



LONDON FIRE BRIGADE

Decision title

Review of Proposal to Move the Second Pumping Appliance from Kingston Fire Station to New Malden Fire Station

Recommendation by
Assistant Director, Strategy and Risk

Decision Number
LFC-0074x-D

Protective marking: **NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**
Publication status: Published in full

Summary

The draft London Safety Plan (2017) proposed to move the second pumping appliance from Kingston Fire Station to New Malden Fire Station. In response to the consultation and improving local performance of the second appliance average attendance time, the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority decided to delay that decision and to review the position in a year.

The findings of the review are set out in LFC-0074x. The recommendation of the review is not to move the second appliance from Kingston Fire Station.

Decision

That the London Fire Commissioner:

1. Notes the conclusion and recommendation of the review proposed in the London Safety Plan (2017) and detailed within the report and decides not to move the second pumping appliance from Kingston Fire Station to New Malden Fire Station, and
2. Notes that the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames and those who responded to the London Safety Plan consultation, and who provided their contact details, will be informed of the outcome of the review.

Dany Cotton QFSM
London Fire Commissioner

Date 25-10-18

Access to Information – Contact Officer

| | |
|------------------|-------------------------------|
| Name | Steven Adams |
| Telephone | 020 8555 1200 |
| Email | governance@london-fire.gov.uk |



LONDON FIRE BRIGADE

Report title

Review of Proposal to Move the Second Pumping Appliance from Kingston Fire Station to New Malden Fire Station

Report to

London Fire Commissioner

Date

10 October 2018

Report by

Assistant Director Strategy and Risk

Report number

LFC-0074x

Protective marking: **NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

Publication status: Published in full

Summary

The draft London Safety Plan (2017) proposed to move the second pumping appliance from Kingston Fire Station to New Malden Fire Station. In response to the consultation and improving local performance of the second appliance average attendance time, the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority decided to delay that decision and to review the position in a year.

The findings of the review are set out in this report. The recommendation of the review is not to move the second appliance from Kingston Fire Station.

Recommended decision

That the London Fire Commissioner:

1. Notes the conclusion and recommendation of the review proposed in the London Safety Plan (2017) and detailed within the report and decides not to move the second pumping appliance from Kingston Fire Station to New Malden Fire Station, and
2. Notes that the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames and those who responded to the London Safety Plan consultation, and who provided their contact details, will be informed of the outcome of the review.

Background

1. At its meeting on 24 November 2016, the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority agreed a draft London Safety Plan for the period 2017 – 2021 (*FEP2678 Draft London Safety Plan (2017)*). One of the proposals in the draft plan was to move the second fire appliance from Kingston Fire Station to New Malden Fire Station.
2. When London Fire Brigade set its budget for 2016/17, 13 fire engines were removed that had been away from stations since August 2013. At the time, the Brigade recognised those fire engines were not always removed from the best locations and agreed to look at whether the Brigade needed to make adjustments to the location of second fire engines to get the best speed of response across London. The review of the Brigade's resources by Anthony Mayer also recommended looking at where second fire engines are located, to help improve attendance times.
3. London Fire Brigade modelled the best locations for second fire engines. There were five changes that could have been made. On further analysis, at the London-wide level, the five moves would have improved the time it would have taken a second fire engine to attend an incident by less than one second. However, the local differences would have been greater, as each individual move would result in slightly slower average second fire engine attendance times in the areas from where they had been removed but would make improvements in the areas where they would be relocated. The Brigade always considers the borough level impact of any proposed moves.
4. The only change that would have had an impact on achieving the Brigade's London-wide attendance standards at a borough level, was to move the second fire engine from Kingston to New Malden, which would have brought Kingston borough within the second fire engine average target of eight minutes. This is because the location of New Malden fire station (on the border of Merton and Kingston boroughs) improves attendance times in a number of surrounding areas. This would have resulted in a beneficial impact for Kingston overall.
5. The Plan was approved for consultation, which commenced on 5 December 2016 and closed on 30 January 2017.

Consultation on the Plan

6. Following a request from local Fire Brigades Union (FBU) representatives, a special public meeting was arranged during the consultation period at Kingston Fire Station largely about the proposal to move this second appliance. It was well attended by local residents, representatives from Ham House National Trust, several local politicians and FBU representatives. Although scheduled for an hour, the meeting lasted for two hours because of the number of questions and issues raised.
7. In terms of responses to the formal consultation, 1,820 respondents commented on this specific proposal. 836 (46 per cent) supported the proposal to move the second fire engine from Kingston Fire Station to New Malden Fire Station. This was set against 765 respondents (42 per cent) who neither agreed nor disagreed with the proposal and 219 respondents (12 per cent) who disagreed.
8. The FBU opposed the move and provided a summary of concerns drafted by local FBU members. The FBU's submission and the Brigade's response is set out within *FEP2723 London Safety Plan 2017*.

9. A petition with 144 signatures was also received from local residents in Kingston affected by the change. The petition was opposed to making the change. A second petition by local residents opposing the change was received after the consultation closed. However, there was no official response from the Royal Borough of Kingston-upon-Thames, or the other boroughs impacted (positively and negatively) by the proposed move.
10. In the main, those who were opposed to the proposal cited concerns about the impacts on some wards in Kingston itself and in the neighbouring borough of Richmond. There were also concerns about whether or not all relevant local risks had been taken into account.

Response to Consultation

11. When the final version of the London Safety Plan (2017) was presented to the Authority for approval on 30 March 2017, officers noted that while the move would have benefitted greater numbers of people than it would have adversely affected, they acknowledged the concerns raised by local residents who may have been adversely impacted by the change.
12. Performance in Kingston had begun to show improvement. Second fire engine attendance performance in Kingston was within eight minutes on average in 2015/16, for the first time. Furthermore, second fire engine performance in Kingston for 2016/17 was then predicted to also be within or close to the target.
13. Officers believed that it could be difficult to continue to reliably deliver second appliance attendance performance within the eight-minute average London-wide target in Kingston without moving the second fire engine to New Malden. However, given the recent improved performance by crews, and local concerns about the move, the Plan was revised.
14. The Authority agreed in the London Safety Plan (2017) to delay any decision regarding moving the second fire engine at Kingston and to review the position in one year.

Review of Proposal

15. The proposal to move the second appliance at Kingston fire station to New Malden fire station was based on the fact that Kingston borough was outside the second appliance average attendance standard (8 minutes). At the time, modelling showed the Kingston second pump performance at 8m:02s and the actual performance was also outside of the target.
16. The relocation of the second pump to New Malden was anticipated to bring Kingston borough within the second pump standard with modelled performance of 7m:45s. Though not the main subject of this report, it should be noted that the modelling carried out for the London Safety Plan 2017 also showed Richmond borough outside the average first pump standard. However, actual performance was within target and it was largely unaffected by the second pump move proposal.
17. The table below shows borough performance now, alongside the modelled performance before and after the move of the second pump, published at the time the move was proposed. It is clear that actual performance London-wide and in the boroughs impacted by the second pump (New Malden/Kingston move) are now all within the average attendance standard and have been for the last three years.

Modelled performance against actual performance

| Average first | | | | Actual performance | | | | |
|----------------------|----------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Borough | Modelled performance (LSP) | | | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 |
| | Before | After | Impact | | | | | |
| London-wide | 05:27 | 05:27 | 00:00 | 05:18 | 05:27 | 05:32 | 05:22 | 05:13 |
| Kingston upon Thames | 05:58 | 05:55 | -0:03 | 06:01 | 05:52 | 05:44 | 05:46 | 05:22 |
| Merton | 05:48 | 05:44 | -0:04 | 05:31 | 05:31 | 05:31 | 05:36 | 05:19 |
| Richmond upon Thames | 06:01 | 06:02 | +0:01 | 06:02 | 05:51 | 05:52 | 05:45 | 05:26 |
| Sutton | 05:39 | 05:39 | 0:00 | 05:50 | 05:43 | 05:41 | 05:37 | 05:28 |
| <i>Times in m:ss</i> | | | | | | | | |

| Average second | | | | Actual performance | | | | |
|----------------------|----------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Borough | Modelled performance (LSP) | | | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 |
| | Before | After | Impact | | | | | |
| London-wide | 06:47 | 06:46 | -0:01 | 06:39 | 06:48 | 06:51 | 06:44 | 06:34 |
| Kingston upon Thames | 08:02 | 07:45 | -0:17 | 08:21 | 08:04 | 07:38 | 07:51 | 07:28 |
| Merton | 07:45 | 07:19 | -0:26 | 07:42 | 07:36 | 07:10 | 07:30 | 07:14 |
| Richmond upon Thames | 07:29 | 07:47 | +0:18 | 08:26 | 07:12 | 07:27 | 07:16 | 07:07 |
| Sutton | 07:07 | 07:06 | -0:01 | 07:03 | 07:01 | 07:06 | 06:55 | 06:38 |
| <i>Times in m:ss</i> | | | | | | | | |

18. Since the introduction of the Vision mobilising system (in late 2015), attendance time performance has improved year on year, despite the reduction of stations and appliances implemented as part of the Fifth London Safety Plan and subsequently. All boroughs shown are now comfortably within the attendance standard.
19. Performance at the ward level was not a driver for the proposal, although the impacts of the proposal on ward level performance were acknowledged. The Brigade does not seek to achieve the attendance standards at ward level; the standards are for London-wide performance. Performance at ward level is more variable and this, together with the relatively lower number of incidents, mean that it is not possible to reliably model the impacts of proposals at ward level.
20. However, it was possible to predict those that would 'benefit' and 'lose' as a result of the proposal. Officers have looked at ward performance as a part of this review and, as with borough attendance performance, ward performance has generally improved over the period 2015 to 2018. Of the wards that would have been impacted by the move of the second appliance, 12 were outside the first appliance standard in 2015, and nine were outside in 2018. For second appliance attendance, 16 were outside the standard in 2015, and 10 were outside in 2018.

Conclusion

21. Actual performance London-wide and in the boroughs impacted by the proposed move of the second pump from Kingston to New Malden are now all within the average attendance standards and have been for the last three years.
22. This performance suggests that the move is no longer necessary in order to maintain performance within the attendance standards. It is therefore recommended not to move the second appliance from Kingston Fire Station.
23. In accordance with good practice, those who responded to the London Safety Plan consultation and who provided their contact details, will be informed of the outcome of the review. Officers will also share the outcome with the Royal Borough of Kingston-Upon-Thames.

Finance comments

24. This report recommends that the proposal to move the second pumping appliance from Kingston Fire Station to New Malden is withdrawn. This move was not expected to result in any

budget implications and as a result if the proposal is withdrawn there will not be any financial pressures.

Workforce comments

25. The Fire Brigades Union has not been consulted formally, but are expected to support the recommendation in the report, given their objection to the original proposal. No other staff groups are affected by the recommendation.

Legal comments

26. The production of a London Safety Plan is a requirement of the National Framework issued by the Secretary of State under section 21 of the Fire and Rescue Services Act 2004. Section 21(7) of the Act requires fire and rescue authorities to have regard to the Framework in carrying out their functions. The framework requires the London Fire Commissioner to have integrated risk action plans which are to be the subject of formal consultation.
27. In setting out its management strategy and risk-based programme for enforcing the provisions of the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005 within the London Safety Plan, the London Fire Commissioner must also act in accordance with the Regulators Code. The National Framework also requires authorities to have effective business continuity arrangements in place in accordance with their duties under the Civil Contingencies Act 2004.
27. The London Safety Plan 2017 committed the Brigade to review the position to move the second fire engine from Kingston to New Malden. The review has taken place, and the Brigade's duty has been discharged. The recommendation of the review being taken by the London Fire Commissioner means that there will be no change to the current position and therefore there is no change to the London Safety Plan 2017.

Sustainability implications

28. There are no implications arising from the recommendation, as there is no change proposed to the current position.

Equalities implications

29. There are no implications arising from the recommendation, as there is no change proposed to the current position.

List of Appendices

30. None.