting again then one way would be to use the staff groups to help engage with under represented groups where appropriate.

through schools colleges. advertising in local papers.

Recruitment should always be the very best candidate regardless of race, creed or colour, anything else is political correctness & not acceptable to the silent majority who feel unable to voice their opinions on this matter for fear of being classed as racist or rocking the boat

Advertise? Put a black woman in a nitty gritty advert against starting fires?

work in targeted schools and youth groups

Fire Service is an exceptional job, and anyone with the right qualifications can join, but you need the balls to do it.

Stop being such an archetypal organisation and have less managers and more on the ground

Under-representative groups can apply for a career in the fire service just like anyone else. To employ someone on the grounds that their group is under-represented only makes for a less efficient service. Employment should be on merit and not who you are.

Greater co-operation with other agencies.

Ability and commitment should come before anything else.

work with community groups and schools / young people's groups

I am sure everyone knows what a wonderful job it is.

The service should pick the best for the role irrespective of the group they are placed in!

I know you have been given targets to achieve, however, I think that as long as people from all walks of life are given true facts about what a career in the FRS entails then if they fit the criteria they will apply themselves. One way to ensure this could be put to all under represented groups is to attend schools, colleges, job fairs, community meetings etc.

I would think that in these times you would not be employing any staff, but trying to find ways to keep the staff you already employ.

Make it obvious that if a woman takes on a firefighting role the level she will need to attain will be less than a male ie carrying weight on ladder (not that I agree with it)

Treat people as equal, make sure they are fit, make sure they can speak clear English (This causes trouble on the phone)

Work with the central information office to produce promotional films involving black and asian officers (liase with London fire brigade)

I do not support positive discrimination. I would imagine if a career in this field interests someone they will look into it

The people who are attracted to a job like yours has to be dedicated and in my experience these types are few and far away

Get rid of the army style way of control top down (outdated)

More promotion of careers in fire & rescue in schools. Advertise – costs money – but the British forces do.

Special events, other than local events such as summer fairs, where a tour of station could be arranged.

Competitions for all. Apprentice incentives. Nominate a friend/family for a fun activity or a prize? fireman/woman for the day? Health and safety?

It is difficult to overcome prejudices. Perhaps a few more open days

Free public adverts to glamorise all opportunities and departments

Look at the police service model on advertising also armed services

Advertising in newspapers

I wish I had but immigrants coming into this country on the whole are coming not to work but for the benefits.

Those that come from countries at war are not willing to risk their own lives to save others

Stop reducing the quality of your workforce. If there are 20 vacancies you should employ the 20 best applicants not reduce standards to fit quotas

Dos their representation really matter? School career services are now very thorough. You need dedicated, reliable and committed staff who are physically capable of doing the work. If someone is interested they will follow advice and try to enter the career. Sex and ethnic group are not important at all in my opinion

I would prefer that people are recruited on ability rather than to ensure the correct diverse mix. If my life is in danger I would want to feel that the person could get me out

## **12. What are your top three priorities for our future?**

### **Responses:**

#### **Prevention**

continue to reduce fires

Remain proactive for the community

Raising Community awareness of the danger of Fires

More community involvment

Working to reduce injury, death and keep property safe

reducing the risk

Save lives

minimise fire related deaths and injuries

keeping the community safe

Reduction in deaths by fire

preventing emergencies rom happening

fire prevention

working to make my community a safer batter place

Fire prevention work

Education and support of high risk groups

Doing our best to reduce deaths and injuries and keep property safe

Reducing deaths

Safeguarding children and families

Reduce number of fires

education

maintaining prevention and education services

preventing emergencies

Doing our best to reduce deaths and injuries and keep property safe.

Preventing emergencies from happening in the first place

prevention education to keep incidents to a minimum

minimise fire related crimes in local area

Prevention & safety awareness

reducing deaths and injuries

Reducing deaths from fire

Safety

Public Safety

children education

save lives

to continue educating young people via fire cadet scheme

Working with agencies to reduce anti-social behaviour

Being professional and seeking to achieve the highest standards at all times

Preventing emergencies from happening in the first place

Doing our best to reduce deaths and injuries

Preventing emergencies (prevention better than cure)

Prevention by education

Doing our best to reduce deaths and injuries and keep property safe

Improving community safety

Provide Home Safety Checks for vulnerable people

Preventative Work

To identify and reduce fire risk where possible

Fire prevention

Fire Prevention

Community safety

**PROTECTING PEOPLES PROPERTY**

education of children / fire risks

promote community safety with partners

education

Fire prevention

educating people

More education engagement with the community

community fire safety

Home Safety advice for everyone

education of vulnerable adults

preventing emergencies in the first place

Reduce arson via education

Fire prevention

Reducing fires

Preventing emergencies etc.

Preventing emergencies from happening in the first place.

reducing fires

Contributing to helping protect the public of South Yorkshire

preventing future emergencies / fires

continue to work with local communities/educate

Improving Fire Safety and Education

Reducing arson

Work with young "firerisers" about the risks they cause

improve community safety

education

education of children for arson reduction  
To continue trying to prevent emergencies from happening in the first place.  
Fire reduction  
education to stop false useage  
Prevention

### Emergency Response

response times  
Protect areas of high value to public - response time and effectiveness  
do not reduce response times further  
Respond quickly and effectively to emergencies  
Emergency Reponse  
Emergency Response  
Responding quickly and effectively to emergencies when they happen  
QUICK RESPONSE TIMES  
To ensure rapid measurable response to incidents  
Maintain emergency response  
Responding quickly to emergencies  
Achievement of Govt response targets  
Responding quickly and efficiently to emergencies  
Maintain a fast and safe response  
Quality: attending incidents on time  
Providing a fast response to emergency calls  
Emergency response  
Rspoding Quickly  
emergency response  
responding quickly to emergencies when they happen  
quick response to all incidents  
Doing best to reduce deaths etc. and responding quickly and effectively as one priority  
Maintaining "Just in Time" cover  
response time to emergencies  
attending fires as soon as possible  
Faster response times  
respond to incidents in a timely manner with an appropriate vehicle  
Quicker response times  
Putting out fires as quickly and safely as possible  
responding th emergencies  
Responding quickly and effectively to emergencies.  
Response times  
Quick response  
Quicker response times to call-outs  
Responding quickly and effectively to emergencies when they happen,  
Able to deliver response times  
be there when I need you  
SAVING LIFE  
Quick and Efficient Service  
Fast response  
save life  
consistent and guaranteed response to emergencies  
saving people from in emergencies / fires  
Fire and accedent resque  
Reducing response rates  
Responding quickly and effectively to emergencies when they happen,  
Responding quickly and effectively  
reintroduction of response times

Response times  
Fast responses  
Rescuing people from dangerous situations as effectively as possible  
Good Response Times  
Responding quickly and effectively to emergencies when they happen  
Good Response Time  
response times  
Be there when it matters

#### Emergency Fire Cover/fire station provision

maintaining 24 hour cover in as many locations as possible  
Maintaining Fire Cover  
Maintain fire and rescue cover and existing service levels where possible  
Maintain Front Line Service  
24/7 fire cover  
Maintain full 24/7 service  
Keep fire stations open  
maintain fire cover  
maintain present fire cover  
no station closures  
No withdrawal of appliances  
No further station closures to reassure public of local cover  
do not remove fire engines  
Adequate amount of frontline Appliances.  
keep stations open  
ensure stations local and available  
No more station closures  
Best Location of Fire stations  
Keep all the fire station's open  
Ensuring any cuts do not affect emergencies and that stations are not closed unnecessarily  
Adequate amount of Stations.  
ensuring fire cover is appropriate to the risk

#### Frontline staffing

maintain frontline service  
Maintaining /improving front line  
Frontline services  
Happy well trained staff who are well resourced  
maintaining front line staffing levels  
Keeping frontline services  
Maintain staffing levels  
Keep the Frontline service I pay for!  
Review staffing arrangements at quieter stations  
Adequate amount of frontline Personnel  
No redundancies for firemen  
More staff  
the same or more firefighters  
Sustaining employment with SYFR  
Job stability for firefighters  
Maintaining Front Line Personnel  
Have the best trained staff you can  
Maintain the current staff where possible, and stop pandering to uniformed requirements.  
Full time firefighters  
Motivate your staff better, treat them with respect, make common sense decisions

To hope that you don't let me die in a fire when you have closed my local station or taken some of the fire fighters away from the front line.

Staffed local stations

fire service 24/7

More FireFighters

EFFICIENT 24 HOURS SERVICE

Keep the number of fire station based staff as it is.

providing adequate 24/7 staffing to meet such calls

more front line staff

Same level of front line Firefighters

stop playing the statistics game to reduce 'front line crews'

### Efficiency/resources

Saving money

keep the service free

Reduce burden on the taxpayer

more efficient service

more efficient

make sure you have enough funding

FULL FUNDING

sufficient funding to be guaranteed

Save money

Reduce support activity headcount & costs through mergers

increase efficiency

Providing sufficient resources in tough economic climate without increased costs to tax payer

Efficient

Value for money

Don't waste money - use the right resource for the right need

Less waste !!!!!

Cut back on the hierarchy

Cutting out waste so that more cash is available for investment

Cost effective service

improving efficiency

avoiding wastage of resources

sufficient resources

Providing our service efficiently, offering good value for money

Stop wasting money.

use resources effectively

To pressure the government for the funding to give us the service we as a civilised country deserve.

Efficient Service/good value for money Best Quality staff

Better more modern response vehicles

best equipment

Less paid overtime

Cut back on activities such as Young firefighters, crucial crew and providing free facilities.

Use our resources efficiently

eliminate back of house waste

Being more efficient and commercial

value for money.

Shared resources with YAS

Become more efficient

provide a service that is efficient in response and service

Cut the waste of office staff not required.

Reduce bureaucracy, improve efficiency of asset utilisation

### Professionalism/Striving for excellence

Continue to provide an already great service  
Being professional and seeking to achieve the highest standards at all times.  
Speed and quality of service  
keep the service good  
quality  
Providing a good service  
Professional Excellent Service  
to maintain a high level of service  
BEST SERVICE  
serving the community  
The very best emergency service no compromising  
High Standards  
maintain an excellent service  
Being professional etc.  
PROFESSIONALISM  
PROVIDING A SERVICE TO BE PROUD OF  
Professionalism and high standards always.

#### Service Provision (general)

maintain local service to help anyone who needs it  
maintaining an effective service  
Maintaining service levels for fires  
Free Service at current levels maintained  
Maintain service level  
maintaining current level of service  
maintain a comprehensive service  
Putting the people and communities we serve before ourselves  
Putting people and communities first  
keep doing a fantastic job  
Maintain good level of service  
Quality of service provided.

#### Training/Equipment issues

Recruiting and Training the best qualified staff  
ensuring you have the training and equipment to do the job in the safest possible way  
Spend the money needed on people and equipment  
more kit for fire  
Ensuring our firefighters have sufficient high quality training and equipment to keep them and the public safe when  
correct resources available  
Invest in up to date and specialist equipment  
Well maintained fleet of vehicles  
Send fully kitted fire appliance's to all incidents  
Quality of Operational Staff ie Trg  
Ensure all staff fully qualified  
ensuring fire fighters are safe  
SAFETY & WELFARE OF OFFICERS  
Well equipped  
Well trained  
Ensuring our firefighters have sufficient high quality training and equipment to keep them and the public safe  
when responding to emergencies  
Recruiting and retaining the best quality staff  
Sufficient training + equipment  
Having the right equipment to carry out your duties as efficiently as possible  
Staff Safety  
Ensuring firefighters are sufficiently trained and have all relevant equipment to carry out their duties at all times  
Firefighting training

up to date equipment  
better training  
High quality training for our fire staff to keep them safe!  
training  
Ensuring our firefighters have sufficient high quality training and equipment to keep them and the public safe when responding to emergencies.  
Having the right equipment  
Firefighter safety  
Provide best possible equipment for front line personell  
and well trained personell  
Maintain equipment and training  
recruiting and retaining best quality staff  
Maintain high training levels and standards  
Ensuring our firefighters have sufficient high quality training and equipment  
Providing quality training and equipment to a staff who work hard to provide a service that is efficient and good  
Trained personal  
Good/Up to date equipment  
Ensure the people in the service are properly qualified to hold their post. not just fire fighter training but senior manager training. Recruit from the best in industry  
properly trained staff  
well equipied/trained

#### Cultural issues

New Chief, one that understands how to manage and lead through change rather than making a comprehensive mess of a straightforward shift pattern change  
Modernise  
More Open, less confrontational, honest management  
Stop fire fighters striking - it's a fantastic job with good prospects and excellent benefits, persion, etc.  
alter the culture within the service  
More efficient use of staff time  
more acceptable to change.  
Talk to the union whilst beating them  
renewing the relationship with the crews on the ground  
keep staff motivated  
Be honest with all your staff  
change with the times  
Encouraging staff to embrace changes to staffing and appliance profiles that will be needed to meet the coming financial pressures  
more recognition  
happy motivated workforce  
Better managers  
To explore different ways of working without comprising the service  
not stuck in the "old times"  
Well managed service  
Ensuring staff are treated fairly

#### Publicity/reputation

using media (incl social media) for fire safety awareness  
maintaining and improving SYFRS reputation  
promoting services  
Providing our service efficiently, offering good value for money.  
Continue to review more efficient ways of working to reduce costs  
Raising profile of Fire Service  
re-imaging the service  
showing positive feedback to the public  
Maintenance of excellent reputation and esteem through continued high-profile community presence

to be proactive in promoting preventative measures

### Localism

Local bases

local involent

local stations

Maintain local stations wherever possible

ensure that you continue to be locally accountable to the people who provide the money for the service - i.e.

taxpayers and their elected representatives

keep stations local

### Others

Review existing Support Services provision

Least change/disruption to the service

Effective

Family

Better Partnership involvement

provide an efficient effective and reliable service to all our local communities

Community Awareness Sessions

for SYFRS to continue as a statutory organisation - and not a regional arm of Great Fire Service UK

less targets

Don't have any.

Fire Fighting

the economy

Health

Stability

protect life

a return to sensible management

Support the workforce in times of uncertainty

eliminate unnecessary targets

be available at all times

Providing more specialised service that is flexible to meet all SY risks

Ability to always respond effectively

More Multi-role vehicles.

work

Operational response

speed

One Yorkshire Fire Service

liason with communities & vulnerable people

Maintain current station and shift patterns

How can you choose 3 when you already give us the best

Reduce the number of Managers

Charge for corporate false alarms?

Protect the firefighters they a lot to protect you

less beaurocracy

as above

protect jobs

ending the illegal war

FULL SERVICE

Easy to contact in emergency

reduce non operational depts

Look at reducing management levels where possible

no cutbacks in workforce

The right number of firemen and appliances

save property

Less Back Office Staff  
fire prevention in both domestic and commercial property.  
paying mortgage  
Maintain operational jobs  
Family  
ensure adequate staffing  
putting people and communities before ourselves  
Use the extra money for more firemen  
Feel secure that when you ring 999, you get the Fire Service & not prioritised into different organisations  
Streamline shifts  
protect property from the effects of fire  
Have a priority in what we're there for...Tax Payers  
Engaging the community  
protect all your assets for the unknown future  
achieve time and resource thresholds  
Reduce political correctness protect the real jobs  
Maintaining of Safety for communities  
working in partnership  
Confidence  
more excitement  
improve engagement  
look for other opportunities to maintain SYFR as a high performing organisation  
reducing malicious calls  
no staff cuts  
concentrate on emergencies not social working  
No job cuts  
Reduction of top heavy management  
Better communication/ consultation with staff within the organisation  
Focused on results not targets  
neighbourhood  
Fire safety  
safety  
remove political correctness(the best person for the job, not someone who can tick a box for this pc crazy government)  
consult more on changes  
working in the public's best interests  
Common sense approach  
Greater partnership working  
multi agency approach where possible  
Install a decent recruitment process  
**COMMUNITY AWARENESS**  
sufficient staff  
be innovative and progressively look at other good working examples around the world  
Partnership working  
Shortage and turn over of tech fire safety officers must be addressed if the service are to support businesses in  
improving fire safety and reducing false alarms  
Keep them on the present shift pattern as it works best  
to recruit more women and more ethnically diverse citizens into SYFRS  
pensions  
less high paid officers  
Remove the positive discrimination and employ the best  
increase pay until you have the number of staff required  
as above  
equality for all in the U.K.

Stop wasting money on trying to recruit people that probably don't want a job with you. i would rather you employ the best person for the job not someone that ticks a box on some government thought up target, you don't see the local council or government trying to hit the equality targets, so stop cutting services so you can. better working conditions less hours more money  
Tough enforcement of fire codes  
keeping well  
Career  
unified call centre  
give humanitarian services.  
Make cuts based on operational common sence, not corporate sence  
better partnership working  
self-esteem/team building placements for our vulnerable children  
doing this more efficiently dut financial constraints?  
Improved partnerships  
near home where the palce of fire stations  
Commerical promises

**14. If there is anything you want to comment about which hasn't been addressed earlier, please tell us about it here**

**Responses:**

More care and responsibility taken when ordering very expensive equipment,making sure it is fit for purpose.  
Respecting Frontline Firefighters opinions and comments- they have ongoing knowledge and experience in very dangerous and difficult situations.

---

It appears to me, after reading many different web sites, if the Part-Time Firefighters are cheaper to employ and yet are given the same training, surly there would be a substatal saving in costs to us - THE RATE PAYER. They also live in the community they serve so would be less likely to be constantly threatning to go on strike every time they cant get their own way. This is 2010 and we should be moving away from this sort of thing at the same time giving your employers - YES US THE RATE PAYER, better value for money when it can be achieved,

---

You could consider outsourcing the HR and Equal Ops activities.

---

I guess I have always seen the fire service as separate and self standing, but I wonder if this is right any more. Success in reducing incidents (though the recession and climate change could bring an increase) will inevitably mean either more down time, or having to do other types of work to ensure value for money. Fire fighting should remain the basic function but does the image of the firefighter need to be the traditonal macho one? Only asking because I don't know!

---

Can't think of anything at the moment, except that SYFR need to be more careful with its decision making. The CARP fiasco didn't do the service any favours and I think that the CAT2 Response Vehicles are another step in the wrong direction. Investment in better appliances that actually work would be better.

---

I am answering the questions at least partly with professional views (around media coverage of SYFRS). important to maintain prevention role and maintain good reputation with the public

---

The service is undoubtably going to be affected by the previous governments reckless and irresponsible financial mismanagement. Support staff and back office services should NOT be targeted at the benefit of the uniformed side, just because they are an easier target. Get rid of Joint Secretariat - what do they actually do? Change the fire authority regularly and rotate the chair position every 12 months. The authority needs to look more closely at their management team to ensure they are effective and suitable to carry out what are essentially business

---

management positions. Stop pandering to uniform staff because the service is afraid that the FBU will be unhappy. A lot of uniform need to start living in the real world and be more accountable for their actions. The management should actually make sure they do value their staff, rather than keeping them in the dark. Management should be more visible. SYFR is a very good organisation, but needs to realise that it can't continue on the stance of 'uniform first, support second'. Without support, uniform cannot function. Uniform do provide a professional, essential public service, but cutting staff isn't the panacea that management may believe it is.

---

Start valueing your staff Yorkshire!

---

I think you've current got too many priorities to deliver, streamline them into 5 (maximum) and you've got more change of your staff remembering what they are and knowing how their work contributes to them

---

This survey is weighted to the answers that you are hoping to get.

---

I have filled out this form as I am on secondment and do not have access to the staff intanet version. Please contact me via above email if a staff version can be emailed.

---

I think you had a team of dedicated, professional firefighters working for you, from your structure you seem to employ an inordinate number of back of house services, divisions and staff, Streamline them and concentrate on the job in hand, front line services. I also think you need some proper change management and organisational change support to move through this next difficult period.

---

Raise the publics Perception of your service and promote yourselves more. A lot of people still think that all you do is squirt water and are not aware of the intensive and expensive traing program you have.

---

Yes-I would like to thank all fireman & other emergency services for the work they do each day helping others, something most of us take for granted

---

joint working should involve combined response when fire engines attend abusive areas police should accompany with dogs to keep bottle throwers etc at bay while the fire is put under control

---

under the freedom of information act i hereby request certain information,that being-- the percentage increase since 1999 of fire service support staff in s yorks brigade until 2009 and also the percentage decrease in operational firefighters over the same period.could you please also elaborate in which departments any changes have occurred and the proportion change. i understand that you have a limited amount of time to provide me with this information.

---

Please slim down your huge corporate organisation and stick to your core duty!

---

THIS IS A POOR SURVEY, DOES NOT EXPLAIN A LOT OF ISSUES YOU HAVE RAISED

---

it was quite obvious that the F.B.Union during the altering of the working hours dispute was very set against modernisation.This needs to be addressed by altering the attitude many of the officers to changes in working practices. This may mean changing the gender makeup of the service to make it less "macho"

---

REDUCE THE NO OF SENIOR OFFICERS WHAT DO THE ALL DO? REDUCE THE REMAINDERS PAY AND PERKS IE: THEIR RANGE ROVERS. REDUCE THE SIZE OF THE HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT

---

If funding is tight, look at the management hierarchy, there perks, and departments that could be replaced

---

regionally.

---

I really don't think that this is a very good survey. The questions and the options for answering are leading and also some of the questions are not clear.

---

Current recruitment clearly doesn't reach everyone, especially under-represented groups, perhaps all recruitment should be put to the public more.

---

People do not appreciate how wonderful S Yorks Fire and Rescue Service is.

---

Yes I attend local community group meetings and Station Managers are driving round in Top of the range Volvo's Why?? Our managers use their own vehicles surely a saving to be had there.

---

the last page i have just been to does appear irrelevant

---

We have been fortunate to never require your services in an emergency. However a short time ago two members attended our property to install smoke alarms and they were extremely polite and respectful to us and our property. I thought you should be made aware of this.

---

Your style of questionnaire is very poor, and designed to get the answers you require. If it was used in any research of worth, the university would laugh you out of the class room.

---

Firefighters do a great job saving lives - we're proud you want to serve us, thank you from me and my family

---

The vast majority of fire fighters and their families consider the 4+4 to be the most family friendly system in the country

---

If staff costs are one of your biggest expenses, this cannot be exempt from cuts: private sector organisations have frozen or reduced pay for their employees in recent years, so why should public sector workers not do the same. The cost of providing extremely generous defined benefit pension schemes that allow staff to retire at 55 must be addressed also.

---

I would like to see the service being more commercial and business like in its thinking: as a taxpayer, I do not care HOW the service is delivered, just as long as it is.

---

put up council tax to have the staff and equipment available for ALL emergency situations with quicker response times

---

this whole thing is worded to get the answers that you want and is full of double meanings with two wrong answers instead of a real choice

---

There should be one control room for all the emergency services in South Yorkshire not one for each service.

---

Your questions are based on cuts. The chief officer should be fighting these cuts, protecting his job and his firemen's jobs.  
Failure to defend the service from cuts is a failure by the senior officers of the fire service.

---

REMEMBER THAT THERE ARE SECTIONS OF ANY COMMUNITY THAT DO NOT CONSIDER WORKING IN LOW PAID PUBLIC SERVICE TO BE AN OPTION FOR THEIR WELL EDUCATED CHILDREN, IN FACT IT IS

---

BENEATH THEM.

---

Better industrial relations would look better in the public eye, instead of the persistent bickering between management and the employee reps.

---

I bet you won't be cutting services where the chief officer stays.

---

protect the front line services

---

take the money we as tax payer pay you and spend it not as your own but as if was your own with care

---

SYFR need to consult more openly with the workforce & be less dictatorial

---

cuts to essential services put lives at risk.

---

Some of thses questions are not worded very well. Some are very simplistic & what is question 8 & 10 meant to be about !

---

Why are most middle and top ranking officers driving about in expensive cars when a small van or car would do the same job.

---

South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue, in my opinion, needs to return to the basics. A real commitment to it's staff. Providing a real service to the public & not being a slave to targets or statistics.

---

write your questions in plain english and refrain from the use of political nonsense

---

Thank you for the work you have done and will do.

---

You need to look at all aspects of saving, Think out of the box

---

CARPS fantastic resource however cannot be used in S.Yorks therefore a bit of a waste of money. SYFS do not send FF on degree courses, therefore in a few year time there are going to be personel who do not have a degree Qual in fire safety, therefore SYFS will need to employ consultants to carry out this role. Sending them cost the fire service money, however not having them could result in building being built which donot comply with Building Regulations. a solution could be to employ degree educated fire engineers, SYFS do not pay for their education and if employed on a subcontract basis, dont have to pay pensions; sick ; maternity etc

Although I have never needed the services of the Fire Services it it comforting to think that should the time come when I do they will be only a phone call away. Anyone who thinks a cut in services in order to save money should look at the invaluable role the Fire Service plays within the community.

Too many top brass and not enough indians.

What has happened to the firework law (after 11pm) has any surveys been done on ponds when people have died in this area why not drain a few

Work with the courts so that arsonists, whatever their age work to restore the buildings they destroy

Keep up the great work during what will undoubtedly be a difficult time with the change of government

More money must be sought from either councils or government to fund fire services

Get rid of deadwood, people due for retirement doing hardly anything but having a higher wage maintained

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and express my opinions in regard to the future of our fire services. Overall I think that SYFR provide an already outstanding, value for money public service. They are often putting their lives on the line for us all. Their job is often hindered by mindless people obstructing them in their line of duty. Youths attacking them when answering calls. The service they provide to us is more than value for money already, it is priceless. They often give us the ultimate sacrifice, their own lives. Very good value for money most would agree

Keep up the good work

Two intros front and rear of this survey why? Why no freepost for such an important survey that's why people ignore you

Firefighters do not get the recognition and publicity they deserve. Fires are published in papers without a mention of the job done by firefighters. The most they get is how many attended

At many incidents an officer (or several) turns up in an expensive car to monitor instead of taking charge. Is this because they have little or no practical experience, learning all they know sitting at a desk and are not competent to be in charge. This begs the question why are so many officers getting paid to not make decisions and why do the fire service have so many expensive cars to race around the county when they are plainly not needed

I think it has been superbly presented – all very clear, well explained + easy to understand and respond to. Perhaps cheaper paper could be used next time

Not many people that I have spoken to about this consultation were aware of it, which is quite concerning.

I am not against management though some of my answers might imply that I am, in such an important service like the fire service there is only one way to get things right (or as right as humanly possible) and that is communication. People have to talk to each other and not one party dictating to the other. I am 65 years old and spent 32 years or so in the mines, half as a deputy (lower management) and responsible for safety of the 50 or so men on our district, as well as production, so I think I can justify myself. There has been many cuts made to the fire service, new stations opened but to cover larger areas, in the document the emphasis has been on cuts, why? The fire service is a vital service, one that saves lives like soldiers and other frontline services, so the people in charge of the fire service should battle for correct funding and not accept cuts. We are back to communication, the public do not know what is happening, all they know is when they ring 999 and ask for fire they get a quick professional service, choose what, so inform them and get them on side? But please don't go down the same road as the police, they employed plastic plonkers or as we call them Blunketts plonkers, they are of course PCSO's, a real waste of public money, no powers at all. That is something I know about, after 32 years in the mines, at 49 years of age I joined the special constabulary and did 4 years, now at 65 I think I know what I'm talking about. So please don't think that I am a raving radical. I'm not, I am not a member of any political party, I'm not a parasite like them I'm a level headed bloke who likes golf and wild life.

