

**To: The Clerk  
The Lothian and Borders Fire and Rescue Board**

## **REPORT TO THE LOTHIAN AND BORDERS FIRE AND RESCUE BOARD**

**REPORT NO: 1/2006**

***SUBJECT: MAKING SAFER COMMUNITIES: SERVICE IMPROVEMENT  
PLAN 2005/2010***

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1** The modernising agenda for the British Fire and Rescue Service was born out of the Fire Service industrial dispute which was settled in 2003. The settlement provided for changes in three key areas – the determination of standards of fire cover – now defined as Integrated Risk Management Planning; a new approach to the development of staff – Integrated Personal Development System; and a substantially adjusted Scheme of Conditions of Service.
- 1.2** Collectively, these three issues provide significant challenges to the Fire and Rescue Service, and significant effort is being directed towards delivering a modernised Fire and Rescue Service for Scotland. Work within Lothian and Borders has been continuing since 2003. With regard to Integrated Risk Management Planning, one significant outcome has been the Fire and Rescue Board's draft Service Improvement Plan which went to public consultation during the summer.
- 1.3** The purpose of this report is to consider the outcomes from the consultation exercise on the draft Service Improvement Plan. Specifically to:
  - a.** review the background leading to the Service Improvement Plan proposals;
  - b.** analyse the submissions made on the Service Improvement Plan proposals;
  - c.** review the detailed proposals for the Service Improvement Plan; and
  - d.** make recommendations on the way ahead for the consideration of The Fire and Rescue Board.
- 1.4** A detailed analysis of the consultation responses is attached.

### **2. BACKGROUND**

- 2.1** The Fire (Scotland) Act came into effect on 2 August 2005. The Act introduced a range of new responsibilities for the Fire Service which underpin the overall thrust of modernisation.
- 2.2** Concurrently with the development of the legislative framework, proposals were brought forward for a new approach to determining fire cover within the United

Kingdom. This new approach is given the title of Integrated Risk Management Planning.

- 2.3 The specific requirement on Fire and Rescue Authorities to produce Integrated Risk Management Plans is contained within the Fire and Rescue Framework for Scotland which came into force on 6 October 2005. The Framework is issued by Scottish Ministers and has been accepted by the Scottish Parliament.
- 2.4 Fire and Rescue Authorities are required to have regard to the Framework when carrying out their functions. Scottish Ministers have the power to intervene if they consider that Authorities are failing to act in accordance with the Framework by setting out, by order, an obligation for an Authority to take particular action or to refrain from taking particular action, thus ensuring that they act in accordance with the Framework.
- 2.5 The specific provisions within the Fire and Rescue Framework for Scotland in relation to Integrated Risk Management Plans (IRMP) are contained within Chapter 2 of that document. Specifically, IRMPs are required to provide for each Fire and Rescue Authority, strategies for:
  - Reducing the number and severity of fires, and in collaboration with other agencies, road traffic accidents and other emergency incidents, occurring in the area for which it is responsible;
  - Sustaining and improving the safety of the general public and Fire and Rescue Authorities staff;
  - Reducing the commercial, economic and social impact of fire and other emergency incidents;
  - Safeguarding the environment and heritage (both built and natural);
  - Providing value for money, consistent with the principles of Best Value.
- 2.6 As well as a range of other detailed issues, each Fire and Rescue Authority must have in place, and maintain, an IRMP which reflects local needs and which sets out plans to tackle such needs by effectively addressing existing and potential risks to communities.
- 2.7 The draft Service Improvement Plan, which the Board agreed could be issued for consultative purposes, can be seen to meet the terms of the Fire and Rescue Framework for Scotland 2005, as well as previous guidance issued by the Scottish Executive and Her Majesty's Fire Service Inspectorate.

### **3. VALIDATION OF PROGRESS TO DATE**

- 3.1 Following the pay settlement in 2003, effort has been directed towards implementing changes towards a modernised service. Both Audit Scotland and HM Fire Service Inspectorate have reviewed progress within the Lothian and Borders area. Details of their earlier assessments have previously been submitted to the Fire Board.

**3.2** It is pleasing to note the recognition given by these external bodies on progress made within the Service, in developing and implementing Integrated Risk Management Planning.

**3.3** Key extracts from their reports are as follows:

- a. Audit Scotland- October 2004:** *‘Lothian and Borders Fire Authority has demonstrated a clear commitment to the continuing development and implementation of the modernising agenda and has established the necessary building blocks to deliver this in most areas. It has a number of areas of good practice within IRMP and IPDS where it is making good progress.’*
- b. HM Inspectorate of Fire Services – March 2005:** *‘Performance of the Service in this area is outstanding. All the milestones set by the Scottish Executive in their guidance document have been exceeded and the Service is effectively well ahead of the schedules. Whilst work will always be ongoing in this area, the Service is well placed in terms of data gathering, empirical evidence and professional judgement to make even further recommendations to The Fire Authority.’*

*‘Lothian and Borders Fire Authority, the Service and staff have been recognised for many years as being leaders in terms of fire safety. When coupled with the excellent work of the IRMP team and those who support them, this places the Service in a very strong position to benefit from the opportunities arising from IRMP and the flexibilities it provides.’*

- c. Audit Scotland – December 2005:** *‘Data inputting and validation using the FSEC software is generating a robust evidence base to support Chief Fire Officers in using their professional judgement in using their options to present to the Fire Authority for taking forward resource allocation and incident intervention strategies. Highland and Islands and Lothian and Borders Fire and Rescue Authorities are considered by the Fire Inspectorate as having made ‘outstanding’ progress on IRMP.’*
- d. HMI Inspectorate of Fire Services – December 2005:** *‘There is good evidence to be confident that in addressing these challenges (of the modernising agenda) transparency and compliance with best value will continue to be at the forefront in their endeavours to improve Service Delivery and, thereby, improve the safety of both the community and staff.’*

#### **4. BEST VALUE**

**4.1** Best Value was introduced within Scotland on a voluntary basis in 1998 following the Programme for Government. Best Value became a statutory duty in the Local Government in Scotland Act 2003. The objective of Best Value has been defined as ensuring that management and business practices in local government deliver better and more responsive public services.

**4.2** Best Value in local government is about local authorities:

- Balancing quality service provision against costs;
- Achieving sustainable development;
- Being accountable and transparent, by engaging with the local community;
- Ensuring equal opportunities; and
- Continuously improving the outcomes of the services they provide.

**4.3** While innovation and initiative are welcome in the public sector, increases in risk and the pace of change need to be managed carefully. Best Value is a flexible system that puts quality and effective management to the fore.

**4.4** The Board’s approach to evolving the Service Improvement Plan is consistent with this approach to Best Value.

## **5. CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

**5.1** A copy and the analysis of the consultation process report is attached at Annex 1. In total 2,289 responses were received.

Edinburgh	34
West Lothian	19
East Lothian	4
Midlothian	1
Scottish Borders	2,233 (this relates entirely to the proposals for Melrose Fire Station)

**5.2** There were eight petitions submitted by groups affected by some of the service improvement proposals. This accounted for some 22,195 named individuals. An analysis of these is included at Annex 1. Some of the details, however, are:

- Marionville Fire Station - 4,061;
- Livingston Fire Station - 3,596;
- Tranent Fire Station - 4,363; and finally
- Melrose Fire Station - 10,175.

**5.3** As mentioned above, there were almost 2,300 responses to the consultation exercise as well as a range of petitions.

**5.4** In essence, most respondents were satisfied with the proposals to extend our current services. However, concerns were expressed where we intended to use existing capacity to meet those improvements.

## **6. RISK ANALYSIS**

**6.1** The obligation on the Fire and Rescue Board to undertake the process of integrated risk management planning is clear, and is explained within the Fire and Rescue Service Framework for Scotland and other documentation issued by the Scottish Executive. There are clear risks associated with not complying with that requirement:

- a. Firstly, we would be unable to maintain our progress in fulfilling the requirements of the modernising agenda; and
- b. Ministers could take action against the Fire and Rescue Board based on the provisions of the Fire and Rescue Framework for Scotland.

## **7. OPTIONS**

**7.1** Broadly, there are three options for the Board to consider:

- a. Implement service improvements without supporting efficiencies;
- b. Implement service efficiencies without service improvements;
- c. Implement a combination of service improvements supported by efficiencies.

**7.2** a. *Implement service improvements without supporting efficiencies*

This would maintain the current position of duplication and overlaps in service in some areas of the Board's responsibility.

This would lead to a risk of financial liability to constituent Councils, together with a risk of not fulfilling the requirements for efficiency and Best Value.

In addition, there would be the risk of not fulfilling the Board's requirements in the modernisation agenda. Ministers could take action against the Fire and Rescue Board, as allowed for within the legislation.

**7.3** b. *Implement Service Reductions without Service Improvements*

This would have a significant impact on the services which the Board is required to provide. This option was suggested by two respondents and would lead to a reduction in our wholetime establishment of in excess of 100 full time firefighters. Having analysed the implications of this option, I am satisfied that it would be detrimental to the services which we are required to provide to the communities of Lothian and Borders.

The risks associated with this option are that the Board would be unable to deliver an effective Fire and Rescue Service as stipulated by the Fire Services Act 2005. Ministers could take action against the Fire and Rescue Board, as allowed for within the legislation.

In addition, this option is likely to lead to a worsening of industrial relations, if the Board were to adopt it.

**7.4** c. *Combination of service improvements supported by efficiencies*

In effect, this option embraces the Service Improvement Plan, as amended following the Board's consultation process.

The Plan would provide for major improvements in the services which we provide to communities, partially by redistributing current capacity.

The proposals are consistent with guidance issued by the Scottish Executive. The Revenue consequences of the proposals are contained within the existing Revenue Budget provision.

Whilst there has been broad support for the service improvements during the consultation process, it is fair to say that there have been a number of concerns expressed about the redistribution of resources.

## **8. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

**8.1** Details of the financial implications of the Service Improvement Plan proposals, as well as those arising from alternative suggestions which have been submitted, are attached at Annex 2.

**8.2** It should be noted that the initial Service Improvement Plan contains a proposal for the relocation of the Fire Training Centre. Following further discussions on this subject, it has been agreed that the Fire Training Centre will be treated as a separate project from the Service Improvement Plan. Discussions are currently taking place with the Scottish Executive on how we can fund a collaborative approach to the delivery of this facility. Further details will be submitted to the Fire and Rescue Board in due course. This change in approach should make the capital requirements of option 'C' more achievable when compared with the initial Service Improvement Plan.

## **9. FRAMEWORK FOR CHANGE**

**9.1** Annex 3 provides details of the proposals issued for consultation; a summary of comments, and identifies where changes have been made to the initial Plan following the consultation exercise.

## **10. RECOMMENDATION**

**10.1** The Board is asked to consider the terms of this report and, subject to that, support the revised Service Improvement Plan proposals, at Annex 3, for 2005/2010.

**10.2** Subject to the Board's consideration and agreement, a detailed financial plan will be prepared for submission to its next ordinary meeting.

**BRIAN ALLAWAY  
CHIEF FIRE OFFICER**

**January 2006**

**To: The Clerk  
The Lothian and Borders Fire and Rescue Board**

**REPORT TO THE LOTHIAN AND BORDERS  
FIRE AND RESCUE BOARD**

**REPORT NO. 18/05**

**SUBJECT: MAKING SAFER COMMUNITIES: SERVICE IMPROVEMENT PLAN  
2005-2010: CONSULTATION ANALYSIS REPORT**

***INTRODUCTION***

The Fire (Scotland) Act came into effect on 2 August, 2005.

Section 40 of the Act requires Scottish Ministers to prepare a document setting out priorities, objectives and guidance for Fire and Rescue Authorities in connection with the carrying out of their functions. This document, the Fire and Rescue Framework for Scotland, came into force on 6 October, 2005.

The Framework confirmed the requirement on Fire and Rescue Authorities to produce integrated risk management plans. (Chapter 4, paragraph 4-9)

The Improvement Plan approved by the Board for consultation on June 24<sup>th</sup> 2005 is based upon the guidance and direction issued to Fire and Rescue Authorities by the Scottish Executive in respect of integrated risk management plans.

The purpose of this report is to provide the Fire and Rescue Board with details of the consultation methods used and the extent of responses received. A report is being compiled which will provide a detailed analysis of the responses submitted.

***BACKGROUND***

On June 24<sup>th</sup> 2005 the Lothian and Borders Fire Board agreed the Service Improvement Plan for consultation.

The Plan was formally launched on 1 August, 2005 inviting views and comments on its content. 1800 copies of the Plan and 75,000 leaflets were distributed. A range of interest groups were identified as key stakeholders and these formed the basis for the distribution of the Plan:

Constituent Councils  
Scottish Executive  
MSP's, MP's, MEP's  
Trade Unions including STUC  
Justice Department

HMFSI  
Community Planning Partnerships  
Community Safety Partnerships  
Equality and Diversity Groups  
Community Councils  
Internal stakeholders  
General public

Responses from the limited consultation on the earlier IRMP 2005/2006 are also included in this analysis.

## CONSULTATION METHODS

As well as being available on the Fire and Rescue Service's website at [www.lbfire.org.uk](http://www.lbfire.org.uk), 1800 printed copies of the Plan and 75,000 leaflets were distributed to internal and external stakeholders. A full list of those consulted is shown at Appendix A and includes;

- 5 Constituent Councils
- 5 Community Planning Partnerships
- 5 Community Safety Partnerships
- 162 Community Councils
- Scottish and neighbouring Fire and Rescue Services
- Scottish Executive
- HMFSI
- MP's, MSP's and MEP's
- Convention of Scottish Local Authorities (COSLA)
- Chief Fire Officers' Association (CFOA)
- Fire Brigades Union (FBU)
- Unison

### Internal Consultation

All 1250 employees of Lothian and Borders Fire and Rescue Service were consulted via the Service Intranet, through memoranda, letters, briefing notes and via articles and features in the Service magazine. Copies of the Plan were sent to;

- 52 Wholetime Watches
- 26 Retained Stations
- 4 Fire Control Watches
- 10 Functions and Functional Areas
- 59 Managers including 11 Station Commanders
- 11 Community Safety Firefighters
- Scottish International Fire Training School
- Trade Unions

Copies were also available in the Service library.

Four seminars took place, attended by 158 Firefighters, Watch and Crew Managers, along with 22 smaller meetings attended by 60 Retained employees and 248 Wholetime staff across

the Lothian and Borders area. Any pertinent issues raised at these meetings were captured and will be carried into the full evaluation of consultation responses.

## Public Consultation

Advertisements were taken out in the following newspapers and publications:

Herald and Post  
 Lothian Times  
 Midlothian Advertiser  
 Evening News  
 Herald and Post  
 South Edinburgh Echo  
 North Edinburgh News  
 Edinburgh Times  
 The Leither  
 Corstorphine News  
 The Speaker  
 West Lothian Courier  
 Linlithgow Journal & Gazette  
 The Berwick Gazette  
 Berwickshire News  
 Selkirk Weekend Advertiser  
 Southern Reporter  
 Hawick News  
 Berwick Advertiser  
 Peebles Times  
 East Lothian Herald  
 Musselburgh News  
 East Lothian News  
 Edinburgh A-Z of Council services

Many articles and features were carried by these publications and others, such as the Midlothian News. The proposals have also been debated through the letters pages of local newspapers.

Press releases were sent out and the proposals contained in the Plan were featured on local and national radio and television.

Copies of the Plan and leaflets were sent to 125 Doctors surgeries and 68 Libraries across the Lothian and Borders area. Leaflets were also distributed through community centres, council offices and other public buildings.

Meetings and presentations between Lothian and Borders Fire and Rescue Service Senior Management and various Interest Groups were carried out on request. 19 external meetings and presentations took place and are listed in Appendix B. These included four public meetings in Restalrig, Melrose, Livingston and Tranent. All pertinent issues raised at these meetings were captured and will be carried into the full evaluation of consultation responses.

## RESPONSES

The consultation period ended on 31 October, 2005 and written or emailed responses were received from 2289 organisations and individuals. These are broken down as follows:

Responses concerning the whole Plan		8
Responses concerning Edinburgh		34
Responses concerning West Lothian		19
Responses concerning East Lothian		4
Responses concerning Midlothian		1
Responses concerning the Scottish Borders	Personal responses	118
	Standard letters x 18 variations	2105
<b>Total – all areas/responses</b>		<b>2289</b>

Table 1 provides a breakdown of the number of responses by interest group;

<b>Interest Group</b>	<b>Number of responses received</b>
Constituent Councils	3
Councillors	10
MSP's, MP's, MEP's	10
Scottish Executive	0
Trade Unions (inc. STUC)	3
Justice Department	0
HMFSI	1
Community Planning Partnerships	0
Community Safety Partnerships	0
Equality and Diversity Groups	0
Community Councils	2
Internal stakeholders	9
Others groups/ Individuals	2251

## Petitions

Nine petitions from localities affected by some of the service improvement proposals were also submitted, along with 48 slips from a campaign run by the Border Telegraph newspaper concerning Melrose Fire Station. Table 2 below shows the subject and size of each petition. A number of the signatories were from outwith the Service area and the impact of this will be evaluated at the next reporting stage.

<b>Edinburgh Petition</b>	“Save Marionville Fire Station”	Contact – Ewan Aitken	172 names
<b>Edinburgh Petition</b>	“Concerns regarding the proposal to close Marionville Fire Station which is of great importance to our safety and security. The proposal should not go forward.”	Phyllis Herriot – Chairperson Moira Park Sheltered Housing Tenant’s Association	948 names
<b>Edinburgh Petition</b>	“Do not want Marionville Fire Station closed.”	None	186 names
<b>Edinburgh Petition</b>	“Object to the closure of Marionville Fire Station on the grounds of the increased response time and therefore greater risk to local Restalrig /Lochend /Mountcastle/Northfield/Willowbrae communities.”	None	1282 names
<b>Edinburgh Petition</b>	“Stop the closure of Marionville Fire Station because of the effect it will have on the community and the North East of Edinburgh.”	T.A.R.G.E.T. (Tenants Association Restalrig getting Everyone Together) - Kenny Boorman	1473 names
<b>East Lothian Petition</b>	“Are you in favour of keeping Tranent Fire Station open?”	East Lothian Liberal Democrats	195
<b>East Lothian Petition</b>	“Stop the closure of Tranent Fire Station We the citizens of --- <u>Do Not</u> want the above to close.”  Tranent Prestonpans		3381 235

	<p>Macmerry  Pentcaitland  Longniddry  Port Seton  Elphinstone  Ormiston  Musselburgh  Gorebridge  Dalkeith  Haddington  Dunbar  Cockenzie  Wallyford  Aberlady  Edinburgh</p> <p><b>Total</b></p>		<p>160  112  71  63  83  35  3  1  1  2  2  1  5  1  12</p> <p>4168  names</p>
<b>West Lothian Petition</b>	<p>“We object to the proposed reforms to our local Fire Service. In particular we oppose the proposals to reduce fire cover at Livingston Fire Station (which is the main station serving Livingston, East Calder, Kirknewton and Uphall) from 2 full time appliances, 24 hours each day, to 1 full time and 1 retained appliance from 5pm until 9am, and at weekends. We assert that this reduction in fire cover will put an increased risk on the lives of both residents and firefighters and so demand that the present full time fire appliances be retained at Livingston.”</p>	Fire Reforms Action Group	3596 names
<b>Scottish Borders Petition</b>	<p>“We wish to register our opposition to the proposed closure of our local fire station. We believe that the closure of our local fire station will be detrimental to fire safety and wish to register our opposition to any such plans.”</p>	Melrose Fire Station crew	10,127 names
<b>Campaign slips</b>	<p>“We wish Melrose Fire Station to remain open.”</p>	Respondents to Border Telegraph newspaper campaign	48

**FINDINGS**

The comments and issues raised by the respondents to this consultation will be evaluated in detail and compared to the proposals contained in the Plan. The results of this evaluation will be brought to a future meeting of the Lothian and Borders Fire and Rescue Board.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Board is recommended to note the extent of the consultation process that was carried out for the Service Improvement Plan 2005/2010 and the quantity of responses returned.

***BRIAN ALLAWAY***  
**Chief Fire Officer**

**November 2005**

## **LOTHIAN AND BORDERS FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE SERVICE IMPROVEMENT PLAN 2005/2010**

### **External and Internal Consultation Consultees**

Age Concern Scotland  
 Arson Prevention Bureau  
 Association of British Insurers  
 Audit Scotland  
 Building Research Establishment  
 Capability Scotland  
 Commission for Racial Equality  
 Community Councils per Community Council Listings for Lothian and Borders area.  
 Community Planning Partnerships Partners  
 Community Safety Partnership Partners  
 Constituent Authorities  
 COSLA  
 Council Emergency Planning Officers  
 Disability Rights Commission  
 Edinburgh and Lothian Racial Equality Council  
 Equal Opportunities Commission  
 Federation of Small Businesses  
 Fire Brigades Union – Scotland  
 Fire Protection Association  
 Fire Service Research Training Trust  
 General public – via distribution of copies of the Plan and leaflets  
 General public - via press and other advertising  
 General public – via public meetings  
 Health & Safety Executive  
 Help the Aged  
 HMFSI (Scotland)  
 Institute of Directors  
 Internal and External audiences – via Intranet and Internet Sites  
 LAPS Partners  
 LBFRS Staff  
 LBFRS Employee Representatives  
 Libraries throughout the Lothian and Borders area  
 Local Business and Commercial Interests  
 Local Health Boards  
 Lothian and Borders Police  
 Mountain and Search and Rescue Teams  
 MSP's MP's and MEP's  
 Neighbouring Fire and Rescue Services  
 Scottish Ambulance Service

Scottish Chambers of Commerce  
Scottish Disability Equality Forum  
Scottish Executive Key Stakeholders -including The Minister for Justice and the Minister for  
Finance and Public Service Reform  
Scottish Fire and Rescue Services  
Scottish Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA)  
Society of Local Authority Chief Executives and Senior Managers (SOLACE)  
STUC  
UNISON

**LOTHIAN AND BORDERS FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE  
SERVICE IMPROVEMENT PLAN 2005/2010**

**External Consultation Meetings**

<b>Attendees</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Venue</b>
Councillors from East Lothian, John Home-Robertson MSP, Ann Moffat MP Retained Firefighters, Wholetime Firefighters	Wednesday 17 <sup>th</sup> August	Tranent Civic Centre
Public Meeting: Chaired by Councillor Ewan Aitken	Wednesday 24 <sup>th</sup> August	YWCA, Restalrig Road South
Queensferry & District Community Council	Monday 29 <sup>th</sup> August	Council Office , High Street, South Queensferry
City of Edinburgh Council and Community Councils	Friday 2 <sup>nd</sup> September	Council Chambers, CEC
Members of the Policy, Partnership and Resources Committee, West Lothian Council	Tuesday 13 <sup>th</sup> September 2005	Chambers, West Lothian House
Public Meeting: Chaired by William Windram, Provost and Chair of the Community Council	Tuesday 13 <sup>th</sup> September	Corn Exchange, Melrose
Scottish Borders Council	Thursday 15 <sup>th</sup> September	Council Headquarters, Newtown St Boswells
West Lothian Community Planning Partnership	Thursday 6 <sup>th</sup> October	West Lothian House, Emergency Planning Room
Public Meeting: Chaired by Councillor Maureen Child	Monday 10 <sup>th</sup> October	Portobello Town Hall
Public Meeting: Chaired by Councillor Ian Perry	Thursday 13 <sup>th</sup> October	Royal High Primary School

Public Meeting: Fire Reform Action Group (West Lothian) Councillor Peter Johnston SNP Group Leader	Monday 17 <sup>th</sup> October	Inveralmond Community High School, Ladywell
Midlothian Council	Tuesday 18 <sup>th</sup> October	Midlothian House
Members of the Policy, Partnership and Resources Committee, West Lothian Council	Tuesday 25 <sup>th</sup> October	Chambers, West Lothian House
Public Meeting: Chaired by East Lothian Liberal Democrats	Tuesday 25 <sup>th</sup> October	Loch Centre, Loch Road, Tranent
Scottish Borders New Ways Forum	Thursday 27 <sup>th</sup> October	Council Headquarters, Newtown St Boswells
Presentation to Susan Deacon MSP	Friday 28 <sup>th</sup> October	Constituency Office
Edinburgh Community Safety Partnership Executive	Wednesday 2 <sup>nd</sup> November	City Chambers, CEC
Lothian & Borders Emergency Steering Committee	Thursday 24 <sup>th</sup> November	Scottish Borders Council

## LOTHIAN AND BORDERS FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE

SERVICE IMPROVEMENT PLAN  
FRAMEWORK FOR CHANGE 2005-2010

## RESOURCE SUMMARY

The estimated resource implications of the three scenarios are detailed below by Council area:

## Revenue Implications

Council Area	(a) Improvement - No Efficiencies	(b) Efficiencies – No Improvement	(c) LBFRS Service Improvement Plan
West Lothian	£868K	£(486)K	£(269)K
East Lothian	No Change	No Change	£395K
City of Edinburgh	No Change	£(1363)K	£(589)K
Midlothian	£217K	No Change	£217K
Scottish Borders	£217K	£(810)K	£100K
Community Safety		£(370)K	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£1302K</b>	<b>£(3029)K</b>	<b>£(146)K</b>

## Capital Implications

Council Area	(a) Improvement - No Efficiencies	(b) Efficiencies – No Improvement	(c) LBFRS Service Improvement Plan
West Lothian	£1223K	£67K	£94K
East Lothian	£2494K	£2343K	£2343K
City of Edinburgh	No Change	£529K	£834K
Midlothian	£194K	No Change	£194K
Scottish Borders	£215K	£(185)K	£30K
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£4126K</b>	<b>£2754K</b>	<b>£3495K</b>

## Wholetime Staffing Implications

Council Area	(a) Improvement - No Efficiencies	(b) Efficiencies – No Improvement	(c) LBFRS Service Improvement Plan
West Lothian	+28	-18	-11
East Lothian	No Change	No Change	+16
City of Edinburgh	No Change	-44	-19
Midlothian	+7	No Change	+7
Scottish Borders	+7	-28	+7
Community Safety		-12	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>+42</b>	<b>-102</b>	<b>No Change</b>

## LOTHIAN AND BORDERS FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE

SERVICE IMPROVEMENT PLAN  
FRAMEWORK FOR CHANGE 2005-2010

Service Improvement Plan Proposals		Summary of Comments	Revised Proposals
1.	<i>City of Edinburgh</i>		
	▪ A general increase in community safety activity	Supported.	No change proposed.
	▪ A permanent home safety visit programme	Supported.	No change proposed.
	▪ A permanent youth initiative programme	Supported.	No change proposed.
	▪ An enhanced fire investigation service	Supported.	No change proposed.
	▪ An enhanced response to fires where persons are involved	Supported.	No change proposed.
	▪ Enhanced operational cover in certain areas	Supported.	No change proposed.
	▪ An improved geographical distribution of stations based on existing and planned communities	Generally supported.	No change proposed.
▪ The relocation of our internationally respected fire training centre to a new purpose built site	The relocation of the training facility is now being examined in the context of a collaborative venture outwith the scope of the Service Improvement Plan. Progress will be subject to separate and detailed reporting to the Board.	Deleted from Service Improvement Plan.	

## LOTHIAN AND BORDERS FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE

SERVICE IMPROVEMENT PLAN  
FRAMEWORK FOR CHANGE 2005-2010

Service Improvement Plan Proposals		Summary of Comments	Revised Proposals
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The relocation of McDonald Road fire station towards the north of Leith</li> </ul>	<p>There was opposition to the relocation of this station. Comments focused on costs in perceived increased risk in older tenemental areas around, and to the south of, McDonald Road. Comment was also made about the specific location of the proposed new station and timing of opening/closure.</p>	<p>Following further analysis and consideration, it is now proposed to construct two stations to cover the Leith/North Edinburgh area. This will ensure appropriate cover in tenemental areas as well as the developments in North Edinburgh. The specific locations will be subject to detailed reporting to the Board but the underlying principle will be to achieve an improved geographical distribution for service delivery. I anticipate that the openings/closure would not be achieved until the latter stages of the Service Improvement Plan. This revised proposal would maintain the existing response capacity. We will examine the feasibility of introducing a combination height/pumping appliance.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The relocation of Marionville's fire appliance to Newcraighall</li> </ul>	<p>This received some support but inevitably is linked to the closure of the station. However, HMFSI suggested that the appliance need not be relocated to Newcraighall but removed from our establishment.</p>	<p>Following further analysis and consideration, it is concluded that the relocation will maintain our intervention capability within the City and East Lothian. Therefore, no change is proposed.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The subsequent closure of Marionville fire station</li> </ul>	<p>There was opposition to this, broadly based on the perceived increased risk brought about by changes in attendance times.</p>	<p>Following further analysis and consideration, it is concluded that effective responses will be provided, in the area currently covered by Marionville fire station, from neighbouring stations. Therefore, no change is proposed.</p>

## LOTHIAN AND BORDERS FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE

SERVICE IMPROVEMENT PLAN  
FRAMEWORK FOR CHANGE 2005-2010

Service Improvement Plan Proposals		Summary of Comments	Revised Proposals
2.	<i>Midlothian</i>		
	▪ A general increase in community safety activity	Supported.	No change proposed.
	▪ A permanent home safety visit programme	Supported.	No change proposed.
	▪ A permanent youth initiative programme	Supported.	No change proposed.
	▪ An enhanced fire investigation service	Supported.	No change proposed.
	▪ An enhanced response to fires where persons are involved	Supported.	No change proposed.
	▪ Enhanced operational cover in certain areas	Supported.	No change proposed.
	▪ A new team of wholetime staff based at Penicuik fire station, supporting our retained staff and working a new shift pattern	Generally supported. However, HMFSI questioned the provision of wholetime firefighters at Penicuik.	Following further analysis and consideration, it is concluded that the wholetime firefighters will provide both operational and community safety services within the Midlothian area. In effect, the additional staff, whilst having a base at Penicuik, will provide a flexible resource for the area.

## LOTHIAN AND BORDERS FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE

SERVICE IMPROVEMENT PLAN  
FRAMEWORK FOR CHANGE 2005-2010

Service Improvement Plan Proposals		Summary of Comments	Revised Proposals
3.	<i>West Lothian</i>		
	▪ A general increase in community safety activity	Supported.	No change proposed.
	▪ A permanent home safety visit programme	Supported.	No change proposed.
	▪ A permanent youth initiative programme	Supported.	No change proposed.
	▪ An enhanced fire investigation service	Supported.	No change proposed.
	▪ An enhanced response to fires where persons are involved	Supported.	No change proposed.
	▪ Enhanced operational cover in certain areas	Supported.	No change proposed.
	▪ A new team of wholetime staff based at Whitburn fire station, supporting our retained staff and working a new shift system	Generally supported. Some respondents suggested that the provision be provided on a 24/7 basis. HMCI questioned the provision of wholetime firefighters at Whitburn.	Following further analysis and consideration, it is concluded that the wholetime firefighters will provide both operational and community safety services within the West Lothian area. In effect, the additional staff, whilst having a base at Whitburn, will provide a flexible resource for the area. The provision of 24/7 wholetime cover is not appropriate given the risks and available operational responses.
▪ A new crewing arrangement for one of the fire appliances at Livingston fire station based on a combination of wholetime and retained crews working a new shift system.	There was opposition to this proposal, broadly based on increased attendance times; concerns about perceived reductions in service; increasing population and expansion of housing and commerce.	Following further analysis and consideration, it is concluded that the revised crewing arrangements will provide, as proposed, an effective response.	

## LOTHIAN AND BORDERS FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE

SERVICE IMPROVEMENT PLAN  
FRAMEWORK FOR CHANGE 2005-2010

Service Improvement Plan Proposals		Summary of Comments	Revised Proposals
4.	<i>East Lothian</i>		
	▪ A general increase in community safety activity	Supported.	No change proposed.
	▪ A permanent home safety visit programme	Supported.	No change proposed.
	▪ A permanent youth initiative programme	Supported.	No change proposed.
	▪ An enhanced fire investigation service	Supported.	No change proposed.
	▪ An enhanced response to fires where persons are involved	Supported.	No change proposed.
	▪ Enhanced operational cover in certain areas	Supported.	No change proposed.
	▪ The relocation of Musselburgh fire station to the Wallyford area	Generally supported although alternative sites were suggested. Comments were made about proposed developments in East Lothian and the capacity of the proposed station.	Following further analysis, it is concluded that the Wallyford area is the most appropriate location for the new station. The new station will incorporate community facilities and be capable of expansion to meet future developments.
	▪ Introducing the concept of a community fire station for the benefit of the whole of the East Lothian community	Supported.	No change proposed.
▪ Enhancing the capability of the new station with the provision of an Incident Support Unit	The provision of the ISU at this station was generally supported. It was suggested that the crewing arrangements could be similar to those proposed for Livingston or that a retained crew could operate this appliance.	Following further analysis, it is concluded that due to the necessary training requirements, the staffing arrangements for the ISU should remain with wholetime firefighters. Therefore, no change is proposed.	

## LOTHIAN AND BORDERS FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE

SERVICE IMPROVEMENT PLAN  
FRAMEWORK FOR CHANGE 2005-2010

Service Improvement Plan Proposals		Summary of Comments	Revised Proposals	
5.	<i>Scottish Borders</i>			
	▪	A general increase in community safety activity	Supported.	No change proposed.
	▪	A permanent home safety visit programme	Supported.	No change proposed.
	▪	A permanent youth initiative programme	Supported.	No change proposed.
	▪	An enhanced fire investigation service	Supported.	No change proposed.
	▪	An enhanced response to fires where persons are involved	Supported.	No change proposed.
	▪	Enhanced operational cover in certain areas	Supported.	No change proposed.
	▪	A new team of wholetime staf based at Duns fire station, supporting our retained staff and working a new shift pattern	Generally supported. However, HMFSI questioned the provision of wholetime firefighters in Duns.	Following further analysis and consideration, it is concluded that the wholetime firefighters will provide both operational and community safety services within the Berwickshire area. In effect, the additional staff, whilst having a base at Duns, will provide a flexible resource for the area.
	▪	The closure of Melrose fire station	There was opposition to this proposal, broadly based on concerns about perceived increased risk to the public; increasing population and expansion of housing.	Following further analysis and consideration, it is considered that Melrose station is not necessary for the provision of our service. Therefore, no change is proposed.
	▪	The removal of the third fire appliance from Hawick fire station	Generally supported. However, HMFSI suggested that the current wholetime crew could be replaced by a retained crew or a wholetime crew on the same basis as that proposed for Livingston.	Following further analysis and consideration, it is concluded that the removal of the third fire appliance will not detrimentally affect service provision. Removal of the current wholetime crew would detrimentally affect the delivery of services. Therefore, no change is proposed.