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**PART ONE: INTRODUCTION, CONTEXT & GOALS**

1. **Introduction**

The Nottinghamshire Fire and Rescue Service’s (NFRS) Community Risk Management Plan (CRMP) consultation aimed to engage with our communities, stakeholders and workforce to gather meaningful insights that would inform the development of our CRMP and the strategic priorities outlined within it.

This report presents the findings of the consultation, designed to increase outreach, feedback and consultation responses and deliver for a cost-efficiencies.

The methodology used combined quantitative and qualitative methods to capture a wide range of perspectives:

An online survey was developed to gather broad feedback from the public, stakeholders, and staff. This provided measurable data to underpin analysis.

For additional depth, the Service facilitated focus groups, which allowed participants to explore the key themes of the CRMP in greater detail and provided richer, more nuanced insights.

The Service engaged directly with minoritised groups to ensure their voices were heard, ensuring the findings reflect the diversity of the population of Nottinghamshire. This included targeted communications, partnership work with community organisations, and adapting consultation methods to meet the needs of different groups.

This report consolidates the findings of the consultation process, providing a comprehensive review of the feedback received and its implications for the CRMP.

The insights gathered will play a crucial role in confirming and shaping our strategic direction and ensuring that our Service continues to effectively manage community risk, meet public expectations, and deliver on our commitment to equality, diversity, and inclusion.

1. **A Change in Approach**

For this consultation, NFRS adopted a new approach – delivering the consultation entirely in-house. This contrasts with previous CRMP consultations that have commissioned external specialists at a cost of approximately £30,000 (based on 2021 consultation).

The consultation was conducted by the Corporate Team in collaboration with the Communications & Engagement Team. The cost for delivery realised a saving of Circa £24,000 against outsourcing.

There were risks associated with this approach, along with potential benefits. These are outlined below.

**Risks and Mitigations**

Various considerations went into the decision to take this approach, including, but not limited to:

* Internal capacity
* Internal capability
* The need to reach diverse audiences

The Service managed these risks by:

* Alignment to the Service’s Consultation Framework
* Undertaking extensive planning and task allocation
* Undertaking close collaboration within teams
* Seeking advice externally, including Community Advisory Group
* Utilising NFCC CRMP Fire Standard guidance,
* Ensuring alignment to the fire service National Framework
* Alignment to learning from HMICFRS inspections and their CRMP audits
* Managing timelines diligently
* Conducting regular in-flight reviews
* Target Service efforts
* Utilising existing partnerships with community organisations where possible
* Seeking community organisations out to participate
* Utilising multiple methods of delivery to meet the needs of Nottinghamshire’s diverse communities.

**Benefits**

Running the consultation in-house gave greater autonomy and flexibility, allowing the Service to own the design and execution of the online survey and focus group activities whilst aligning closely with service values, the specific requirements of the CRMP, and the National Framework.

Direct involvement facilitated stronger connections with various community groups. This enabled a deeper dive into discussion at focus groups, resulting in authenticity to the feedback given.

The consultation has provided learning and insight (via evaluation) into engaging with communities, which can be utilised going forward. Positive interactions with community groups who attended focus groups has led to opportunities to engage with them in future. Lessons learned will also aid in the launch of the CRMP later this financial year.

Delivering consultation in-house has proven to be a successful balance of cost efficiency, engagement quality, and results. The insights gathered are robust, comprehensive, and reflective of the communities NFRS serves.

By addressing risks proactively and embracing the opportunities of an in-house consultation, a strong precedent has been set for future engagement activities.

1. **Operating Context**

**The Fire & Rescue Services Act 2004**

The Fire and Rescue Services Act 2004 establishes the statutory framework for Fire and Rescue Services in England and Wales. Under the Act itself, there is no explicit mention of the term Community Risk Management Plan (CRMP) or Integrated Risk Management Plan (IRMP). However, the Act does explicitly refer to the National Framework in Section 21, which outlines its purpose and the obligations of fire and rescue authorities concerning it. The requirement for a CRMP is therefore derived from the duties imposed by the Act and is reinforced by the Fire and Rescue National Framework for England, outlined below.

Alongside outlining the core functions of a Fire & Rescue Service, the Act refers to the need to assess risks and plan to address them, implicitly requiring Fire & Rescue Services to take a risk-based approach to fulfilling their duties.

The CRMP is the mechanism through which risks are assessed, prioritised, and addressed, ensuring the effective deployment of resources – thus being an integral part of fulfilling Nottinghamshire Fire & Rescue Service’s duties under the Fire & Rescue Services Act 2004.

**The National Framework for Fire & Rescue Services**

The National Framework stipulates that each fire and Rescue Authority has a duty to produce a CRMP which meets specific requirements.

The table below outlines those requirements, and describes how they have been met through the CRMP development and consultation process:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **National Framework Requirement** | **Draft CRMP Product Development** | **Consultation Process** |
| Reflects up to date risk analyses including an assessment of all foreseeable fire and rescue related risks | NFRS undertook a Fire Cover Review via a third-party, sector-leading, independent partner, ORH.  This process considered the distribution of NFRS Fire Cover, the current delivery model of NFRS operational capabilities, and utilised the NFCC Risk Methodology to identify high risk areas of the County and consider how NFRS is resourced against those risks, informing the decisions made around our priorities over the next three years. An overview of this can be found from page 22-25 in the Draft CRMP.  In addition, NFRS undertook a Strategic Assessment of Risk, looking at political, economic, technical, environmental, societal, legal and organisational risks.  Any factors which pose a significant risk are added to the corporate risk register, and these are also captured within the CRMP (pages 18-21). | The consultation sought to verify with our communities, staff and partners that they were confident that we had assessed all risks relevant to their communities. The results are detailed in this report. |
| Demonstrate how prevention, protection and response activities will best be used to prevent fires and other incidents and mitigate the impact of identified risks on its communities | NFRS’ draft CRMP outlines all these areas in pages 26-34 of the document. These pages outline the services we currently deliver in relation to protection, prevention and response.  Pages 37-44 of the document outlines our plans going forward, including performance outcomes. | The consultation sought to verify with our communities, staff and partners how confident they felt in our plans to prevent and/or mitigate fires and other incidents. The results are detailed in this report. |
| Outline required service delivery outcomes including the allocation of resources | A full, in-depth Fire Cover Review was undertaken and is outlined within the CRMP (pages 22-25).  This process considered all operational resources and their availability, against volumes of work. Priorities and delivery targets have been set out within the CRMP according to NFRS resourcing and productivity. | The consultation sought to verify with our communities, staff and partners that they were confident that our resources were best placed to mitigate risk in their communities. The results are detailed in this report. |
| Set out its management strategy and risk-based programme for enforcing the provisions of the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005 | Strategic Goal 2, outlined within the draft CRMP, sets out how NFRS intends to meet the provisions of the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005. This includes building on our Risk-Based Inspection Programme. Details of this can be found on pages 30-31, 37, 40 and 43. | The consultation sought to verify with our communities, staff and partners that they have confidence in our enforcement provision. The results are detailed in this report. |
| Cover at least a three-year time span | The CRMP lifespan is from April 2025 to March 2028. Plans cover this full period, with an annual delivery plan outlining each year. The plan itself will be reviewed periodically to ensure it continues to be deliverable. |  |
| Reflect effective consultation throughout its development and at all review stages with the community, its workforce and representative bodies and partners; |  | The consultation process included communities, staff and stakeholders. The process was delivered in line with the NFRS Consultation Framework and was effective, as outlined in this report. |
| Be easily accessible and publicly available. | Accessibility was considered throughout the development of the draft CRMP. An accessible version is available online, and the PDF version is available in multiple languages. An Equality Impact Assessment was undertaken in advance of the consultation. | The consultation sought to verify with our communities, staff and partners that they felt that the CRMP is accessible to them and their communities. The results are detailed in this report. |

**CRMP Fire Standard**

The Fire Standards Board is an independent body responsible for overseeing the development, maintenance, and promotion of professional standards for fire and rescue services in England. The Fire Standards establish a consistent framework of excellence for fire and rescue services across England, aiming to improve service delivery, ensure consistency, and drive continuous improvement in the sector.

The CRMP Fire Standard provides a framework for how fire & rescue services should develop their CRMPs.

The below table outlines the CRMP Fire Standard and describes how they have been met through the CRMP development and consultation process:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Fire Standard Outcome** | **Draft CRMP Product Development** | **Consultation Process** |
| Being able to demonstrate how protection, prevention and response activities have and will be used collectively to prevent and/or mitigate fires and other incidents | NFRS’ draft CRMP outlines all these areas in pages 26-34 of the document. These pages outline the services we currently deliver in relation to protection, prevention and response.  Pages 37-44 of the document outlines our plans going forward, including performance outcomes. | The consultation sought to verify with our communities, staff and partners how confident they felt in our plans to prevent and/or mitigate fires and other incidents. The results are detailed in this report. |
| Effectively consulting and engaging with communities, FRS staff and stakeholders |  | The consultation process included communities, staff and stakeholders. The process was delivered in line with the NFRS Consultation Framework and was effective, as outlined in this report. |
| Using a robust risk analysis process (giving due regard to existing and emerging local, regional and national hazards) | NFRS undertook a Fire Cover Review via a third-party, sector-leading, independent partner, ORH.  This process considered the distribution of NFRS Fire Cover, the current delivery model of NFRS operational capabilities, and utilised the NFCC Risk Methodology to identify high risk areas of the County and consider how NFRS is resourced against those risks, informing the decisions made around our priorities over the next three years. An overview of this can be found from page 22-25 in the Draft CRMP.  In addition, NFRS undertook a Strategic Assessment of Risk, looking at political, economic, technical, environmental, societal, legal and organisational risks.  Any factors which pose a significant risk are added to the corporate risk register, and these are also captured within the CRMP (pages 18-21). | The consultation sought to verify with our communities, staff and partners that they were confident that we had assessed all risks relevant to their communities. The results are detailed in this report. |
| Ensuring resource deployment decisions are balanced against an assessment of internal and external resource availability | A full, in-depth Fire Cover Review was undertaken and is outlined within the CRMP (pages 22-25).  This process considered all operational resources and their availability, against volumes of work. Priorities and delivery targets have been set out within the CRMP according to NFRS resourcing and productivity. | The consultation sought to verify with our communities, staff and partners that they were confident that our resources were best placed to mitigate risk in their communities. The results are detailed in this report. |
| Creating, and being able to evidence, its community risk management plan in line with a nationally approved structure which involves the key components detailed within this standard. | The Plan has been developed in line with the National Framework (outlined below), NFCC guidance, and the NFCC Fire Standard (outlined here). |  |

**The NFRS Consultation Framework**

The Nottinghamshire Fire and Rescue Service Consultation Framework serves as a guiding document to ensure that NFRS consultation processes are effective, transparent, and inclusive. It underpins the service's commitment to engaging meaningfully with Nottinghamshire communities, alongside the NFRS workforce, representative bodies, and key stakeholders. It highlights the importance of consultation in informing decisions made by the Service.

The below table outlines the requirements of the Consultation Framework and how NFRS has met them.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Consultation Framework Requirement** | **Draft CRMP Product Development**  **Consultation Process** |
| **Section 1: When to consult**  The NFRS Consultation Framework outlines that consultations:   * Should take place when decisions are likely to have a direct impact on the public * Should be conducted using a range of methods * May include an informal ‘pre-consultation’ period of engagement * Should include qualitative and quantitative data gathering methodologies * Should avoid taking place during periods where responses may be affected (e.g. elections & holiday periods). | The CRMP has a clear tangible impact on the public, as it outlines the organisations strategic commitments to the public over the next three years, including how the Service’s resources will be allocated to mitigate risks within the County. A consultation process was therefore required and was undertaken.  The survey questions and focus groups delivery were developed to inform the public about how the CRMP is likely to impact them in order to ensure the public were informed when answering whether they therefore agree with the steps taken.  The consultation process included multiple methods – Focus Groups, online survey, peer review, engagement with partners, correspondence, and staff engagement.  Informal consultation did take place. The service corresponded with partners, local FRS, and colleagues to seek opinions. These supported the development of the CRMP.  Both qualitative and quantitative data was gathered via a range of methods – primarily the online survey and Focus Groups.  The consultation was scheduled between the General Election (in line with Purdah) and the Christmas period in line with this requirement. It ran for 9 weeks, due to the time available between Purdah and the Christmas period, including time to analyse the results of the consultation.  The above outlines that NFRS met the requirements of the Consultation Framework Section 1. |
| **Section 2: The duration of consultation**  The NFRS Consultation Framework outlines that consultations:   * Will typically last between two and twelve weeks – proportionately * May be extended if it takes place over a period where consultees are less able to respond * Should use a range of different methods to gather data * Should ensure that the public, stakeholders and staff have a wide range of option to express their views. | The consultation was scheduled between the General Election (in line with Purdah) and the Christmas period in line with this requirement. It ran for 9 weeks, due to the time available between Purdah and the Christmas period, including time to analyse the results of the consultation.  The consultation process included multiple methods – Focus Groups, online survey, peer review, engagement with partners, correspondence, and staff engagement – to ensure a wide range of people had the opportunity to express their views, in a variety of ways.  The above outlines that NFRS met the requirements of the Consultation Framework Section 2. |
| **Section 3: The content of our consultation**  The NFRS Consultation Framework outlines that consultations:   * Are clear about the reasons for the consultation * Are clear about the proposals * Are clear about how the public and stakeholders might be affected * State how the consultation will run and what we will do with the information gathered * Should provide options, costs, benefits and additional information * Should be equality impact assessed, ensuring that methods of engaging with communities are considered to ensure their needs are reflected * Should include a mixture of questions, which should be as clear as possible | The consultation process included a clear description of what the consultation was for, and what it was about.  Questions provided on the online survey provided an explanation of why the question was being asked.  Both the survey and focus groups provided an explanation of why NFRS was gathering the data, and what it would be used for.  An EqIA was completed prior to the consultation and reviewed during the consultation to ensure that minoritised communities were considered and represented throughout.  The methodology used was multi-faceted, with a mixture of methods of responding to the consultation as well as a mixture of qualitative and quantitative data/questions. |
| **Section 4: The accessibility of our consultation**  The NFRS Consultation Framework outlines that consultations:   * Should be accessible by and targeted toward people affected by decisions * Use a range of methods which can be targeted according to need * Should state how people can participate * Be easy to understand, avoiding jargon * Be pro-active, and use alternative versions to ensure accessibility | The CRMP is available in accessible versions, and questions regarding its accessibility were specifically asked within the consultation. 81% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the CRMP is accessible to them and their community.  The consultation was hosted on the NFRS website which is highly regarded for its accessibility scores – this level of accessibility applied to the consultation survey.  To ensure minoritised voices were heard, focus groups with minoritised communities were arranged and undertaken. Style, language and delivery was adjusted to accommodate different people. |
| **Section 5: The cost of our consultation**  The NFRS Consultation Framework outlines that consultations:   * Should consider the burden and cost on the organisation * May consider referring people to information already in the public domain * Use social media to keep costs down, but won’t rely on this option alone * Should make budgets available for public scrutiny through our accounts | NFRS elected to undertake the consultation in-house. A consideration around this was the costs of utilising a 3rd party supplier, versus undertaking this within the service.  This resulted in a significant saving to the organisation, detailed within this report.  Social media was utilised, along with a range of other promotional methods – including a television appearance, correspondence, and direct contact and engagement. A breakdown of costs is available. |
| **Section 6: Our response to the**  **Consultation**  The NFRS Consultation Framework outlines that consultations:   * Should consider all responses * May provide a general summary of who responded, and the views gathered * Should publish responses, including how they have informed service priorities * Present the findings of the consultation to Full Fire Authority for decisions. | Work has been undertaken to consider all responses – this report summarises these findings and is provided to the Fire Authority to supplement formal reporting.  Responses and outcomes will be published alongside the CRMP itself, which has been updated following feedback review, and will include a section articulating the consultation results and how it has changed the plan. |
| **Section 7: Our capacity to consult**  The NFRS Consultation Framework outlines that consultations:   * Should be conducted by NFRS where possible * May utilise independent/3rd parties where necessary * Should only use providers who meet Framework and best value requirements. | NFRS elected to undertake the consultation in-house. A consideration around this was the costs of utilising a 3rd party supplier, versus undertaking this within the service.  This resulted in a significant saving to the organisation, detailed within this report. |

1. **Consultation Goals**

Prior to undertaking the consultation, various objectives and targets for the consultation were agreed. They were designed to be challenging, ambitious, achievable and measurable.

The goal via the online survey was to reach 330,000+ members of the public, anticipating this would elicit a survey response rate of approximately 333 to 667 responses.

Of these, NFRS aimed to reach:

* Racially minoritised groups: Target of 96 responses.
* Disabled people, LGBTQ+ community, older people: 20 responses each.
* Young People: Estimated 96 participants

The survey would be supplemented via focus groups, involving fewer participants but offering richer, more nuanced feedback. The Service’s goal was to undertake a minimum of five Focus Groups, with one for each of the following demographics:

* Racially minoritised groups
* Disabled People
* LGBTQ+ Community
* Older People
* Young People
* General population

NFRS aimed to have at least 10 participants at each Focus Group.

Internally, the Service’s goal was to engage service staff (~300 responses), the Fire Authority (19 members), representative bodies (~3 responses), and stakeholders/partners (20 responses).

**Promotion**

To achieve reach and responses ambitions, promotion of the consultation was critical. The Service aimed to undertake a robust campaign utilising both online reach and direct correspondence to leverage responses. This included:

* Social Media Marketing (external)
* Press Releases and a media launch to maximize public awareness (external)
* Use of leaflets, flyers, and station dressing to capture attention (internal & external)
* Partner communications, newsletters, and correspondence to enhance visibility through existing networks (external)
* Incentive - entry into a £100 prize draw for completing the survey (internal & external)
* Service communications such as CFO briefings, newsletter, informative and staff meetings (internal)

In addition to the above consultation-specific activities, the Service aimed to maximise its existing, typical activities and leverage them to raise awareness of the consultation at every opportunity. This included:

* Safe & Well Visits: Approximately 1,250 per month during the consultation period.
* Community Befriending Scheme: One engagement per watch during the consultation period.
* Leaflets: Included in every outgoing letter (circa 2,500 during the consultation).
* Partnerships: Raise awareness with City and County Councils, safeguarding boards, universities, and various community networks.

**Efficiency and Cost-Effectiveness**

The consultation was delivered entirely in-house, with the goal of reducing costs from £30,000 (previous external consultation) to no more than £8,000.

This would include covering all activities, incentives, and marketing, e.g.:

* £1,500 budget for paid advertising.
* £30 vouchers per Focus Group participant, totalling £3,000.
* £100 prize for one survey participant
* Design & print of various promotional materials including flyers/leaflets and posters.

The Corporate Team and the Communications & Engagement Team managed all aspects, including survey design, focus groups, and promotion.

**Monitoring and Adaptation**

To ensure the consultation remained on track, NFRs undertook regular reviews within the timeline, including a mid-point evaluation in Week 6.

**PART TWO:**

**CONSULTATION PARTICIPATION**

1. **Overall Response Figures**

**Total Responses**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2018** | **2021** | **2024** |
| **Survey Responses** | 277 | 98 | 645 |
| **Partner Responses** |  |  | 35 |
| **Employee Responses** | 49 | 26 | 157 |
| **Focus Group Attendees** | 43 | 38 | 78 |

Response rates for this consultation exceeded previous CRMP consultations in all areas.

The consultation generated 658% more total responses than in 2021 and 233% more responses than in 2018.

Staff responses increased by 604% compared with 2021 and 320% compared with 2018.

More Focus Groups with community members took place, resulting in a 205% increase in participation compared with 2021 and 181% increase compared with 2018.

NFRS received multiple ‘critical friend’ responses from other services, providing detailed, in depth, feedback (aligned to the National Framework, NFCC guidance, and HMICFRS expectations).

In addition, 33 partner responses have been received.

Compared with original goals, the response rate from the public and partners exceeded original targets. The response rate from staff is below target but is still significantly increased compared with previous CRMP Consultations.

1. **Social Media Reach**

Targeted Facebook Adverts reached 260,000 people, generating 8,900 link clicks.

The reach of organic social posts was 30,000 on Facebook and 9,700 on X, making for an organic combined reach on social channels of 39,700.

The consultation survey page was viewed 6,500 times by 1,900 users. (30%)

This reach is within 10% of our reach goal.

1. **Budget Spend**

The total cost of the Consultation was £6,342, broken down as follows:

* Leaflet production & printing: £750
* Facebook advertising: £2,162
* Videography: £990
* Focus Group attendees’ vouchers: £2,340
* Voucher for winning survey participant: £100

This expenditure represents a significant saving on previous consultations and is a lower figure than our originally projected spend.

1. **Equality, Diversity & Inclusion Demographic Data Analysis**

Demographic data is as follows:

**Age**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Under 18 | 18-24 | 25-34 | 35-44 | 45-54 | 55-64 | 65-74 | 75 and over |
| 5 | 31 | 107 | 148 | 135 | 128 | 61 | 29 |
| 0.8% | 4.8% | 16.6% | 23.0% | 21.0% | 19.9% | 9.5% | 4.5% |

Comparison with the 2021 Consultation provides some notable insights:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **What is your age?** | | | | | | |
|  | Under 25 | 25-34 | 35-44 | 45-54 | 55-64 | 65-74 | 75 and over |
| 2021 | 3 | 8 | 20 | 15 | 15 | 6 | 3 |
| 4.0% | 11.0% | 29.0% | 21.0% | 21.0% | 9.0% | 4.0% |
|  | | | | | | | |
| 2024 | 36 | 107 | 148 | 135 | 128 | 61 | 29 |
| 5.6% | 16.6% | 23.0% | 21.0% | 19.9% | 9.5% | 4.5% |
| Increase/Decrease | 1.6% | 5.6% | 6% | - | 1.1% | 0.5% | 0.5% |

* Submissions from under 35s increased by a total of 7.2% in this consultation. It is probable that this increase has been driven primarily by an improved social media presence & reach.
* As discussed later in this report, NFRS also conducted a specific Focus Group with Young People.
* This increase explains the decrease in the mid-range; overall increases in the percentage of submissions from younger demographics means a decrease in the overall share of the submissions from 35–64-year-olds.

**Gender**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **What is your gender?** | | | | |
| Female | Male | Prefer not to say | Non-binary | Prefer to self-describe |
| 370 | 260 | 9 | 3 | 1 |
| 57.5% | 40.4% | 1.4% | 0.5% | 0.2% |

Comparison with 2021:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **What is your gender?** | | |
|  | Female | Male | Not Known |
| 2021 | 45 | 24 | 22 |
| 49.5% | 26.4% | 24.2% |
|  | | | |
| 2024 | 370 | 260 | N/A |
| 57.5% | 40.4% | N/A |
| Increase/Decrease | 8% | 14% |  |

* It is notable that in the 2021 CRMP Consultation, the public only had the options of identifying as male, or female, or not providing a response at all. In this consultation, options to identify as non-binary, self-describe, or to consciously choose not to say were given. This perhaps reflects greater consciousness of gender inclusivity within the service.
* The increase in male responses in 2021 is likely driven by fewer ‘Not Known’ (nil return) responses.
* The female voice is very well represented in this consultation, with 57.5% of respondents being female. This is an increase of 8% on the previous consultation.

**Sexual Orientation**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Which of the following best describes your sexual orientation?** | | | | |
| Heterosexual /  Straight | Gay/Lesbian | Bisexual | Prefer not to say | Prefer to self-describe |
| 575 | 14 | 17 | 22 | 4 |
| 91.0% | 2.2% | 2.7% | 3.5% | 0.6% |

* It is not possible to draw a direct comparison with the previous consultation, as this data was not captured in 2021.
* Within the 2021 Census, 89.3% of Nottinghamshire described themselves as heterosexual. The responses in this consultation diverge only slightly from that, indicating that responses in this demographic area were largely reflective of the community NFRS serves.

**Ethic Group**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **What is your ethnic group?** | | | | | | | |
| White (English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/British) | White (Irish) | White (Other) | Mixed or multiple ethnic groups | Asian/Asian British | Black/African/Caribbean/Black British | Prefer not to say | Other ethnic group (please specify) |
| 516 | 9 | 20 | 19 | 28 | 27 | 16 | 4 |
| 80.8% | 1.4% | 3.1% | 3.0% | 4.4% | 4.2% | 2.5% | 0.6% |

Comparison with 2021:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **What is your ethnic group?** | |
|  | White (English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/British) | **Non-White British**  White (Irish)  Mixed or multiple ethnic groups  Asian/Asian British  Black/African/Caribbean/Black British  Other ethnic group (please specify) |
| 2021 | 54 | 12 |
| 59.3% | 13.2% |
|  | | |
| 2024 | 516 | 123 |
| 80.8% | 19.2% |
| Increase/Decrease | 21.5% | 6% |

* It is notable that 19.2% of the respondents within this consultation identified as being from a group which does not identify as being white British.
* Within the City, 34% of people identify as being from a racially minoritised group. County-wide, this figure is 6%.
* Returns from racially marginalised groups are not aligned to Nottinghamshire community from a diversity perspective, with some groups underrepresented.
* However, as can be seen in the table above, overall response rates from marginalised groups increased by 925% - from 12 in 2021 to 123 in 2024.
* The NFRS CAG (among other groups) was engaged with and supported in promoting the Consultation across a variety of demographic groups.

**Disability & Long-Term Health Conditions**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Do you consider yourself to have a disability or long-term health condition?** | | |
| Yes | No | Prefer not to say |
| 183 | 430 | 26 |
| 28.6% | 67.3% | 4.1% |

Comparison with 2021:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Do you consider yourself to have a disability or long-term health condition?** | |
|  | Yes | No |
| 2021 | 14 | 54 |
| 15.4% | 59.3% |
|  | | |
| 2024 | 183 | 430 |
| 28.6% | 67.3% |
| Increase/Decrease | 13.2% | 8.0% |

* A significant percentage of respondents elected to state whether they have a disability or not, compared with the last consultation which saw a high number of nil-returns.
* An increase of 13.2% in respondents who have a disability or long-term health condition is notable, particularly due to the potential for these individuals having additional vulnerabilities to fires and other emergencies.

**Religion or Belief**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **What is your religion or belief?** | | | | | | | | |
| No religion | Christian (including Church of England, Catholic, Protestant, and other Christian denominations) | Muslim | Hindu | Sikh | Jewish | Buddhist | Prefer not to say | Other (please specify) |
| 299 | 259 | 19 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 28 | 12 |
| 47.5% | 41.1% | 3.0% | 0.2% | 0.5% | 0.8% | 0.6% | 4.4% | 1.9% |

* According to the 2021 Census, the religious composition of Nottinghamshire was as follows:
  + Christian: 43.0%
  + Muslim: 2.0%
  + Hindu: 1.0%
  + Sikh: 0.6%
  + Jewish: 0.1%
  + Buddhist: 0.3%
  + Other religions: 3.1%
  + No religion: 43.8%
  + Not stated: 6.1%
* The response rates outlined above align closely with the profile of Nottinghamshire’s community.
* The Hindu community is the most underrepresented in comparison with the overall Nottinghamshire Hindu community.
* It is not possible to draw a comparison with the previous consultation as this demographic data was not collected.

**Staff, Public & Agency Responses**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Are you a member of staff, the public, or a partner agency?** | | |
| Staff | Partner | Public |
| 157 | 32 | 409 |
| 26.3% | 5.4% | 68.4% |

* The consultation saw significant increases in responses from all three categories over the consultation period.
* The increase in responses is such that comparisons with previous years in this area does not provide useful insight. For example, partner responses as a percentage of the total decreased by 4%, but the overall number of partner responses increased 357%.

**PART THREE:**

**CONSULTATION SURVEY RESULTS**

1. **Agreement with the Strategic Goals.**

Participants were asked: “To what extent do you agree that these [the strategic goals] are the correct areas of focus for your Fire Service over the next 3 years.”

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **To what extent do you agree that these are the correct areas of focus for your Fire Service over the next three years?** | | | | |
|  | **Strongly agree** | **Agree** | **Neither agree nor disagree** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree** |
| **Total** | 389 | 227 | 16 | 6 | 6 |
| 60% | 35% | 2.5% | 0.9% | 0.9% |
|  | | | | | |
| **Public** | 254 | 141 | 9 | 3 | 3 |
| 62% | 34% | 2% | 1% | 1% |
|  | | | | | |
| **Agencies** | 14 | 15 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| 44% | 47% | 6% | 0% | 3% |
|  | | | | | |
| **Staff** | 93 | 57 | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| 59% | 36% | 3% | 1% | 1% |

**95.6% of respondents agree or strongly agree that the strategic goals identified should be our focus.**

1.8% of respondents disagree, with 2.5% not sure.

The responses from the public, partners and staff are consistent, with no discernible difference in the level of agreement between each group.

1. **Risk Identification**

Participants were asked: “To what extent do you agree that we have accurately identified and prioritised the key current and foreseeable risks in your community?”

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **To what extent do you agree that we have accurately identified and prioritised the key current and foreseeable risks in your community?** | | | | |
|  | **Strongly agree** | **Agree** | **Neither agree nor disagree** | **Disagree** | **Strongly disagree** |
| **Total** | 286 | 303 | 44 | 7 | 6 |
| 44% | 47% | 7% | 1% | 1% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Public** | 185 | 188 | 29 | 4 | 3 |
| 45% | 46% | 7% | 1% | 1% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Partners** | 12 | 18 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 38% | 56% | 6% | 0% | 0% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Staff** | 69 | 76 | 8 | 2 | 2 |
| 44% | 48% | 5% | 1% | 1% |

**91% of respondents agree or strongly agree that we have accurately identified and prioritised risks.**

2% of respondents disagree, with 7% not sure.

The responses from the public, partners and staff are consistent, with no discernible difference in the level of agreement between each group.

1. **Keeping the Community Safe**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Participants were asked: “To what extent do you agree that our plans under this goal will help you and others in your community stay safe from fires or other emergencies?” | **To what extent do you agree that our plans under this goal will help you and others in your community stay safe from fires or other emergencies** | | | | |
|  | **Strongly agree** | **Agree** | **Neither agree nor disagree** | **Disagree** | **Strongly disagree** |
| **Total** | 286 | 304 | 43 | 7 | 6 |
| 44% | 47% | 7% | 1% | 1% |
|  | | | | | |
| **Public** | 185 | 189 | 29 | 4 | 3 |
| 45% | 46% | 7% | 1% | 1% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Partners** | 12 | 18 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 38% | 56% | 6% | 0% | 0% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Staff** | 69 | 76 | 8 | 2 | 2 |
| 44% | 48% | 5% | 1% | 1% |

**91% of respondents agree or strongly agree that our plans will help to keep them safe.**

2% of respondents disagree, with 7% not sure.

The responses from the public, partners and staff are consistent, with no discernible difference in the level of agreement between each group.

1. **Fire Protection & Enforcement**

Participants were asked: “To what extent do you agree that we have an appropriate approach to enforcing fire safety and protecting the community from fires in these types of buildings?”

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **“To what extent do you agree that we have an appropriate approach to enforcing fire safety and protecting the community from fires in these types of buildings?”** | | | | |
|  | **Strongly agree** | **Agree** | **Neither agree nor disagree** | **Disagree** | **Strongly disagree** |
| **Total** | 315 | 271 | 43 | 17 | 2 |
| 49% | 42% | 7% | 3% | >1% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Public** | 214 | 156 | 29 | 10 | 0 |
| 52% | 38% | 7% | 2% | 0% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Partners** | 10 | 19 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 32% | 61% | 3% | >1% | 0% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Staff** | 68 | 76 | 9 | 4 | 1 |
| 43% | 48% | 6% | 3% | >1% |

**91% of respondents agree or strongly agree that our plans will enable us to enforce Fire Safety and protect buildings.**

3% of respondents disagree, with 7% not sure.

Although the overall agreement from the public, partners and staff is consistent, there is a variance between the strength of feeling in relation to the ratio between ‘strongly agree’ and ‘agree’.

1. **Emergency Response**

Participants were asked: “To what extent are you confident in our emergency response to incidents?”

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **To what extent are you confident in our emergency response to incidents?** | | | | |
|  | **Very Confident** | **Confident** | **Don’t Know** | **Unconfident** | **Very Unconfident** |
| **Total** | 381 | 229 | 19 | 14 | 3 |
| 59% | 35% | 3% | 2% | 0% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Public** | 234 | 153 | 16 | 7 | 0 |
| 57% | 37% | 4% | 2% | 0% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Partners** | 15 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 50% | 50% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Staff** | 101 | 51 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| 64% | 32% | 0% | 2% | 2% |

**94% of respondents stated that they are confident or very confident in our response plans for emergencies.**

2% of respondents are not confident, with 3% not sure.

Notably, 100% of partner responses stated that they are confident in our response plans. The public & staff were 94% and 96% confident respectively.

1. **Resource Allocation**

Participants were asked: “To what extent do you agree that our CRMP clearly explains how our resources are allocated to address the most significant risks in your community?”

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **To what extent do you agree that our CRMP clearly explains how our resources are allocated to address the most significant risks in your community?** | | | | |
|  | **Strongly agree** | **Agree** | **Neither agree nor disagree** | **Disagree** | **Strongly disagree** |
| **Total** | 271 | 283 | 69 | 19 | 3 |
| 42% | 44% | 11% | 3% | 0% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Public** | 177 | 179 | 44 | 10 | 0 |
| 43% | 44% | 11% | 2% | 0% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Partners** | 10 | 16 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| 31% | 50% | 19% | 0% | 0% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Staff** | 66 | 69 | 8 | 8 | 2 |
| 43% | 45% | 5% | 5% | 1% |

**86% of respondents either agree or strongly agree that the allocation of NFRS resources according to the risks identified is clear**

3% of respondents disagree, with 11% not sure.

Although largely in agreement, partners were the least certain, with nearly 1/5th of respondents stating they were not sure. It may be that some communications may aid this understanding.

Notably, whilst staff had the least neutral responses, they also had the highest volume of responses in disagreement. Although a small proportion of total responses, 6% of staff disagreed that NFRS resources are allocated to address risk. This suggests that the service will benefit from communicating how we do this to staff.

1. **Accessibility**

Participants were asked: “To what extent do you agree that our CRMP is easy to understand and accessible to everyone in your community?”

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **To what extent do you agree that our CRMP is easy to understand and accessible to everyone in your community?** | | | | |
|  | **Strongly agree** | **Agree** | **Neither agree nor disagree** | **Disagree** | **Strongly disagree** |
| **Total** | 236 | 284 | 90 | 28 | 7 |
| 37% | 44% | 14% | 4% | 1% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Public** | 181 | 147 | 61 | 16 | 4 |
| 44% | 36% | 15% | 4% | 1% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Partners** | 8 | 18 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| 25% | 56% | 19% | 0% | 0% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Staff** | 64 | 67 | 17 | 7 | 2 |
| 41% | 43% | 11% | 4% | 1% |

**81% of respondents agree or strongly agree that our CRMP is accessible to them and their community.**

5% of respondents disagree, with 14% not sure.

There is more uncertainty within these responses than in previous questions. Partners and the Public gave a neutral response more often than in previous questions, with 5% of the public and staff disagreeing that the CRMP is easy to understand and accessible.

Whilst these are relatively small percentages, some additional work to explain the CRMP to all groups may be beneficial.

1. **Accessibility**

Participants were asked: “Our CRMP is available in both an accessible web-based format, and online document format. Which version do you prefer?”

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Our CRMP is available in both an accessible web-based format, and online document format. Which version do you prefer?** | |
|  | **Web Based** | **PDF** |
| **Total** | 472 | 174 |
| 73% | 27% |
|  |  |  |
| **Public** | 303 | 107 |
| 74% | 26% |
|  |  |  |
| **Partners** | 24 | 9 |
| 73% | 27% |
|  |  |  |
| **Staff** | 112 | 45 |
| 71% | 29% |

**Nearly three quarters (73%) of respondents prefer the accessible online version of the CRMP.**

The accessible web-based version of the CRMP was identified as being the more popular version. It is worth noting that this is the version that participants of the survey were directed to (with the option of downloading the PDF version).

The responses from the public, partners and staff are consistent, with limited discernible difference in the level of agreement between each group.

1. **AFAs**

Participants were asked: “To what extent do you believe it is reasonable for NFRS to consider charging a call-out fee for attending unnecessary false alarms at business premises where other efforts to reduce attendances have failed?”

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **To what extent do you believe it is reasonable for NFRS to consider charging a call-out fee for attending unnecessary false alarms at business premises where other efforts to reduce attendances have failed?** | | | | |
|  | **Very Reasonable** | **Reasonable** | **Don't Know** | **Unreasonable** | **Very Unreasonable** |
| **Total** | 370 | 210 | 29 | 25 | 12 |
| 57% | 33% | 4% | 4% | 2% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Public** | 239 | 132 | 19 | 14 | 5 |
| 58% | 32% | 5% | 3% | 1% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Partners** | 13 | 15 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 41% | 47% | 6% | 0% | 0% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Staff** | 90 | 49 | 5 | 6 | 6 |
| 58% | 31% | 3% | 4% | 4% |

All groups felt relatively strongly about this, with the public and staff having the highest rate of ‘Very Reasonable’ responses.

1. **Council Tax Increase**

Participants were asked: “To what extent do you think that it would be reasonable for Nottinghamshire residents to pay an increase of up to £5 (annually) in their Council Tax (for an average Band D property) to support funding for your Fire Service?”

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **To what extent do you think that it would be reasonable for Nottinghamshire residents to pay an increase of up to £5 (annually) in their Council Tax (for an average Band D property) to support funding for your Fire Service?** | | | | |
|  | **Very Reasonable** | **Reasonable** | **Don't Know** | **Unreasonable** | **Very Unreasonable** |
| **Total** | 248 | 251 | 59 | 64 | 23 |
| 38% | 39% | 9% | 10% | 4% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Public** | 140 | 169 | 41 | 46 | 13 |
| 34% | 41% | 10% | 11% | 3% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Partners** | 11 | 20 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 32% | 59% | 6% | 0% | 0% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Staff** | 81 | 49 | 9 | 11 | 8 |
| 51% | 31% | 6% | 7% | 5% |

**77% of respondents feel it is reasonable or very reasonable to consider a £5 increase in Council Tax.**

14% feel negatively about this as a proposal, with 9% unsure.

Partners felt strongly that this would be a reasonable proposal, with 91% agreeing. Staff had a slightly lower positive response, albeit still high, with 82% of staff agreeing it would be a reasonable step. Over three quarters of the public agreed it would be reasonable.

**PART FOUR:**

**CONSULTATION FOCUS GROUPS**

To enrich the feedback received on the draft plan, targeted Focus Groups were conducted to ensure diverse community voices were represented. These sessions allowed NFRS to explore the specific concerns, needs, and ideas of key demographic groups in a way that complemented the broader insights gathered through the online survey.

The focus groups engaged participants from a range of communities and backgrounds, including:

* Older People (Forever Young Community Group)
* Disability (Pulp Friction)
* Online (General Population)
* Online (In2People Delegates)
* LGBTQ+
* Young People (West Notts College)

In total, approximately 80 participants attended these focus groups, exceeding the target of an average of 10 attendees per session.

Each session was tailored to create an open and supportive environment where participants felt encouraged to share their views. The discussions provided qualitative data that added depth to the quantitative findings of the online survey.

**Key Findings & Themes**

1. **Prevention**

**94% of Focus Group attendees feel confident in NFRS’ plans in relation to Strategic Goal One.**

6**%** have reservations/concerns about the Service’s ability to deliver its plans. Reasons cited are relating to the financial envelope placing restrictions on ability to deliver services, and concerns that the task of identifying all vulnerable people is incredibly difficult.

Delegates felt priorities in relation to improving Prevention activity should be focused on:

* Increasing community engagement activities
* Sharing fire safety messages/education, particularly targeting specific messages to those at risk
* Ensuring services are accessible
* Diversity (both in relation to workforce and engaging with underrepresented groups).

1. **Protection**

**84% of Focus Group attendees agree that NFRS should consider charging a call-out fee to businesses who are repeat offenders regarding false alarms.**

Feedback from delegates highlighted common themes, which, whilst supportive of the principle, the public feel NFRS should focus on if this process was implemented. These included:

* The importance of having a clear and fair process, which does not adversely affect partners such as the NHS and schools
* Continuing engagement with businesses in the first instance to provide education and guidance
* A robust process to ensure that reasonable opportunity has been given to businesses to resolve the issues prior to sanctions being applied
* A cost-benefit analysis should be undertaken to establish whether it would be practicable in the first place.

The Focus Groups also highlighted a view that businesses should take responsibility to resolve faulty alarm systems, and concerns from those present that attending AFAs draws resources NFRS resources away from other areas.

1. **Response**

**91% of Focus Group attendees rated their confidence levels in NFRS’ plans to Respond to fires and other emergencies as 8/10 or higher. 60% gave a 10/10 rating.**

9% rated their confidence levels between 5 and 7 out of 10, with no delegates rating their confidence levels lower than 5/10.

There were no comments indicating concerns or suggesting areas for improvement in this area, with overwhelming support for NFRS in its Response capabilities and plans.

1. **People & Culture**

**The plans outlined within Strategic Goal 4 were endorsed by all Focus Groups.**

Focus groups were asked, primarily based on Strategic Goal 4, but in combination with everything else they’ve heard during the workshop, what sort of organisation they believe NFRS to be striving to be.

The words with the highest number of responses are:

* Proactive
* Supportive
* Inclusive

The word cloud below outlines this as well as the other most prominent responses:

Words on a white background

Description automatically generated

Generally, the perception of NFRS’ culture is positive. Below is a sample of comments provided:

*“Nottinghamshire Fire and Rescue Service sounds like an organization that values community safety and proactive engagement. They seem committed to continuous improvement and collaboration, focusing on prevention and education. It appears to be a supportive environment where employees can make a real difference in their communities, and where innovation and feedback are welcomed. Overall, it sounds like a fulfilling place to work.”*

* *Disability Focus Group Attendee*

*“I believe that NFRS sounds like an organisation that is committed to fostering a diverse and inclusive workforce, where the well-being of staff is a priority. The focus on aligning the culture of the service with public expectations also indicates a progressive organisation that values transparency and public trust. Moreover, with the emphasis on leadership development, it sounds like a place where employees have opportunities for growth and career progression while contributing meaningfully to their communities.”*

* *Disability Focus Group Attendee*

*“Before today - quite masculine service, not very welcoming to 'others'. After today - a business actively looking to diversify, grow and better itself.”*

* *LGBTQ+ Focus Group Attendee*

1. **Service Improvement**

**Focus Groups have been asked what they see as areas NFRS should seek to target to improve the Service’s efficiency and effectiveness.**

**The most popular themes outlined below:**

* **Community engagement & Communications**
* **Resourcing & finances**
* **Staff wellbeing**
* **Digital, Data & Technology systems**

Regarding the above, community engagement is identified within the plan as being a priority, with clear evidence of steps being taken to progress in this area (community befriending, Prevention restructure, CAG and so on).

Resourcing & finances comments were largely relating to a perception that NFRS is under-resourced/funded and requires additional finances to invest in the service. We have limited levers to pull in this area, but this is perhaps reflected in the support for charging for false alarms and a £5 council tax increase identified in the Consultation Survey, outlined earlier in this report.

Staff wellbeing is a clear priority in Strategic Goal 5.

Use of digital and data comments relate to use of analytics to identify high-risk areas. This is already referenced in the plan via the further development of the RBIP and the development of a risk-based prevention programme (the NTU CEAC project), however some comments also were made regarding investing in AI.

1. **Sustainability**

**Focus groups were asked, based on everything they have heard in the workshops and their understanding of the three-year plan, how reasonable they feel a £5 increase in council tax per year would be.**

**83% stated that they think it would be reasonable or very reasonable for council tax to increase to support the funding of the Fire Service.**

14% stated that they felt it was unreasonable or very unreasonable, with 3% unsure.

Generally, the comments made were similar and clearly supportive. However, there were some concerns raised about affordability for some members of the community, and the requirement for any additional funding to be well managed and targeted at the priorities discussed elsewhere in this report.

*“I believe that a £5 increase in council tax per year is a reasonable contribution if it directly supports essential improvements, such as renewing vehicles and equipment, building new stations, and enhancing environmental sustainability. These initiatives are necessary for maintaining and improving the service’s capability to respond efficiently and keep the community safe. However, it’s important that the public is clearly informed about how the funds will be used, ensuring transparency and accountability. If people can see the tangible benefits, I think they would be more likely to support the increase.”*

* General Population Focus Group Attendee

**PART FIVE:**

**TECHNICAL PEER REVIEW FEEDBACK**

The feedback provided by critical friends from other services highlights significant strengths in the CRMP, while offering valuable insights for improvement. The assessments reflect the robust and credible nature of the CRMP, while also identifying areas where refinements could enhance its impact and accessibility.

Reviewers commended the CRMP for its well-considered structure, effective visual design, and the ability to present complex information in an accessible manner. The clear articulation of challenges, priorities, and risks faced by the county is noted as a major strength, offering readers understanding of the local context which sets NFRS’s strategic direction. The inclusion of our achievements was praised for instilling confidence in the service’s competence and credibility, while it was felt that the use of infographics, QR codes, and succinct content ensures the document is engaging and easy to navigate.

The decision to adopt a three-year timespan for the CRMP is well-supported. This timeframe strikes an effective balance between futureproofing and maintaining agility in response to year-by-year funding challenges. It is seen as a pragmatic approach that aligns well with the legislative framework and the Fire Standards Board’s requirements.

Notably, the inclusion of a "Plan on a Page" format was celebrated as a *sector-leading practice*, providing tangible and measurable goals that resonate with public expectations and regulatory standards.

Reviewers did suggest opportunities for refinement to further elevate the CRMP’s effectiveness; the need for a more prominent presentation of financial information, particularly regarding future resource allocation to mitigate risks would be beneficial. This addition would ensure clarity on how resources are aligned to identified risks. Similarly, they suggested enhancing the Community Risk Assessment by categorising risks as current, emerging, or future to reflect the dynamic nature of the three-year plan.

Additional suggestions included emphasising cultural improvement initiatives like the development of a cultural dashboard. The governance section could also benefit from a clearer articulation of how good governance ensures accountability, robust decision-making, and public interest alignment, potentially referencing the International Framework for Good Governance in the Public Sector.

Reviewers endorsed the strategic goals, though they suggested providing succinct summaries or “headlines” to clarify how each goal reduces risk and aligns with the overall CRMP priorities. For example, linking prevention efforts directly to reduced fire risk among vulnerable populations would underscore the tangible benefits of these initiatives.

In conclusion, the feedback from these critical friend partners underscores the CRMP’s status as a strong and credible document, reflecting sector-wide best practice. While some refinements were suggested, it is the view of sector partners that the CRMP is already positioned as an exemplary plan that effectively communicates NFRS’s strategic vision and commitment to serving the community.

**PART SIX:**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

The consultation process has yielded a comprehensive understanding of public, partner, and staff perceptions of the CRMP, its strategic priorities, risk assessment and plans.

The findings consistently demonstrate high levels of agreement and confidence in NFRS’s approach and resource allocation.

These are summarised below:

**Strategic Goals**

**Across the focus groups and survey, there was a strong endorsement of NFRS’s strategic goals.**

Survey data showed strong agreement with the goals, echoed in focus groups where participants appreciated the balance between Prevention, Protection, and Response in combination with strategic goals 4, 5 and 6.

Peer review feedback was supportive, with the plan on the page section described as “sector leading”. However, they suggested that greater emphasis should be placed on how the strategic goals will reduce risk.

**Recommendations:**

* Continue the current path regarding the Strategic Goals. They are well supported.
* Maintain clear communication around the goals throughout the life of the plan, highlighting progress in future updates to sustain evident public confidence.

**Risk Identification**

**Both the focus groups and survey participants agreed that NFRS have accurately identified and prioritized key risks.**

91% of survey respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. Focus group participants valued the detail and proactive nature of risk assessments but suggested continued engagement to adapt to emerging risks.

Peer review feedback suggested refinements to the presentation of how resources are allocated/aligned to mitigate risks. Similarly, they suggested grading risks and categorising them as current, emerging, or future to reflect the dynamic nature of the three-year plan.

**Recommendations:**

* Review the Strategic Assessment of Risk with more regularity, ensuring alignment with public and stakeholder expectations.

**Community Safety and Emergency Response**

**High confidence in NFRS’s ability to protect the community was a recurring theme.**

Survey results indicated 91% agreement that plans would keep the community safe, with similar confidence expressed regarding emergency response. Focus group participants particularly value the visibility and preparedness of response teams.

**Recommendations:**

* Continue showcasing emergency response capabilities through public engagement activities to reinforce confidence.
* Consider opportunities where technologies can support NFRS in data analysis, forecasting, optimising resource allocation, and improving community engagement.

**Accessibility**

**While most respondents (81%) found the CRMP accessible, the focus groups highlighted potential barriers, particularly for certain community segments.**

Survey results also indicated more neutrality or disagreement on this question than on others, with 14% unsure about accessibility – but overall, there is still a high level of endorsement in this area.

**Recommendations:**

* The online version of the CRMP was identified as being the most popular, but there was still a reasonable percentage of people who preferred the PDF version. Retain both.
* Continue to engage with underrepresented groups, potentially supporting staff in how to do so.

**Charging for False Alarms**

**Both focus group discussions and survey responses indicated strong support (90% survey agreement) for charging a call-out fee for unnecessary false alarms at business premises after other mitigation efforts.**

Focus groups recognized the potential for financial and operational efficiency, provided businesses are well-informed and supported.

**Recommendations:**

* Further explore implementing a charge for excessive and repeated False Alarm calls to Businesses.
* Exclude partners such as the NHS.
* Develop a clear and transparent framework for implementing charges, including communication and education for businesses.

**Funding and Council Tax Increase**

**The proposal for a £5 annual Council Tax increase saw 77% support in the survey, with focus group participants expressing cautious agreement.**

The above is caveated by ensuring that provided funds are transparently allocated to frontline services.

**Recommendations:**

* Explore the possibility of a £5 annual Council Tax increase.
* Communicate specific benefits of the additional funding and how it will directly support service improvements

**PART SEVEN:**

**CLOSING SUMMARY**

The consultation process undertaken by NFRS in support of the development of NFRS’ new Community Risk Management Plan was effective, with the draft CRMP itself being broadly supported by most participants.

Engagement with the public, staff, and key stakeholders, was delivered with transparency, inclusivity, and collaboration at its heart, with the results of the consultation providing valuable insights that affirm the robustness of NFRS’s strategic direction while offering guidance for further refinement and improvement.

This consultation process, in terms of responses from the public, partners, and staff, has been the most successful that NFRS has undertaken in terms of response rates across all areas.

The consultation process adhered closely to national guidance, the Consultation Framework and the National Framework; confidence can be assured regarding consistency with both internal and external expectations.

A strength of the consultation was reaching a broad spectrum of people, including traditionally underrepresented groups. Under 35s saw an increase in responses in this consultation, from 11 in 2021 to 143 this time around compared to the last consultation. 57.5% of responses were from female respondents. Sexual orientation demographics were representative of the community of Nottinghamshire. Non-white British responses increased by 925% compared with 2021, making up 19% of the total responses received in this consultation. Responses from individuals with a disability or long-term health condition increased by 13.2% compared with 2021. Participation by most religions and beliefs was representative of the community of Nottinghamshire.

The diversity of the respondents, supplemented by Focus Groups, indicates that feedback received will encompass a wide range of community perspectives. This has allowed NFRS to gain a holistic understanding of public sentiment.

The CRMP’s strategic goals, including those focusing on Prevention, Protection, and Response, were broadly supported by participants across various demographics. This alignment is not only consistent with NFRS’s responsibility to the communities it serves but also ensures compliance with the statutory duties outlined within the National Frameworks as well as the expectations of strategic leaders.

This support underscores public confidence in NFRS’s approach. Moreover, the focus on fostering partnerships and targeting vulnerable populations resonated strongly with those in the focus groups, highlighting the importance of collaboration in building community trust.

The proposition of charging businesses for false alarms received broad support, though the consultation results reinforced the need for clear, transparent communication regarding its implementation, and a robust and fair process. This finding highlights an understanding by the public of the need for the Fire Service to creatively address operational efficiency without compromising service delivery.

The discussions around the proposed Council Tax increase similarly demonstrated public receptiveness, albeit with the necessary caveat of ensuring that the funds would directly support frontline services. These insights confirm the legitimacy of the proposals and their alignment with public sentiment.

While the service could have chosen to utilise the same budget as previous years, it instead made the conscious decision to prioritise efficiency by conducting the consultation in-house. The consultation process not only generated results exceeding previous consultations but also demonstrated the Service’s ability to leverage its available resources without sacrificing the quality or authenticity of the outcomes.

Feedback received about the Focus Groups was positive, providing community groups with in-depth insights; the ability to discuss and examine topics resulted in insightful feedback, as well as building relationships which can be revisited in the future to maintain on-going dialogue.

The process has been successful not only in achieving its immediate objectives but also in reinforcing NFRS’s commitment to ongoing engagement with the communities it serves. The feedback gathered through this consultation has been invaluable in confirming the service’s strategic priorities and in providing direction for future planning. The support for NFRS’s approach, coupled with actionable insights from participants, reinforces the credibility and legitimacy of the process. The consultation has played a critical role in ensuring that the CRMP is a living document, reflective of public needs and responsive to emerging challenges.

**PART EIGHT: NOTABLE QUOTES**

**On Strategic Goal 1:**

*“I feel confident that NFRS is dedicated to keeping our community safe from fires and other emergencies based off their proactive approach in the community risk management plan which emphasizes prevention, education, and collaboration with local organizations. This shows a strong commitment to understanding and addressing the unique risks we face. However, I think it's important for the service to continue fostering open communication with residents. Ensuring that community members are informed and engaged in safety initiatives can enhance trust and effectiveness.”*

* General Population Focus Group Attendee, on Strategic Goal 1

*“I feel confident that NFRS is committed to keeping our community safe from fires and other emergencies. Their focus on prevention, education, and community engagement is key. The community risk management plan highlights proactive measures like fire safety campaigns, partnerships with local organizations, and targeted interventions for vulnerable groups.”*

* General Population Focus Group Attendee, on Strategic Goal 1

*“You're doing well, but fundamentally the question is what \*more\* can you do. Constraints seem to be keeping you from adding folks to "at risk" lists - the Severn Trent / priority services idea sounded useful. A specific focus on allowing the fire service more access to council and utilities data could help.”*

* In2People Focus Group Attendee, on Strategic Goal 1

*“Happy that areas of prevention are being considered. Partnership working is key as very often people with vulnerabilities do not want to become involved with “authorities”. Sharing of information key. Housing Associations have lists of their vulnerable residents. Following today I have now a greater understanding of what you can do.”*

* In2People Focus Group Attendee, on Strategic Goal 1

*“The plan gives me confidence in NFRS ability to keep our communities safe. I already feel they do an amazing job in keeping us safe, so it fills me with confidence to see their plan for constant improvement.”*

* In2People Focus Group Attendee on Strategic Goal 1

*“The plan gives confidence because more people will get smoke alarms fitted within their homes.”*

* Young People Focus Group Attendee, on Strategic Goal 1

*“I am confident, I feel like you have a grasp of your own weaknesses and are actively trying to combat them.”*

* LGBTQ+ Focus Group Attendee, on Strategic Goal 1

**On Strategic Goal 2:**

*“I think charging a call-out fee for unnecessary false alarms at business premises could be a fair approach, particularly if efforts to address these alarms through other means have not been effective. However, it's essential that the fire service ensures businesses are well-informed about how to prevent false alarms and that they have support in upgrading their systems. A clear explanation of the rationale behind the fee, along with proper education on how to avoid false alarms, could encourage businesses to be more proactive in maintaining effective alarm systems. This would also help maintain a positive relationship between the fire service and the business community.”*

* General Population Focus Group Attendee, on Strategic Goal 2

*“I think that providing that protocols are put in place, so that we have done as much as we can. Make sure all incidents, recommendations are taken than yes! I think that you should also consider the impact of collecting the debt once it has been raised. We must keep good records in case it has to go to court if nonpayment.”*

* In2People Focus Group Attendee, on Strategic Goal 2

*“I worry that the messaging that it is business only might not be strong enough and may lead to people be discouraged from calling. If the messaging is clear, it may encourage university halls with faulty alarm systems to fix their systems. I think it would decrease the number of callouts, but it highlights the commercialisation of our public services.”*

* General Population Focus Group Attendee, on Strategic Goal 2

*“It's very complicated and needs nuance. A simple warehouse with a dodgy wire would be easy to hit with "third call in X weeks and you get a charge". A massive, and massively busy campus like QMC or Kings Mill would prove almost impossible to reign in. You would need a solid marketing campaign to explain why, and why some sites are being omitted.”*

* General Population Focus Group Attendee, on Strategic Goal 2

**On Strategic Goal 4:**

*“I believe that NFRS sounds like an organisation that is committed to fostering a diverse and inclusive workforce, where the well-being of staff is a priority. The focus on aligning the culture of the service with public expectations also indicates a progressive organisation that values transparency and public trust. Moreover, with the emphasis on leadership development, it sounds like a place where employees have opportunities for growth and career progression while contributing meaningfully to their communities.”*

* Disability Focus Group Attendee, on Strategic Goal 4

*“From what I’ve heard today, Nottinghamshire Fire and Rescue Service sounds like an organization that values community safety and proactive engagement. They seem committed to continuous improvement and collaboration, focusing on prevention and education. It appears to be a supportive environment where employees can make a real difference in their communities, and where innovation and feedback are welcomed. Overall, it sounds like a fulfilling place to work.”*

* LGBTQ+ Focus Group Attendee, on Strategic Goal 4

*“Before today - quite masculine service, not very welcoming to 'others'. After today - a business actively looking to diversify, grow and better itself.”*

* LGBTQ+ Focus Group Attendee, on Strategic Goal 4

**On Strategic Goal 5:**

*“Keep pushing communications and liaison - keep talking and sharing with surrounding services; with councils and trade organisations; with utilities and social groups; with social media community hubs. Stronger together!”*

* In2People Focus Group Attendee, on Strategic Goal 5

*“I would make sure that when putting the plan together I would make sure that I had the resources in place not just the money! I would not put too much on the plan and not be able to deliver because we haven’t got the people in place. People are the most impotent assets so we need to make sure we can invest in them.”*

* In2People Focus Group Attendee, on Strategic Goal 5

*“Economy of scale. Could you not procure with other fire services? Any decision should be data led, are you happy that you are making the decisions on the proper information? Do you consider sponsorship? Naming a tender etc for a fee.”*

* In2People Focus Group Attendee, on Strategic Goal 5