CRMP Consultation 2024 - 2029 - External feedback	
Is the draft CRMP document easy to read and understand?	CFRS feedback and comment
If you responded 'no' to Q1, please tell us what we can do to improve the document.	
	The LRF section at the back of the document details the specifics of
	the LRF and the link will be checked on formal publication. To find
	the website you can also enter 'Local Resilience Forum
No info regards LRF - When you click the link it says page not found	Cambridgeshire' into a search engine.
	As this is not specific, we do not know which data is being referred
Use the correct data to ensure the public are not mislead and misinformed	to and therefore cannot address this.

Much to commend in doc but some queries;	Points addressed in order.
due to covid but this is not mentioned in this section although raised in section. The Calls we	Figure 2 - Comment in CRMP added about Covid impact to figures and call profiles.
- Table Total Number of Mobilisations per Day' shows 10 busiest ever days in past 5 years. Could this not be part of an expanded section of the 'Growing Impact of Climate Change'. Climate warming is creating warmer summers with more extreme downpours and winters with flooding and potentially could be more severe winters. Will need more resources to	This is covered in this section to outline the impact of extreme weather on CFRS and forms 2 risks in our strategic risk register. We have to balance the detail and length of document against incorporating too much detail that makes it too complex, we are content that extreme weather is included within our planning.
<ul> <li>Wildfire Risk section refers to the summer of 2020 - surely this is 2022?</li> <li>Youth Engagement. Doesn't even mention Firebreak courses. Seems to be a key omission?</li> </ul>	Re MunichRE graph - no that is the most recent publicly available at this time. Re summer of 2020 - 2022 added to this section
F Culture states Our Service has a good organisational culture. That's not for us to say -	Fire break is mentioned in the actions listed under Community Safety Excellence
- Technology. No mention of sustainability in this area? Reduce carbon and work with tech suppliers re environmental, social and governance sustainability in tech. Globally IT produces more carbon than the global airline industry! We need to shine a light in the dark recesses of IT and its carbon footprint.	Culture clarified with evidence used to make the statement.
- Sustainability section. Sustainability should be embedded in everything we do and not have its own little section. This section only focuses on carbon. This is emphasised in a later section on sustainability referring to carbon offsetting, waste reduction and single use plastic. Sustainability includes these but is bigger and has social and governance obligations. To be sustainable we need to engage with all suppliers and ensure they are sustainable - includes not using child or slave labour, not using additional resources but re-use/recycle, no	sustainability strategy that reaches across our organisation. It is incorporated across all stands, however we feel that it does need to be mentioned as it is such an important issue. In this document we are referencing individual items that are woven across our entire
we use in fires have any environmental impact? If so then push our suppliers to innovate.	with the Carbon Trust for an independent review.
<ul> <li>Have we baselined our carbon footprint? This isn't easy to do.</li> <li>Document looks to have been written by many people. Needs one person to edit to provide</li> </ul>	It takes many people to formulate our CRMP, we have worked to ensure consistency. To address this and the next point, there will be

consistency.	a final proof-read before publication and the final document will be
- Document might need re-sectionising. There's a lot of repetition of points and it doesn't	designed, this is just the word document.
quite flow.	
Do you think we have included all the significant risks for Cambridgeshire?	
If you answered 'no' to the previous question, please tell us why you think that and what	
you think should be included.	
	This is a vague statement, so we cannot understand the change
Water risks? - it might be in LRF but can't check	required; possibly referencing flooding, water ways or our access to

	water. However, all these are incorporated in the detailed planning and risk analysis behind the formation of our CRMP.
	,
You have stated the following:	
In terms of location, mapping five years of historic incident data (most serious incidents	
- primary fires, RTCs and special services) has shown us which of our on-call fire	
engines we need to have available around the clock to best meet our response standards (these are in addition to the four wholetime stations, three day-crewed	
stations and our two roaming fire engines which are crewed by wholetime firefighters).	
We have called these strategic on-call CRMP stations and they are:	
• Yaxley	
• Whittlesey	
March	
Chatteris	
• Ramsey	
• Cambourne	
• Cottenham	
• Soham	
• Sawston	
	We think this means we cannot say we have roaming fire engines and then all those on-call stations available as the roaming fire
This again is incorrect and misleading as the roaming pumps are quite often sent to these	engines sometimes provide the cover instead of that strategic on-
stations due to lack of crewing so to advise that these stations are on in addition to the	call station. We have added a clarification statement to the CRMP to
roaming pumps is incorrect	address this point.
	We have not covered all the risks we face in our CRMP but
Based on what has happened historically. Needs to look at worse case scenarios future risks -	
obscure and unlikely but massive impact risks. For example - ransomware in ICT as has	which contains detailed and specific risks. We also pay due regard
happened already to another FRS. Physical risk to staff due to negative reports in other	to the national and local community risk registers when researching
	our CRMP. Cyber security is one of the highest risks we face was
Washes for example.	referenced but we have made this more specific now in the CRMP.

Do the actions look appropriate to address the identified risks and opportunities?	
If you answered 'no' to the previous question, please tell us why you think that and what you believe is missing.	
	Typing in 'Local Resilience Forum Cambridgeshire' in a search engine will allow you to gain access to the required information. We note
Unsure as cannot access LRF to compare	the link wasn't working and will check this prior to publication.
Shutting stations should never be the answer, especially when this is being led by financial decisions as appose to public safety	
Staff are not being redeployed they are being terminated this will decrease the number of trained firefighters you have available	Unsure what specific changes are being requested to the CRMP as there is no direct reference to the points made here. We continually look at service improvements and will consult and
Poor senior management decisions in regards to recruitment and new mobilizing systems wil ultimately put the public at a greater risk	engage on specific activities in addition to the overall CRMP consultation.
Is there anything missing you think we have overlooked (that you have not already mentioned), or anything you would have expected to see in this plan that isn't there?	
I understand a lot of the data and tables are linked to the 2021 Census information, which means they only provide data up to year 2021/22. This is data for only half of the last IRMP and from an outsider I would possibly question that does the service have the information available to create plans and inform decisions they make as they are unable to provide any information for 2022/23 onwards?	Preparation for the CRMP starts 18 months in advance of publication, and we take a snapshot of the data available to us then Annually, we review and refresh our data to ensure we continue to be aligned. The Census data is released on a 10-year basis and is the most detailed data available for use.
Page 24 you've got your timings wrong for when WT appliances are available during the day. You've stated 9am-6pm	Thank you for spotting this, we have amended this.
CRMP Consultation 2024 - 2029	- External feedback
Is the draft CRMP document easy to read and understand?	

If you responded 'no' to Q1, please tell us what we can do to improve the document.

It might be 'plain English', but there are some big words and concepts, and the document goes on and on. At whom is it aimed? I found myself skim-reading, and I cannot think of even the most dedicated civil servant studying a document such as this for each county's service.	The CRMP is aimed at all our community and partner agencies; it is also used internally by our people. It is challenging to provide a summary without providing the background and context. We have reduced this document considerably over the years. It is less than 40 pages to outline our context, planning and plans for the next 5 years. On our website with our feedback survey, we did provide a condensed summary of our risks and actions for people recognising
Rather too wordy?	that some people may not want to read the background and
Make it shorter	analysis we did. We will do this when we publish our final CRMP
less jargon. a public information document should not need a glossary	too.
Do you think we have included all the significant risks for Cambridgeshire?	
If you answered 'no' to the previous question, please tell us why you think that and what you think should be included.	
Closing fire stations is a huge risk to villages and towns that are only growing	We continually look at service improvements and will consult and engage on specific activities in addition to the CRMP consultation.
Little mention of the increase in science/research facilities and the likelihood of a younger population being attracted by those jobs. No mention on the risk to water resources from over-development of housing around Cambridge.	We have not covered all the risks in our CRMP but highlighted the most prevalent. We have a strategic risk register which contains detailed and specific risks. We also pay due regard to the National and local community risk registers when putting our CRMP together. With regard to water rescources, it is unclear if this means flooding or access to water? We are consulted about Hydrant placements on new build developments and we are engaged with the Local Resilience Forum (LRF) to understand and plan for flooding risks.
There is no mention of the fire station in Manea. There was a suggestion that this station may close, but with the constant expansion of the village, is this seen as a viable option for the safety of the village with the closest next pump being in Chatteris.	Under the actions for Operational Excellence we state that we will 'Work to align operational resources and skills (wholetime, on-call and fire control) to our risk and demand, understanding how we respond to incidents and the number of resources required to safely resolve them, and to ensure that we are maximising our productivity and efficiency.' The redistribution of resources from

	Manea and two other on-call fire stations is part of this action point
	which is a continuation of an action point in the current IRMP which
	ends on March 31, 2024. Consultation and engagement around
	specific options as part of this work will be carried out separately
	from the overall CRMP consultation.
I don't know as I lost patience	No specific changes requested.
	Although there is nothing specific that references flooding it is
I have tried to read the report which although is clearly written and contains a lot. Of	covered under extreme weather conditions and we plan for this as
background information, is very long for the average person to read. If it was your job, you	part of the Local Resilience Forum under the civil contingencies act.
could spend all day reading each word, but a summary would be useful on one page. I missed	We did provide a summary of the risks, opportunities and actions on
the response to flooding incidents.	the consultation webpage and we will do the same when we publish
	the final version.
Do the actions look appropriate to address the identified risks and opportunities?	
If you answered 'no' to the previous question, please tell us why you think that and what you believe is missing. See above. No mention of this aspect means no provision. (Previous comment referred to	Please see response above re Manea.
closure of fire stations)	reuse see response above re manear
Is there anything missing you think we have overlooked (that you have not already	
Is there anything missing you think we have overlooked (that you have not already	
Is there anything missing you think we have overlooked (that you have not already mentioned), or anything you would have expected to see in this plan that isn't there?	Thank you for the feedback
Is there anything missing you think we have overlooked (that you have not already mentioned), or anything you would have expected to see in this plan that isn't there? I found that the whole draft document very easy to read and understand. It shows all salient	
Is there anything missing you think we have overlooked (that you have not already mentioned), or anything you would have expected to see in this plan that isn't there? I found that the whole draft document very easy to read and understand. It shows all salient points quite clearly. All in all a very well-produced document. Well done Regards	
Is there anything missing you think we have overlooked (that you have not already mentioned), or anything you would have expected to see in this plan that isn't there? I found that the whole draft document very easy to read and understand. It shows all salient points quite clearly. All in all a very well-produced document. Well done Regards Shutting stations for no reasons is just disgusting behaviour to people who rely on having a	
Is there anything missing you think we have overlooked (that you have not already mentioned), or anything you would have expected to see in this plan that isn't there? I found that the whole draft document very easy to read and understand. It shows all salient points quite clearly. All in all a very well-produced document. Well done Regards Shutting stations for no reasons is just disgusting behaviour to people who rely on having a service If you're that worried about funding cut the fat from the top, why does CFRS need so	Thank you for the feedback
Is there anything missing you think we have overlooked (that you have not already mentioned), or anything you would have expected to see in this plan that isn't there? I found that the whole draft document very easy to read and understand. It shows all salient points quite clearly. All in all a very well-produced document. Well done Regards Shutting stations for no reasons is just disgusting behaviour to people who rely on having a service If you're that worried about funding cut the fat from the top, why does CFRS need so many officers at the top ? I feel the service is becoming very misguided and old fashioned on	Thank you for the feedback
Is there anything missing you think we have overlooked (that you have not already mentioned), or anything you would have expected to see in this plan that isn't there? I found that the whole draft document very easy to read and understand. It shows all salient points quite clearly. All in all a very well-produced document. Well done Regards Shutting stations for no reasons is just disgusting behaviour to people who rely on having a service If you're that worried about funding cut the fat from the top, why does CFRS need so many officers at the top ? I feel the service is becoming very misguided and old fashioned on how it operates and maybe should look at keeping staff and work out why people don't want	Thank you for the feedback
Is there anything missing you think we have overlooked (that you have not already mentioned), or anything you would have expected to see in this plan that isn't there? I found that the whole draft document very easy to read and understand. It shows all salient points quite clearly. All in all a very well-produced document. Well done Regards Shutting stations for no reasons is just disgusting behaviour to people who rely on having a service If you're that worried about funding cut the fat from the top, why does CFRS need so many officers at the top ? I feel the service is becoming very misguided and old fashioned on how it operates and maybe should look at keeping staff and work out why people don't want to stay.	Thank you for the feedback No specific changes requested.

areas are skimmed over (increase in EV vehicles resulting in fires that are difficult to put out	We cover EV under emerging technologies in the risk and opportunity section.
sharing your plans for dealing with vehicle fires. I would expect from you Clear information	We cover EV under emerging technologies in the risk and opportunity section. We engage in the national communications around EV and emerging technologies and we will continue to work with our partners in this area.
The potential for an increase in domestic fires due to the 'cost of living' increases. Cheaper	This is a risk we recognise and we already have this listed as a strategic risk in our risk register. It is a focus in our prevention strategy, however, it is too detailed for inclusion in the high-level CRMP.
In terms of rescues and collisions, more preventative measures and education of young riders and e-scooters and the aftermath of this to victims and riders and yourself	We have this listed as a strategic risk in our risk register and this is a focus in our prevention strategy and activities, including proactive messaging on our social media channels and work with local media. It is too detailed for inclusion on the high-level CRMP.
about fluvial flooding or surface drainage flooding either. Also not much about the	Although there is nothing specific that references flooding it is covered under the extreme weather conditions and we plan for this as part of the Local Resilience Forum under the civil contingencies act.
most appropriate feedback to high risk individuals. Checks for fire risk due to lack of party walls in older terraced houses on house visits. More campaigns around road safety for the	Both are covered in our prevention and protection strategies. It is too detailed for inclusion in our high-level CRMP. We do regular road safety messaging on our social media channels as well as proactive events with partners targeting different audiences.

No mention that I saw of the use of social media. I only found this on Neighbourhood and I find articles on that forum very useful, such as not placing a charging item in an escape route although many older people don't use this as much	Good to hear how this engagement was found. We use a variety of communication channels to reach different audiences and will look at how we can further enhance them.
	We do regularly post about access issues on our social media sites
	and have worked with local media to highlight the issue. We will
I don't recall any mention of working with local councils to support the access issues with car	scontinue to do this.
parked so as to restrict access. Another point I would strongly encourage is engaging not just	
with health services to identify those at risk but also community trusts to also identify those	We do have a number of data sharing agreements (including oxygen
disabled individuals who have egress issues and those on oxygen therapy. I am sure this has	data) to help us to identify those most at risk in the communities
been considered and I apologise if I missed this. As a health professional, this has been an	and we also conduct joint visits to these individuals to address any
issue for me for those with long term conditions who live alone and have great difficult to no	trisks identified.
only leave the property but also move around their home.	
	These are covered in our prevention strategy but is too detailed for
	inclusion in our high-level CRMP.

## **CRMP Consultation 2024 - 2029 - Union Feedback**

I don't think its overlooked, but certainly could clarify better. When talking about resources and requiring 14 pumps (2 x 6 pump jobs, plus 2 spare), I think we should be making it clear this is 14 pumps of 5 firefighters. Given that we now operate some appliances with 2 or 3 firefighters, I think it would be easy to confuse our intent on the statement with something that is technically accurate but does not provide the same, or required amount of resources to deal with the size of incident described.	This has not changed since our previous IRMP. The measure is 14 fully crewed fire engines. Crews of 2 or 3 are not included within the 14 fire engines listed.
I would also like to see mentioned in the document our commitment to DECON and the focus on reducing the risk of cancers caused by firefighting. I know CFRS have got a real determination and have taken many steps towards this change in mindset, attitude and behaviours and it would be nice to record this formally in the CRMP.	This would be covered in the CRMP action plan under the 4th bullet point in operational excellence