

IRMP Consultation 2019 Comments

No	Comment	Response
1	<p>I see nothing here other than significant cost savings which will significantly reduce the response times and effective work of the fire service in County Durham. I also feel this will be a way of reducing fire fighter numbers on the quiet. All emergency services are at an all-time low and I know first-hand are at breaking point and this will contribute towards the safety of the public</p>	<p>Option 3 reduces five firefighter posts in total we have been clear about the savings generated by this option. The modelling has shown the impact on response standards for each of the options. Only option 3 has a positive impact on the Service level response standards.</p>
2	<p>Spennymoor has always been a 'standby' station. When pumps are off elsewhere in the county Spennymoor gets moved to fill gaps. By moving the second appliance from Durham to Spennymoor you are effectively leaving Durham with one pump. In busy periods the retained cannot be relied on to make it to the station in time because of its location on Sniperley roundabout, Spennymoor could be standby somewhere then you get a PRT house fire in Durham, 1 pump attending with a delay on other pumps getting there. Not to mention by moving Durham's second appliance to Spennymoor the extra delay it would take fire appliances from further away to travel into the Chester le street area.</p>	<p>The Service are fundamentally reviewing how we cover standby moves. Spennymoor will no longer be used in the way it was used previously. Durham's second appliance has also traditionally been used to cover other stations on standby moves.</p> <p>The modelling has fully considered the impact of response standards on Chester-le-Street.</p> <p>We are aware of the issue relating to Sniperley roundabout and have a number of options to consider to overcome this.</p>

3	I think removing a crew at anytime is risk taking, but Option 3 looks the better option. Ideally drum up funding for an extra engine at Spenny, in times where there are more businesses out of town and more houses popping up everywhere, your services will no doubt be stretched further and further and as a career forces man, I understand that! Living in the Worlds 3rd biggest economy and we cannot really look after ourselves....	We would agree that if additional funding was provided to the Authority then we would have greater choice about resources. This, however is not the case and it is also important that we fully consider the demand and risk data when making resourcing decisions.
4	I have put all three options as there is no option to query what existing arrangements are to be able to make a comparison. It is impossible to vote that CDDFR's preferred option would be mine also when I don't know what the 'current arrangements' are in Spennymoor for example to try and take a view on whether it would be an improved service	The current arrangements are explained in the consultation document and the video that accompanied it. There is also detailed information available on our website: www.ddfire.gov.uk
5	Seaham should not be going to a reduced cover on a night time this town is having huge development with thousands of new houses and families moving into the area Seaham should have a wholetime appliance on call 24/7 None of these options are palatable	The future development of Seaham has been considered as part of the Emergency Response Review. Information was taken from the County Durham Plan which details the proposed developments across County Durham.
6	Option 3 means losing a whole time pump in Durham, a UNESCO world heritage site, one of the largest student populations in the country and growing,3 prisons (2 on the north side of the city),a	The risk data considered heritage risk, prison locations, future student accommodation locations, and a range of other factors. This has been fully impacted into the final recommendations.

	lot of problems in the river wear and Spennymoor has???	The modelling predicts that Spennymoor's turnout area will expand to both the North and the South and will cover some of the highest risk wards in the Service area.
7	Is there an over provision of uniformed staff at service headquarters working in offices when they would be more valuable providing operational cover at fire stations especially Darlington	The Service operates one of the leanest back-office provisions of any stand-alone Fire and Rescue Service (FRS). There have been substantial reductions across all support areas over the period of austerity.
8	My comments are regarding Section 2 regarding collaboration with other services. It's important to collaborate and share ideas and resources but it must be for a purpose, i.e saving money, for example it is understood CDDFRS recently collaborated with TWFRS and Northumberland Fire Service in a recruitment campaign but only TWFRS benefited from it as they were the only service to take on new firefighters, from a public point of view it seems that a lot of money was wasted by CDDFRS during this process in aiding with the test and interviews but as they never took any new firefighters on does this not seem as money down the drain.	We fully agree with the comments relating to meaningful collaboration. All collaboration options are considered carefully including the recruitment campaign with Tyne and Wear FRS. Both Northumberland FRS and County Durham and Darlington FRS may draw on the list of potential trainees that was generated from that process. Operating one joint process was significantly more cost effective than operating three separate processes.
9	Taking an appliance from durham is endangering lives . Student accommodation in durham city is increasing every term these people are high risk	Please see the response to comment 6.

10	I'm not sure any of these are a good idea but if you have to make a change then option 3 is the best option.	Agreed.
11	More funding for more staff and equipment would also be of benefit to all.	Agreed but this is unlikely to be the reality of our funding position going forward.
12	Neither	N/A
13	This survey would be better if it was clear how many firefighter posts would be lost due to changes being put forward. The public will be unaware of how many less firefighters will be on duty to attend incidents	Please see the response to comment 1.
14	Employ more firemen	The Service employs firefighters and has done so for over 27 years. Firemen is an outdated and sexist term that isn't appropriate in this day and age. Given the funding cuts that the Authority has endured over the last 8 years employing more firefighters is not currently an option although we are doing everything we can do to protect frontline posts.
15	Firefighters are not given enough credit for the job they do. Thank you.	Agreed. Thank you.
16	I feel unqualified to make these decisions. I would like a service that is not just adequate but good for the community and importantly, best supports it's firemen.	The Service employs firefighters and has done so for 27 years. Firemen is an outdated and sexist term that isn't appropriate in this day and age.

		The Service will be subject to detailed assessment from Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabularies and Fire and Rescue Services (HMICFRS) in 2019. This will give an independent judgement of our performance.
17	Would the crewing levels move to 2 retained appliances and 2 whole time at spennymoor or would you cut one retained pump at spennymoor?	There will not be a need for 2 on-call (retained) appliances at Spennymoor as the station will have a full-time and an on-call appliance if option 3 is implemented.
18	With the resources you have, you do a brilliant job. Thank you.	Agreed. Thank you.
19	Option 3 in question 3 seems like the best choice. But I wonder at the hardship and inconvenience of the existing staff in moving from one station to service another.	The impact of any change will be fully discussed with staff and the trade unions and they will be involved in how any of the options are implemented.
20	This would be dependent on demand and as this is not outlined it is difficult to determine the need. But it is likely that there are not sufficient calls during the night to warrant full time service	The demand data was fully considered during the Emergency Response Review. Your assumptions are correct in that we receive less calls during the night. About 80% of our calls occur between 10 a.m. and 10 p.m. we also however need to consider risk factors and ensure we can respond effectively at all times of the day and night.
21	Would like to have had more information but trust the fire brigade to do what's right for their community	Thank you.
22	It makes more sense to have equal assets over a wider area (but not too far) 365 days a year as opposed to having two engines, with the possibility only one being used. If a fire is too big for one engine	We endeavour to listen to the views of all staff during any proposed changes. Staff have featured heavily in this consultation process. We cannot always

	<p>the other is pulled from a neighbouring station. All said, it's easy to speculate from the outside and hope the fighters are getting an equal say on their day to day shift pattern potentially changing.</p>	<p>meet everyone's needs but we will always do what we can to agree a way forward even during a very challenging financial climate for the Authority.</p>
23	<p>There's no mention of Sedgefield so I assume no changes are planned there. As a growing town with many smaller villages nearby I would hope that cover continues with a base in Sedgefield.</p>	<p>Sedgefield has been fully considered as part of the Emergency Response Review.</p>
24	<p>Should have more funding to do your jobs without having to mess about with staffing arrangements and how you operate as a service. Keep up the good work</p>	<p>Agreed. Thank you.</p>
25	<p>Have you considered following SFRS in having full time retained staff. This would in turn help with staffing issues on retained stations allowing fire cover when needed. Keeping full time pumps on their home stations.</p>	<p>We already operate full-time/retained staff and benefit significantly from this model. We are always looking for innovative ideas in order to improve our efficiency and effectiveness and will review the approach in Scotland (SFRS) than you for your suggestion.</p>
26	<p>None of these proposals make any sense at all. Option 1 - By downgrading DCP+ to Day Crewed is only going to make the night time cover nil. Both stations may struggle on the appliance availability which has not been given on this IRMP consultation. This needs to be rewrote with correct figures on the availability of the Seaham and Newton Aycliffe RDS appliances.</p>	<p>Changing the Day Crewing Plus (DCP) model at Seaham and Newton Aycliffe has been forced onto the Service following the legal ruling in South Yorkshire. We have fully considered the availability of all on-call appliances when undertaking the Emergency Response Review. Neither station will be left without cover during the night. We have procedures in place to cover any drop in on-call availability.</p> <p>We have fully modelled the impact of all the options on response times.</p>

<p>Option2. By removing the second pump from both Peterlee (to Seaham) and Durham (to Newton Aycliffe) effectively down grades both Peterlee to one pump on a night and Durham to one pump wholetime/retained. This will mean for both these areas that longer response times for 'Persons reported' incidents will happen. Peterlee 1 will have to rely on Wheatley Hill on responding and Durham 1 will have to wait that extra 10-15mns for the RDS at Durham to attend. It would be far more easier to remove the RDS at Durham as they are 'off the run' more times over the 24hrs. Again no availability have been provided for any of the retained stations through out this consultation.</p> <p>Option 3 Again this consultation has not provided any data on how many times an appliance has turned out during the day or night. Spennymoor 1 0800-1700 spends more time on standby duties at other stations do to appliance availability. This proposal looks at also removing 5 firefighters but has not said what would happen to them. If the service is trying to save money then it reads that they are having to create 16 posts (including 4 WMs and 4 CMs) to replace the current arrangements. It would be far easier to keep Spennymoor 1 as a pump but use it as a 'roving pump' especially when</p>	<p>We have fully considered the availability of all on-call appliances when undertaking the Emergency Response Review. We have used a significant amount of risk and demand data when considering all of the options. It would not be practical to outline all of this data during a public consultation.</p> <p>No staff will face redundancy. The five posts will be lost through natural wastage. The 16 posts are not growth they are redistributed from the overall staffing model. There is a requirement to increase the number of watch manager posts but this has been factored into the savings for option 3.</p>
--	---

	other two pump stations are on exercises or at Training Centre.	
27	None of the above options.	N/A
28	Having worked at Peterlee and Seaham station I feel option 2 would be more practicable and better for the business. Any fire fire call in the Murton area 04 2nd appliance would make a quicker attendance anyway and vice versed 03 to Hawthorn. So for that, I would go with option 2.	The impact on response standards for all of the options has been fully considered.
29	<p>The loss of firefighters and/or the reworking of their roll seems to be the preferred option all the time. Have you considered removing one ACO and several ADM posts instead? The brigade ran perfectly well with just one person running the stations in the past.</p> <p>The options above are bias and skewed towards only giving one answer.</p>	<p>Over the last 8 years we have done everything we can to protect frontline posts although when we have faced the levels of cuts we have over that period it is inevitable reductions will occur. There are currently 10 staff in the District Management Team structure. To go back to one person per station would require 15 staff and therefore significant growth.</p> <p>The decision to restructure the Service Leadership Team was taken in September 2017 based on the increasing demands at Principal Officer level. An Area Manager post was taken out of the structure to facilitate this change.</p>
30	look to maintain current fire cover at Seaham & Newton Aycliffe with a variant of current shift pattern. Therefore not increasing risk in these areas	We are continuing to talk to the Fire Brigades Union (FBU) about alternative options for both stations. Given the doubts about whether the existing system complies with the Working Time Regulations or not, we have to consider the implications for staff and the Authority of any new proposals that are made.

31	Seaham requires immediate cover during night time hours not wait five plus minutes for Retained Firefighters to turn out.	We have fully considered the impact on response standards at every station when undertaking the Emergency Response Review.
32	would seem to be the option with the least amount of disruption.	Agreed. Thank you.
33	None of the above. Focus on finding a solution to resolving the issue with Dcp. Options will only reduce cover.	Please see the response to comment 30.
34	Option 3 seems to have implications for the workforce greater than those of options 1 & 2 so have the workforce been consulted in a timely fashion?	Please see the response to comment 22.
35	Durham and Spennymoor having identical cover !!! Surely not ,Durham city must require more fire cover than Spennymoor	Please see the response to comment 6.
36	The ruling in SY should be explained as it was due to illegal shift patterns. Option 1 relies on retained cover so when off the run = no cover this is a failing duty nationwide. When taking away a 2nd appliance you leave that area with reduced fire cover Residents of Country Durham are going to receive a poorer service so will we see a reduction in Fire Authority charge on Council Tax	The legal ruling in South Yorkshire is complex and applies only to that specific shift system. We believe we have explained the impact on County Durham and Darlington adequately during the consultation. There are more on-call (retained) appliances in our Service than wholetime (fulltime) appliances and the duty system is an integral part of our response model.

	<p>Questions are very leading. Why has a small Brigade like DDFRS not merged with a similar sized Brigade like CFB ? Would this not result in a major saving by reducing 1 CFO and numerous senior managers and saving front line jobs ?</p>	<p>While the restrictions around Council Tax Equalisation exist a merger with any FRS in the North East would not be financially viable. FRS mergers don't align with government policy and therefore unlikely to attract any funding to support such a move. No other FRS has shown a desire to merge although we are actively pursuing collaboration opportunities.</p>
37	<p>Maybe a review of salaries would be a good idea. As a public service maybe limit wages across the board no matter what position is held to £30000. The money saved could then be spent on extra crews and vehicles where needed!</p>	<p>FRS salaries are set nationally through the National Joint Council.</p>
38	<p>I wonder why all these options are deliberately written to totally confuse the general public?</p>	<p>We don't believe the options are confusing especially if the supporting video is watched.</p>
39	<p>Well I don't think any of the above as I feel things should be left as they are as Durham is a big area to cover and time is of the essence with a fire it will be like the ambulance service cut backs lives at risk what price on life does this government not understand I feel things should stay as they are more staff needed plus pay rise in my book</p>	<p>Please see the response to comment 26. Leaving things as they are is not an option.</p>
40	<p>Options 2 and 3 will lose firefighters jobs. Do some job cuts in your headquarters where staff exceed the number of firefighters on duty. This will save you money and prevent the loss of firefighters.</p>	<p>Please see the response to comment 7.</p>

	<p>Moving a 2nd pump from Peterlee or Durham doesn't seem well thought through. It leaves a lot of risk for one pump crewed by 4 firefighters.</p> <p>Also the current night shift is only 11 hours long so how can a pump be sent to Aycliffe & Seaham for 12 hours without night shift crews working longer?</p> <p>As you're just about to take the beds away the public are already going to have tired firefighters arriving at incidents having been awake all night after potentially being awake during the day beforehand.</p> <p>The risk of accidents etc is already increasing without then putting extra pressure on these crews by only having 1 whole time pump with 4 firefighters at Peterlee & Durham to potentially deal with an escalating house fire, while the next arriving pump is going to be 10-15 mins away if not longer? Not to mention the extra risk and pressure of tired firefighters driving fire appliances. Is this really a risk worth taking?</p> <p>Also what will happen to the accommodation blocks built at Aycliffe & Seaham. They seem to have been a waste of money.</p>	<p>The Service's preferred option is option 3. If Peterlee reduced to a single pump station the crewing levels would increase to 5. This has been costed in to option 2.</p> <p>There are various options available to meet this demand. Resources could be moved on a permanent basis if this option was implemented rather than just on a night shift.</p> <p>The working routine for wholetime staff on stations in CDDFRS was amended in 2013 removing the requirement for beds. This is the subject of a collective local agreement with the FBU.</p> <p>We monitor the health and safety of all our staff carefully and the collective agreement around the wholetime shift system allows for changes to be made if accident rates increase. We are confident the FBU would support a review of the existing arrangements should the health and safety of our wholetime firefighters become an issue.</p> <p>The accommodation blocks at Seaham and Newton Aycliffe were fully funded from government grant. The change at these stations has been forced upon us due to the ruling in South Yorkshire.</p>
--	---	---

49	None of these options are a viable choice as they all have an impact on attendance times and fire cover throughout the county and further options should be considered	We have fully considered the impact on response standards at every station when undertaking the Emergency Response Review.
50	I would like to offer my deepest thanks to the Fire and Rescue Service for the outstanding work they do. Heroes one and all.	Agreed. Thank you.
51	Although none of these options seem to be positive we must remember that it is the conservative governments approach to public sector funding that has driven the fire brigade to have to propose these Changes In the first place. Fund our hard working public sector workers properly!	N/A
52	I'm not sure I agree with moving fire engines away from Durham city but I trust the fire Brigade to make the right decisions for the public.	The impact on Durham City has been fully considered as part of the Emergency Response Review.
53	I disagree with option 3 as moving an appliance to Spennymoor does not increase resource availability in Aycliffe or Seaham overnight. Although beneficial for Spennymoor, this does nothing to aid the overnight response for Aycliffe or Seaham and	We have fully considered the impact on response standards at every station when undertaking the Emergency Response Review. Relocating an appliance to Spennymoor does have a positive impact on response standards in the South of Durham's station area and the north of Newton Aycliffe's station area. This gives the overall increase in response standards across the Service area.

	decreases the level of fire cover in Durham City and surrounding areas.	
54	Aycliffe does not have that many fires during the night , so the retained will manage fine to cover through the night .	Please see the response to comment 20.
55	I understand the financial problems but they work as they are now and moving the second fire engine would be wrong	Our medium-term financial plan (MTFP) predicts that the financial challenges will increase over the next four years.
56	Moving Durham's second fire engine away from Durham so they are just left with one whole time fire engine is really quite unbelievable. Is this where we have gotten to?!?!	We have fully considered demand and risk data while undertaking the Emergency Response Review and formulating the options.
57	Saves the most money??	Option 3 does deliver the greatest saving, but it is also the only option that improves the response standards across the Service area.
58	Continued cuts MUST have safety issues for both CDDFR and the general public, it will end up costing lives. It's disgraceful.	The Authority and Service have continually lobbied for additional funding and/or flexibility on the Council Tax Precept. We will continue to do so going forward.
59	You guys do great job	Agreed. Thank you.
60	No option to say that I would prefer a growing town like Seaham to have FULL cover, I. e. 24hrs whole time. Why the sudden change after spending millions	Please see the response to comments 5 and 26.

	<p>on the accommodation block only five years ago? Don't understand the logic. This appears to be simply a cost cutting exercise regardless of the safety for the people of Seaham and Aycliffe. Hope you take notice of this comment and it is not ignored!</p>	<p>The accommodation blocks at Seaham and Newton Aycliffe were fully funded from government grant. The change at these stations has been forced upon us due to the ruling in South Yorkshire.</p> <p>The Service is examining options for the accommodation blocks.</p>
61	<p>Seaham station should remain as full time firefighters there is some major development in the next few years bringing in more business and also homeowners and children none of these options are a benefit to the area this is not making the area safer it is the opposite.</p>	<p>Please see the response to comment 26.</p>
62	<p>Is it safe for only 4 fire fighters on a fire engine, especially in major fires. Given the chemical and industrial factories at Aycliffe should they not have 24 full time cover, thinking back to the large fire at Stillers and the neighbouring chemical factories. You need to put safety of fire fighters and the public first.</p>	<p>The majority of fire appliances in the Service are crewed by 4 firefighters. None of the options would increase this position and option 3 increase the crewing from 4 to 5 of Durham's first appliance.</p> <p>The demand and risk data for Newton Aycliffe has been fully considered as part of the Emergency Response Review.</p>
63	<p>There should not be a dilution of service if at all possible. I pay the same amount of council tax every year and deserve the same level of public service and protection, every year.</p>	<p>Council tax is only makes a proportion of our funding. The money we receive from government has been cut by 58% over the last 8 years so providing the same level of service to the community is extremely challenging.</p>
64	<p>Services should not be watered down and therefore risk increased when we pay the same amount of</p>	<p>Please see the response to comment 63.</p>

	council tax every year. We should receive the same cover.	
65	Option 3 would mean the loss of a fire appliance in the county and I think it is dishonest not to highlight this in the consultation.	The consultation clearly outlined the options that reduced the number of fire appliances. See the table on page 10 of the consultation document https://www.ddfire.gov.uk/sites/default/files/attachments/Final%20draft%207.pdf
66	Durham will become a 1 pump station. Absolutely unacceptable , it is the heart of our county and 1 pump covering such heritage and life risk is shambolic. All down to cuts but it is ok to appoint another senior officer the day before this! disgraceful!!	Please see the response to comments 6 ,26, 52 and 56
67	24 hours a day 7 days a week has got to be the best option for public safety but also for the firefighters who do a magnificent job always. It must be far less stressfull for them to be on site and ready to go rather than being called in through the night to attend emergencies There wellbeing must be of prime importance	Having every fire appliance staffed by wholetime personnel would improve the level of service to the public but is unrealistic in any financial climate. The majority of fire appliances are crewed by on-call staff who equally do a magnificent job for our communities.

68	<p>Very difficult decision for me to make as I don't know or understand what has been past or present situation at all the fire stations.</p> <p>Providing a safe and effective service is paramount. I can't agree with option 1 as feel fire fighters need to be on site to respond as quickly as they can. I am agreeing to option 3 as this is the fire service preferred option so I'm assuming this provides a public services as well as staff well being. Good luck.</p>	<p>Option 3 does provide the best level of service to the public. Any staffing system introduced will comply with national terms and conditions of service and the trade unions will be fully consulted with.</p>
69	<p>Employ more firefighters!</p>	<p>Please see the response to comment 9.</p>
70	<p>None of the above. Try reducing the amount of backroom staff, by that I mean officers' who don't actually attend fires. There should be no reduction to any cover. Moving existing resources from one station to another reduced the cover in the original station.</p>	<p>Please see the response to comment 7.</p>
71	<p>I think we should ensure we have coverage 24 hours a day -we must learn from Grenfell although I think this was down to mismanagement and not the fire service .I think you should travel with fire and rescue ,trained medical personnel ,and police .Maybe someone who has the skills of both (medical, police) .Have one per station and they travel with you in addition to all services attending say an RTA .i think each homeowner should have an extinguisher (home insurance void if they don't)</p>	<p>Please see the response to comment 67.</p> <p>We already operate Tri-responders in rural areas and are discussing the opportunities to expand this provision although this requires the agreement of other partners.</p>

72	Option 3 would put public safety at risk	Please see the response to comment 26.
73	You are putting lives at risk with constantly cutting back the services. An absolute disgrace.	Please see the response to comment 26.
74	Constantly cutting staffing levels will most Definitely put lives at risk let it be on your heads ! This service is so very much needed and why would you wish to cut staffing levels ??	Please see the response to comment 26.
75	Why don't you ride 5 on Bishops pump and 2 on the SRU at all times. Stop putting the lives of the public at risk by cutting FF posts when your communications department has expanded. Leave Bishop alone and get rid of your comms clique.	<p>The trial of the option at Bishop Auckland was suggested by staff from that station and has been a success.</p> <p>The Communication and Governance Team was formed by merging two separate teams together. Overall we have reduced our support staff by over 30% in the last 8 years.</p>
76	Outrageous to move Durham's fire Engine to Spennymoor	Please see the response to comment 6.
77	Taking a fire engine from Durham during the night will leave managers open to corporate manslaughter charges should there be a fire death due to resources being reduced . Durham city is expanding every year with students living quarters .	Please see the response to comment 6.
78	There's a much greater risk in Durham City than in Spennymoor surely!	Please see the response to comment 26.

79	<p>Q1 How can you deploy the SRU immediately if the BA crews are out on a job? You would need to wait for 4 RDS to come in. Presumably the crews needed to man the SRU need specialist training?</p> <p>Q2 Be careful, its a VERY short step from efficiency measures to combining the 3 fire services.</p> <p>Q3 Without seeing the recent & historic call rates and the response times I am unable to give an answer to question 3</p>	<p>Please see the response to comment 62.</p> <p>Please see the response to comment 36.</p> <p>Please see the response to comment 26.</p>
80	<p>The following comment has been received from Great Aycliffe Town Council - As the town continues to grow with both new housing estates being built together with a planned further 900 houses as indicated in the Durham Local Plan to the East of the Town, together with an expansion of the business park, a reduction in emergency response would seem to be in the wrong direction. Concern was expressed that if the present level of service is reduced it is unlikely to be increased in the future to meet the expansion of the town and surrounds. It was noted that the result of the preferred option would be to increase the response time for non-domestic incidents. Concern was expressed that the Aycliffe Business Park (the largest in Co. Durham)</p>	<p>Please see the response to comment 20.</p>

	<p>also brings with it a potential risk of incidents. In particular members pointed out the proximity of two COMAH sites and were concerned over any reduction in response times given the proximity to Newton Aycliffe/School Aycliffe. Whilst it was explained that data modelling has taken place and used to identify frequency of incidents, members felt that changes to health strategies, which encouraged older residents to stay in their home and receive home care, may increase the risk of incidents in domestic properties now and in the future with a resultant increased demand for emergency service responses. Members also commented on the recent rise in RTA's between J58 and J60 on the A1 (M) and the increased demand this creates. The Council requests these concerns are taken into account during the consultation process.</p>	
81	As long as question 2 does not mean consideration of a merger with other services/authorities.	Please see the response to comment 36.
82	More funding should be made available ASAP	Please see the response to comment 55.
83	More money required	Please see the response to comment 55.
84	need more funding	Please see the response to comment 55.

85	More funding required urgently	Please see the response to comment 55.
86	All of the above options point to a reduction in fire cover in one area or another, with the constant rises in my council tax there should be NO increase in attendance times and there should be more firefighters riding all of the engines including full time staffing of special appliances.	Please see the response to comment 63.
87	Or option 4 - a revised version of DCP at Seaham and Aycliffe comprising of day crew on call with the same crew. No loss of fire cover or response time.	Please see the response to comment 30.
88	All of the above options are about fire cover/turn out time. I feel its in the best interests of the Fire Service to find a solution to the DCP situation. A large number of employees are under unnecessary stress and worry due to prospect of losing a shift system they are very happy with.	Please see the response to comment 30.
89	All options result in reduction in response standards in some part of the county. Current staffing at Seaham and Aycliffe is a very cost effective staffing model and every avenue should be explored in order to maintain it.	Please see the response to comment 30.

90	Cannot choose one of the above 3 options as all will reduce fire cover somewhere in the county. This is UNACCEPTABLE.	Please see the response to comment 1.
91	When looking at the above 3 options it becomes very apparent that all will bring a reduction in vital fire cover somewhere within Co. Durham and Darlington which is in no way beneficial to the tax payers and community its supposed to serve.	Please see the response to comment 1.
92	To keep the county safe we have to protect the family	We are unsure as to the relevance of this comment.
93	<p>I have ticked option one however I don't believe your staff will want to work such an anti family friendly shift pattern .Further more I believe that the service were aware that this shift system was bordering on being illegal and would be taken to task via the courts, I would question whether the cost of building the accommodation blocks at Seaham and Newton Aycliffe has yet being recouped by savings in firefighters salaries at these stations.</p> <p>With regards to Spennymoor fire station the amount of calls would quite easily be covered by a totally retained station, the new station was built to fulfil a PFI agreement with other services in the region and in my opinion has been a total waste of tax payers money and the service have tried various ways to use it to justify the cost.</p>	<p>Any shift system introduced would need to comply with national terms and conditions which specifies are requirement for it to be family friendly. We would negotiate the details of any shift system with the trade unions.</p> <p>Please see the response to comments 6 and 26.</p>

	I believe that if the service listened more to their staff then they would find working arrangement's that would be mutually agreeable to staff and management and within budget.	
94	Bishop Auckland should be staffed with 5 firefighters on the pumping appliance and two firefighters on the heavy rescue vehicle, with the second appliance at bishop being retained there will be many times when this pump is not on the run and therefor turning out with 4 would not give our tax paying public the cover they need and could be hazardous to the health and safety of the firefighters.	Please see the response to comment 75.
95	You should look at putting a Paramedic on your vehicles too.	This would require the agreement of the ambulance service or a significant investment in training staff to that level who may struggle to maintain competence.
96	I think if something that isn't broken doesn't need fixing. I think that the Emergency services are the services local money should be put into. The personal risk their lives just like Armed Services is they should be respected and given hours and pay to match. On the info you give I've completed the response however if I've been misinformed my answers would not be valid.	Please see the response to comment 55.
97	Durham Red is a City	Please see the response to comment 6.

	<p>Spennymoor is a town, a much smaller scale area in all capacities which DDFRS has risk factored as such since the year dot, why and how now is it now deemed to be identical as a main city area with wider area, population and risks.</p> <p>Incredible decision making, one would think weak and political planning may be at play here!</p> <p>If Durham council tax payers are aware that they're receiving a reduced service on a life risk scale I would expect us to push our local councillors for some honest answers and explanation!</p>	
98	<p>Durham city alone has a population of 65000 people, a large university, a world heritage site in the form of Durham Cathedral, multiple student accommodation, a hospital and the list goes on. Spennymoor has a population of 20000 and nothing of any significance what so ever. Who thinks Durham City and Spennymoor town requires the same level of fire cover? Plus Spennymoor station gets around 300 call outs a year, even if you call it one a day and assume the crew are off station for 1 hour at a time, what is £150000 a years worth of 5 wholetime firefighters going to do for 23 hours of the day. The proposal to have a 24/7 wholetime crew sat in Spennymoor station is an absolute sacrilege and a blatant waste of tax payers money.</p>	Please see the response to comment 6.

99	Crazy to think of Durham having one fire appliance. A hospital. 3 prisons. Cathedral. Castle. A larger population and risk than Spennymoor in my opinion.	Please see the response to comment 6.
100	If staffing is short on fire stations why not reduce the pen pushers at HQ and put them back on fire stations where they can do the job they are paid to do	This is a derogatory comment. Please see the response to comment 7.
101	I have chosen option 2 as I am unclear as to whether option one "on call fire fighters" means whole time on call from the accommodation or retained duty system?	On call firefighters does refer to wholetime firefighters responding from the accommodation blocks. This would be day crewing plus.
102	Newton Aycliffe has a big industrial estate with a few chemical plants and needs a 24 hr fire station and it's fire engines should not be reduced we are also very close to the A1 which has a good few accidents on	Please see the response to comment 20.
103	Taking the appliance out from Peterlee is madness, look at the stats which clearly show Peterlee is one of the busiest, behind Darlington.	Please see the response to comment 48.
104	Seriously ??? Taking away 24 hour cover from Seaham with the extra 1000's of houses been built locally and severe RTC that happen at Seaham on the A19 daily ? A disaster waiting to happen - Will you be reducing the amount we pay to you	Please see the response to comment 5.

	through our council tax by 50% to reflect a service we wouldn't be receiving ?	
105	<p>Seriously ??? Taking away 24 hour cover from Seaham with the extra 1000's of houses been built locally and severe RTC that happen at Seaham on the A19 daily ? A disaster waiting to happen -</p> <p>Will you be reducing the amount we pay to you through our council tax by 50% to reflect a service we wouldn't be receiving ?</p>	Please see the response to comment 5, 58 and 63.
106	I am highly concerned that none of these options will be enough when all the new builds proposed for Seaham and the Garden Village plus surrounding areas are completed	Please see the response to comment 5.
107	<p>None of the above!</p> <p>I think it is appalling that you say "The tragedy that unfolded at Grenfell Tower last year served as a poignant reminder of the critical role we play in protecting our communities and has only made us more determined and passionate than ever to do the job we do and to do it well". When the root cause of the Grenfell disaster was down to money and this is clearly the case once again.</p> <p>While it is 'dressed' up because of the ruling in South Yorkshire, that came about purely because you are asking the crew to do more with less, because of</p>	Please see the response to comment 58.

	<p>previous budget cuts - the fact that the firefighters who have been affected, have worked in contravention of the work time regulations only goes further to demonstrate their commitment to the the role they perform.</p> <p>The lives of people should AND HAVE to come first and the senior managers in the authorities need to do their job in balancing the books to make sure it can be achieved.</p> <p>Stop spending money on 'gloss' to make somewhere look better or to satisfy the needs of the favoured few.</p> <p>People matter - this is what should be the number one priority!</p>	
108	No way should Durham City be only covered by 1 Wholetime Fire Engine. Disgrace to be even on the agenda	Please see the response to comment 6.
109	Do not water down your Fire service any more. One fire engine to cover Durham. Really???	Please see the response to comments 6, 58 and 63.
110	Durham city is a vast area with a rising number of students. A cathedral & castle as well as heritage buildings which need a quick response if needed, spennymoor is too far away to cover the city in an emergency. Why have a full time fire engine at a place like spennymoor? There's nothing there I'm sure a part time fire engine could cover spennymoor.	Please see the response to comment 6.

	<p>Taking a fire engine from Durham city to sit at spennymoor is nonsense and I will be speaking to my local MP & councillor .Ive never heard anything so ridiculous.Option 1 is my vote no matter how much extra council tax i have to pay to keep Durham city covered by 2 if not 3 fire engines & safe. Stick to your saying "safest people,safest places " and keep Durham city well covered because 1 full time fire engine in the city centre certainly isn't safest.</p>	
111	<p>I'm confused where at the bottom of option 3 it says "this is the preferred option of CDDFRS??As my neighbour is a serving firefighter in durham and I asked why option 3 was the preferred which he said it's not the preferred option by the firefighters on the fire engines? so I find your bottom statement very misleading and untruthful. The preferred option of the lads n lasses riding and working the shifts who it's going to effect should be put on the bottom of their preferred option if you going to put preferred option of HQ or senior officers....hang your head in shame it's bad enough this government being dishonest we don't need it from our local fire service.</p>	<p>It is important that the funding position facing the Authority is considered. All staff in the Service have had the opportunity to respond to the consultation, we have conducted station/section visits and hold regular communications forums. We are fully aware of the views of staff at every level in the organisation. Staff from various stations have differing views about their preferred options. Unfortunately we still have to present a balanced budget following significant budget pressures over many years. Ultimately it is for the Chief Fire Officer to consider the available options and make a recommendation on efficiency savings. Option 3 is the preferred option although we accept that some staff hold different views.</p>
112	<p>Taking a fire engine from durham is playing with fire. Durham city's population is expanding every year including high rise buildings have you forgot about Grenfell tower block fire . ???????</p>	<p>Please see the response to comment 6.</p>

113	Why reduce the cover of durham where the population and risk are higher than in Spennymoor.	Please see the response to comment 6.
114	Does Spennymoor need a full time pump after cover being ably supplied by on call firefighters for a long time This is a good opportunity to further cut front line services whilst maintaining a hugely overly staffed management system and office staff. This is nothing more than a cost cutting exercise at the detriment of public safety	Please see the response to comment 6.
115	1 full time fire engine in durham city is a no go. Spennymoor is too far away for emergency cover for the city and why have a full time fire engine at spennymoor anyway?	Please see the response to comment 5.
116	Not knowledgeable enough to decide between the 3 options	Noted
117	Cooperation and collaboration should always be the watchwords!	Please see the response to comment 8.
118	Sorry but I don't feel I have enough information to make a better judgement. I have picked this option as it seems to be a half way solution to availability of a response but not diluting the current provision excessively.	There is a limit around the amount of information that we can realistically include in a consultation document without confusing the public. This is why we held a series of open nights at various stations around the service area to enable greater levels of detail to be explained.

	<p>Now give me a full copy of a risk assessment of all the types of potential fires and types of businesses and residential categories I could possibly give a better response. I look to you as experts to have my best interests at the fore and not listen to nimby or anti change communities.</p> <p>Keep up the good work and long may I not need your services.</p>	<p>Thanks you for your kind remarks, staff appreciate them.</p>
119	<p>Durham has to cover a number of high responses to hospitals 3 prisons and local and civil government buildings plus one of the biggest university campuses and the A1(m) they need full cover at all times .How is High Handenhold Pelton staffed?</p>	<p>Please see the response to comment 5.</p> <p>High Handenhold has one wholetime appliance and one on-call appliance.</p>
120	<p>Durham risk too great to remove a fire engine from the area</p>	<p>Please see the response to comment 5.</p>
121	<p>Durham area far too high risk with university, cathedral and motorways to remove a fire engine from the area. Do not remove!!!</p>	<p>Please see the response to comment 5.</p>
122	<p>Durham left with one fire engine. Really???</p>	<p>Durham will have two fire appliances if option 3 is implemented. Please see the response to comment 6.</p>

123	<p>Seaham and Newton Aycliffe require a full time crew 24/7.</p> <p>Moving a Pump from Durham is a total red herring and is your preferred Option as it saves the most money. CDDFRS is at it bare bones already and has been for a number of years.</p> <p>A 5 minute delay in the deployment of a Pump from Seaham/Aycliffe will at some point in the future be the cause of a death, you are playing Russian Roulette with the people of Seaham and Newton Aycliffe.</p> <p>Yes a slick and polished performance of a Presentation disguised as "a Consultation" to suit your means.</p>	Please see the response to comment 5 and 20.
124	<p>Get your act together Durham and Darlington Fire & Rescue Service and stop losing fire appliances. Once gone you'll never get them back. Show some back bone and find another way!!!</p>	Please see the response to comment 58 and 63.
125	<p>Downgrading fire cover in Seaham when there is over 2000 new homes to be built in a new development in the next few years is not sustainable. The council tax gains from these homes should cover the cost of maintaining Seahams cover. Until then maintain it using reserves.</p>	Please see the response to comment 5.

126	Survive without making any changes until there's a change of government. It's on the cards, so keep the fire engines!!!	The Authority has a legal duty to set a balanced budget and plans to balance it over the medium term.
127	Keep the fire engines at Durham. Crazy idea!!!?	Please see the response to comment 6.
128	Am I reading this right? Are you thinking of leaving Durham with just one whole time fire engine?!?!? Good God! Let's hope there isn't 2 incidents at the same time. Get your act together Durham!!	Please see the response to comment 6.
129	Disgraceful options!!!! Keep the fire engines	Please see the response to comment 58, 63 and 126.
130	The whole point of having "emergency services" is to have spare capacity to deal efficiently with any eventuality. It seems there is no spare capacity left after decades of the three E's plus 'effectiveness'. The question is, has 'effectiveness' been sacrificed?	Please see the response to comment 58, 63 and 126.
131	Ref question 3. Certainly not option 1 as I think it dangerous to have no staffing overnight at Seaham. And the 5 minute response for on call fireman is somewhat ambitious, unless you have a crew of firemen who live in the IMMEDIATE vicinity of the fire station! Seaham is a growing town therefore not a brilliant idea to base important	The Service employs firefighters and has done so for over 27 years. Firemen is an outdated and sexist term that isn't appropriate in this day and age. We already operate an on-call model with a 5 minute response standard at Seaham as we do employ firefighters who live within 5 minutes of the station. Please see the response to comment 5 in relation to growth in Seaham. The modelling data simply informs decisions we also apply professional judgement.

	decisions wholly on a computer model. Everything is not black or white. There are grey areas.	
132	All the above choices seem a sensible and practical way of dealing with reduced resources in a cost effective way.	Noted.
133	No change to Durham at all!	Please see the response to comment 6.
134	But will this not have a detrimental impact on the response for Durham incidents?	Please see the response to comment 6.
135	Quite honestly whoever came up with these ideas are absolute idiots keep the Durham fire fighters in there brand new headquarter in Durham Bishop Auckland is too far away for any emergency the other side if Durham	We believe you have the misunderstood options. In option 3 the proposal is to move an appliance to Spennymoor not Bishop Auckland.
136	None of these options are acceptable. They may be called out within 5 mins but how long will it take them to get there. Why remove services from a city? If they're needed in Durham area its not a quick journey to get there from n aycliffe etc	We believe you have the misunderstood options. In option 3 the proposal is to move an appliance to Spennymoor not Newton Aycliffe. On-call firefighters respond to the station within five minutes from the call coming in. We do not wait five minutes to call them into the station. The majority of appliances in County Durham are staffed by on-call firefighters.
137	Option 3 seems by far the best option in terms of maintaining the service provided, and at a lower cost.	Noted.

138	This appears to be the best way for safety reasons	Noted.
139	Aycliffe needs 24hour cover as we have one of the largest industrial estates and we are closer to the A1M motorway and it seems we pay one of the highest council taxes so we should keep 24 hour cover	Please see the response to comment 20. The council tax precept level for fire and rescue is standard for everyone in the same band across County Durham and Darlington. We believe you are referring to the Town Council precept level that does not fund the fire and rescue service.
140	Do not reduce number of fire engines at Durham, this city is expanding with the student population in high rise properties	Please see the response to comment 6.
141	Removing a fire engine from Durham station is endangering lives in Durham city whose population is mostly students in high rise properties	Please see the response to comment 6.
142	Surly option two and three is robbing Peter to pay Paul. Leaving Durham with sub standard provision for a vast area. Leave Durham station alone and employ more staff to cover other areas. Improvements need to be made to encourage more into the local fire service instead of being reliant on other areas. Local MPs need to be lobbying parliament for more money for better and more workable provisions which makes it safe for all areas of this district.	Please see the response to comment 6 and 58. Local MPs do regularly lobby the government for increased funding for the fire and rescue service.

143	<p>In the event of an incident occurring over night at Newton Aycliffe or Seaham Option 2 gives the greatest chance of lives being saved. I can appreciate the cost implications but think the cost of losing a single life would balance out finances saved. I think the savings should be considered elsewhere.</p>	<p>Please see the response to comment 5 and 20.</p> <p>Over the last 8 years we have been forced to make savings across all areas of the organisation.</p>
144	<p>Hello</p> <p>No option is a good option in my opinion. It would be beneficial to carry out the proposed changes that were issued 12 months ago by the fire service. - Changes to DCP were not mentioned in this list.</p> <p>Asking for the public's thoughts and opinions seems to be a PR stunt as it's already confirmed as to what changes will be made. Very much like asking the firefighters who currently work the DCP System their thoughts and feelings, before doing the exact opposite.</p> <p>It is my understanding that dcp plus will be changed to a 9-9, 4 on-4 off 'FAMILY FRIENDLY' shift system commencing April 2019.</p> <p>I myself work full time, have a young family and a partner employed by DDFRS. my job is very demanding meaning I leave the family home at 7.30am and return early evening 6/7pm</p>	<p>Please see the response to comment 26.</p> <p>This is a meaningful consultation and all comments will be fully considered prior to any decisions being made.</p> <p>No final decisions will be made until the end of February 2019.</p> <p>Thank you for a detailed explanation of the impact of these changes on you and your family. Please see the response to comment 93.</p>

<p>I value my time away from work and weekends are very important to me. The 9till9 shift system is, in your words, 'family friendly' please correct me if I'm wrong , but what evidence do you base this on?</p> <p>It doesn't take a mathematical genius to calculate the time away from home and hours of potential family weekend time lost to a shift that pattern that I imagine to be the least preferred choice of current staff.</p> <p>For example, it's wednesday, my partner leaves the family home at 7.30am for his first 9-9 shift. We live 50 minutes away but he will now be traveling at peak times so let's provide extra time for traffic.</p> <p>Now the fire service has moved on from drinking tea all day so I imagine he will have a busy day??? Fast forward to 9pm, peak time for call outs in the area. High chance he will be off station at incident. If he is lucky he will be home for 10pm. I say lucky because the stats for call outs beteeen 7-9pm are higher than other times. So this could possibly mean he doesn't return home till 10.30/11pm. At this time his family will be in bed.</p> <p>Let's repeat this for the next 3 days. Thursday through to Saturday night. Where is the family time here ???? I understand family time to be time spent together as a family during day time hours. So this</p>	<p>We will take full account of your feedback as we discuss alternative arrangements.</p> <p>Please see the response to comment 30.</p>
---	---

week I get one day. The Sunday. Let's hope he is refreshed !

Roll onto the next week. Thursday - Sunday. Nope , no family time here. What about the week after?

Friday till Monday. No. Again family time is non existent. How about week 4, Saturday through to Monday evening. Well I return home at 6.30 Friday evening, so yes, we will have 15 minutes together before our daughter goes to bed.

1 day and 15 minutes over a 4 week period. If you are being pedantic you could total the other 15 minutes a day when I return home and he is on his rest days.

Family friendly? I think not.

You may argue that other stations work 4 shifts in a row over multiple weekends. This is correct however the 2/2/4 system with family friendly start/Finish times allow for more freedom before and after shifts.

You may also argue that 9-9 is better than working 4/5 continuous shifts similar to what they do now which to some may seem to be less favorable. Well my partner chose to do that, he is paid an enhancement to do it and his family can visit anytime. Add on to that flexible working shifts, a maximum of 10 shifts falling on a Friday Saturday or Sunday and it becomes very appealing. 3 shifts

Friday - Sunday (plus 1 more shift) over a two month period is far more appealing and family friendly.

Now I think I have covered the 'family friendly' issue. It would be interesting to know the financial implications of changing the shift system. Despite being told that DDFRS supports DCP and does not want to change this system, it seems that changes will be made imminently.

We have recently remortgaged, taking into account total family income. This will change when his shift pattern changes so how does the service plan to soften the financial blow and problems that may arise?

Looking towards the future it was our intention to increase our family. With the drop in family income this will have a detrimental affect on time spent on maternity leave. Time that was supported by DCP to give that special family time a new born requires.

I fully understand there are many other issues connected to this topic. Budget, fire cover, retained availability, or lack of it, but as someone who doesn't work for CDDFRS but has a family member who does, then this is my greatest concern.

Thank you

145	<p>The City of Durham Parish Council has carefully considered the details of County Durham and Darlington's Fire and Rescue Service's integrated risk management plan for 2018/19.</p> <p>Keeping residents safe and secure is at the core of the service the Fire and Rescue Authority provides. We believe that 0 deaths in house fires in 2017/18, a 17% reduction in domestic fire-related injuries in 2017/18 and 88% of survey respondents describing themselves as feeling either safe or very safe in County Durham and Darlington is testament to the outstanding work the Authority does on a daily basis.</p> <p>Equally, the City of Durham Parish Council recognises the growing demands on the service at a time of significantly increased financial pressures, with funding from central Government continuing to decline and a shortfall in funding from 2019/20 onwards. The need for the service to identify £448,000 of savings in 2019/20, rising to £735,000 in 2021/22 undoubtedly represents a real challenge and we welcome the opportunity to give our views on the proposals as set out in the Risk management plan.</p> <p>In relation to the Bishop Auckland crewing arrangements, following the review of emergency response provision in 2017, the City of Durham Parish Council does believe that, if successful, this staffing arrangement should be made permanent. We recognise the importance of the review which took place in relation to emergency response and believe that the staffing arrangements as proposed</p>	<p>Thank you for your supportive words, staff appreciate them.</p> <p>Please see the response to comment 6.</p>
-----	---	---

would ensure both the fire engine and the SRU are immediately available to respond to incidents. Furthermore, this also means that swift water rescue capability, also based at Bishop Auckland, can be immediately deployed.

The City of Durham Parish Council also supports the CDDFRS's intention to explore further collaboration opportunities with the Tyne and Wear Fire and Rescue Service (TWFRS) and Northumberland Fire and Rescue Service (NFRS) as a way and means to improve efficiency, effectiveness, increase public safety and deliver better value for money. It is right that the CDDFRS enhances collaborations like this as a key strategic objective and it is positive to hear of the range of successful partnerships in areas such as: shared estates; shared operational resources; shared community engagement; and tri-service responders in rural areas, which the service have entered into.

In relation to the proposed revised crewing options as set out in the integrated risk management plan, the City of Durham Parish Council recognises that Option 3 is the preferred option of CDDFRS and we confirm that this would be our preferred option. While we are aware of the timescale with which decisions have to be made, we would indicate our confirmation in response to the current situation. This option would ensure that there are firefighters on duty at Seaham and Newton Aycliffe for 12 hours during the day and on call firefighters available within 5 minutes

of receiving an emergency call. In addition, moving Durham's second fire engine and crew permanently to Spennymoor to replace the current arrangements would mean both sites would be able to offer an immediate response 24 hours a day, seven days a week with identical resources when responding to incidents. We recognise that this option is based on a wide variety of statistical analysis, with delivering improved outcomes and better value for money at its core. This option would ensure that firefighters are geographically stationed in the best possible place to respond to incidents across the service and resources would be allocated where they were most effective; at the same time creating annual efficiency savings of £450,000.

However, we would wish to qualify our confirmation in terms of future risk and would invite the CDDFRS to provide us with appropriate reassurance in relation to the loss in the number of fire engines from the Durham station. As a Council, we are concerned about the impact this will have on both response times and on those occasions where there are multiple simultaneous incidents in our area which reduced capacity and fire engine availability would no doubt exacerbate. In particular we are concerned that this reduction takes place at a time when the City is subject to a number of large Purpose-Built Student Accommodation (PBSA) buildings which are often four or more storeys in height, will be densely

	<p>populated, often with students from overseas, and in locations where there is not always easy access other than from the front. Should the need arise that a fire crew were needed from Spennymoor to attend an incident in Durham, this will no doubt have an impact on response times and also on the potential for a bigger risk by a reduction in level of proximate service. We would welcome a response to assure ourselves that, in supporting the option, sufficient attention has been given to this issue when deciding to withdraw the engine from the Durham station.</p>	
146	Trust the Experts!	Thank you.
147	1 engine is not enough at Durham - it's a world heritage site and if there is a major incident you'll be in trouble.	Please see the response to comment 6.
148	as a resident at Newton Aycliffe, we already have a shared police/fire station. Aycliffe is a growing town and deserve to maintain a full time 24 hour service.	Please see the response to comment 20.
149	<p>The reason i did not chose option 3 is it feels where I live we have very little fire cover from CDDFRS and this would make things worse.</p> <p>I appreciate the time taken for the presentation, the issue and solutions were clearly presented and easy</p>	Please see the response to comments 5 and 6.

	to understand - much easier to digest than the one I read for TWFRS (I have family that live in their area).	
150	Use W/T crews for cover roles only - not nightshifts from stn's 6 and 4. This may be required on occasion as RDS cover is not guaranteed. Bishop Auckland - ensure station staffing is at competent levels, leave 6 trained personnel on duty. If collaboration saves money then do it, plus save on uniform, ppe etc etc	Noted
151	Please leave High Handenhold FS alone	There are no plans at present to change the crewing arrangements at High Handenhold.
152	It seems sensible to spread resources across 3 geographical areas rather than the other options	Noted.
153	Keep up the good work...we trust your judgement and that of the Fire Authority	Thank you for your kind words.
154	If response times and standards are met	Noted.
155	Parish of Brancepeth will be better served under option 3 2 important Grade 1 listed buildings are there, castle and saxon church	Noted.
156	Sensible to provide cover to the Brandon area	Noted.