

# Appendix J

Emails (Members of Public)



Redacted email response log

Date	Email Comment
13.7.18	<p>Dear Mr Green,</p> <p>The consultation launched recently is a matter of concern to me as a Norfolk and Cromer resident.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ The questionnaire is rather odd. Its format does not give consideration to the details of your proposals. A single comment box after the question over support or rejection of the proposal is disconcerting. It seems a simple measurement of take it or leave it being key, with any input being discouraged. Given that elsewhere there is another comment box after asking about the gender of the respondent [quite what the purpose of that could be is enigmatic], it gives an impression that the exercise is not really a proper consultation</li><li>▪ Your research must have entailed costs. Please would you give the Norfolk public a breakdown of these and how this has been funded</li><li>▪ There is an assumption that Norfolk residents have confidence in the office of PCC. There is a further assumption that the role has been discharged by both yourself and your predecessor in such a way that extension of PCC powers is welcomed. These are not fair assumptions. Quite apart from reservations about your predecessor [he was not re-elected which says much], your own failure to meet with the people of Cromer or our representatives to consider the appalling situation that happened at Carnival 2017 has created a negative impression. Perhaps, also, a telling figure is the low turnout of voters in PCC elections</li><li>▪ Contrary to your protestation that governance of NFRS is not a political issue, it would seem that a route direct to the Home Office to impose enlargement of the office of PCC without full and cross party support from NCC Members and testing this by a local referendum is just that. The model of having a County Council with Members who represent and know the interests of their divisions is very different to having single person governance. It seems a further erosion of local democracy</li><li>▪ NFRS has a very different reputation and image to Norfolk Constabulary. Whatever is said about retaining their distinct identities, perception is important. One is seen as a compassionate service with local engagement which is only matched by the RNLI and the Ambulance service. The other is seen as increasingly remote and concerned with enforcement and performance statistics-driven. Your allegiance comes across as being driven by “efficiencies”. Sadly, efficiency means that simply logging “minor” incidents and/or not following them up may cost the police budget less, but the damage done at the individual level spreads and confidence and respect declines. If that sort of policy extends into NFRS the implications are unacceptable</li><li>▪ Norfolk County Council is neither irrelevant nor defective. This seems implied by what is stated as the case for moving NFRS from its governance. That central government wishes to portray county councils as such is grotesque. The “austerity” of cutting RSG etc has meant that the local authority becomes the agent of severe choice in what to cut, or to increase the tax burden. Ownership and local identity are being eroded, whether this be academisation of schools, PFI indebtedness or moving accountability from County Hall. The proposals you have published look like more of that party political nightmare</li><li>▪ The implications for estate resources are explored in a very limited way in the document. It seems that the experience relating to Norfolk Constabulary has not been without negatives. In Cromer, the new “police office” is unsympathetically located for a community with an ageing profile – and goodness knows what the opening times are! The old site was sold off and a private</li></ul>

	<p>developer has made handsome profit. Co-location and rationalisation sound reasonable, but is it merely a money question?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Deployment of vehicles seems “interesting”. The changes to the fleet must have the confidence of all levels of operational firefighters. One curiosity is the “experimental pilot” idea of a police officer in the NFRS 4X4 – are police officers always that readily available?</li> <li>▪ A mention of increased remuneration for the holder of the enlarged office is not prominent in the document. Presumably, this has been considered and should this not be more visible?</li> </ul> <p>Best wishes,</p>
18.7.18	<p>FAO Lorne Green</p> <p>I have recently completed the on line consultation and wonder what relevance who I work for has to this process. As a County Council worker I feel that having to declare this suggests I have a pecuniary interest and therefore my opinion as a citizen will not have the same weight as other respondents. Can you confirm why the question is asked and what difference employer category will have when considering the responses made?</p>
20.7.18	<p>Dear Mr Green,</p> <p>The consultation launched recently is a matter of concern to me as a Norfolk and Cromer resident.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The questionnaire is rather odd. Its format does not gives consideration to the details of your proposals. A single comment box after the question over support or rejection of the proposal is disconcerting. It seems a simple measurement of take it or leave it being key, with any input being discouraged. Given that elsewhere there is another comment box after asking about the gender of the respondent [quite what the purpose of that could be is enigmatic], it gives an impression that the exercise is not really a proper consultation</li> <li>▪ Your research must have entailed costs. Please would you give the Norfolk public a breakdown of these and how this has been funded</li> <li>▪ There is an assumption that Norfolk residents have confidence in the office of PCC. There is a further assumption that the role has been discharged by both yourself and your predecessor in such a way that extension of PCC powers is welcomed. These are not fair assumptions. Quite apart from reservations about your predecessor [he was not re-elected which says much], your own failure to meet with the people of Cromer or our representatives to consider the appalling situation that happened at Carnival 2017 has created a negative impression. Perhaps, also, a telling figure is the low turnout of voters in PCC elections</li> <li>▪ Contrary to your protestation that governance of NFRS is not a political issue, it would seem that a route direct to the Home Office to impose enlargement of the office of PCC without full and cross party support from NCC Members and testing this by a local referendum is just that. The model of having a County Council with Members who represent and know the interests of their divisions is very different to having single person governance. It seems a further erosion of local democracy</li> <li>▪ NFRS has a very different reputation and image to Norfolk Constabulary. Whatever is said about retaining their distinct identities,</li> </ul>

	<p>perception is important. One is seen as a compassionate service with local engagement which is only matched by the RNLI and the Ambulance service. The other is seen as increasingly remote and concerned with enforcement and performance statistics-driven. Your allegiance come across as being driven by “efficiencies”. Sadly, efficiency means that simply logging “minor” incidents and/or not following them up may cost the police budget less, but the damage done at the individual level spreads and confidence and respect declines. If that sort of policy extends into NFRS the implications are unacceptable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Norfolk County Council is neither irrelevant nor defective. This seems implied by what is stated as the case for moving NFRS from its governance. That central government wishes to portray county councils as such is grotesque. The “austerity” of cutting RSG etc has meant that the local authority becomes the agent of severe choice in what to cut, or to increase the tax burden. Ownership and local identity are being eroded, whether this be academisation of schools, PFI indebtedness or moving accountability from County Hall. The proposals you have published look like more of that party political nightmare</li> <li>▪ The implications for estate resources are explored in a very limited way in the document. It seems that the experience relating to Norfolk Constabulary has not been without negatives. In Cromer, the new “police office” is unsympathetically located for a community with an ageing profile – and goodness knows what the opening times are! The old site was sold off and a private developer has made handsome profit. Co-location and rationalisation sound reasonable, but is it merely a money question?</li> <li>▪ Deployment of vehicles seems “interesting”. The changes to the fleet must have the confidence of all levels of operational firefighters. One curiosity is the “experimental pilot” idea of a police officer in the NFRS 4X4 – are police officers always that readily available?</li> <li>▪ A mention of increased remuneration for the holder of the enlarged office is not prominent in the document. Presumably, this has been considered and should this not be more visible?</li> </ul> <p>Best wishes,</p>
23.7.18	<p>Dear Mr Green</p> <p>As a Norfolk Fire &amp; Rescue Service [REDACTED] employee I would appreciate your response to my questions as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· If MAIT is being budgeted for then why is there a requirement for Fire and Police Controls to be in the same room? MAIT just emphasises the fact that we need technology to collaborate</li> <li>· Pg. 44 – What are the increases in operational efficiencies and why do they jump from 28 in years 1 and 2 to 126 and then get progressively higher – are these staffing savings?</li> <li>· If there is no intent to merge then why are ‘blended skillsets’ mentioned (pg. 65)? Why are Control staff being treated differently to Firefighters – our job is fundamentally different to that of a Police Controller</li> <li>· In terms of the East Coast &amp; Hertfordshire Control Room Consortium it states that ‘<i>This Business Case proposal assumes that these arrangements will remain in place, subject to a review of effectiveness at a later date.</i>’(pg. 65) What is defined as a later date?</li> <li>· Pg. 100 – ‘<i>Efficiency savings resulting from interoperability will be realised earlier. This would bring forward the</i></li> </ul>

	<p><i>reconfiguration of senior management roles through vacancy management and redeployment. Partly nets off against cost of MAIT rollout of 60k.</i> Is this referring to Police Control senior management roles as there are none within NFRS?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Much is said about our headquarters function now being at OCC but we know that the amount of accommodation available is considerably less than what we had at Whitegates, and there is still the contentious issue of car parking! How do you propose to accommodate us sufficiently?</li> <li>· Can we have more explanation on how the PCC as our employer can guarantee that we can remain in the Local Government Pension scheme?</li> </ul>
2.8.18	<p>Having read about the proposed changes I feel I have to comment.</p> <p>The fire service as well as police are struggling due to continued cuts in numbers. To propose they join up together is ridiculous, they are two different services supporting the community in different ways. Having said that in some ways they already work alongside each other, and support each other.</p> <p>If some of the hierarchy of the police and fire service was cut then the money saved would go someways towards funding more officers on both forces.</p> <p>Each of the services undertake years of training in there particular role, this can not be just then be passed onto another service to take over.</p> <p>If there was a major incident both sections will be involved in different roles and need to be governed by superiors equipped to lead them in their task.</p> <p>As for closing fire stations such as Heacham, I am absolutely disgusted. It is not too far back that the people of this village fought led by Tracy Swan to keep this station open. Given the amount of caravan sights in and around Heacham and Hunstanton I would have thought this was essential.</p> <p>Since the demise of the PCSO in Norfolk the police stations have struggled to offer the services people expect. The promise of new police just isn't happening quickly enough. When they are trained all they are doing is filling the gaps of officers retiring, not the extra promised. And then there was the wonderful idea to close PEO's so now people have approximately one hour a week where they guarantee someone will be there to speak to them. The trouble is crime doesn't happen like that, holiday makers need to be able to call in when ever not once a week.</p> <p>I may have diverted from the original subject but I am incensed that this proposal is even being considered and to me it is a step too far and should not go ahead. Moral is at rock bottom and this could be the stone that breaks its back.</p>
3.8.18	<p>Loren Green</p> <p>Please do not even consider your plan to take over Norfolk Fire &amp; Rescue Service, and make the wrong decision to close OUR fire station. Heacham really has spread out over the past years and covers quite a large area. The number of permanent residents has also risen as lots of caravanners who come for holidays decide to move permanently to Heacham. The fact that new houses are popping up throughout Heacham also adds to the population explosion, together with the seasonal holiday makers who love to come here. Now, to add to the equation, the extremely high temperatures we are all suffering greatly add to the risk of serious fires. It is therefore</p>

	<p>imperative that Heacham Fire Station remains in situ. Thank you for your consideration. A worried resident.</p>
4.8.18	<p>Dear Mr Green Please leave our fire station alone. We need it. Never was this clearer than recently, when Heacham crews attended a field blaze in Ringstead. We were badly needed. So, in response to your public consultation, my answer is a resounding NO.</p>
4.8.18	<p>Please do not close down Heacham fire station. This is a much valued service to our village and surrounding villages</p>
7.8.18	<p>Thank you for the email containing the survey. I have a completed and returned this. The transfer of the governance as proposed makes sense certainly from the point of view of it being in the domain of the PCC rather than the Communities Committee which is rather a "soft" unit. Gentle souls compared with the frequently "rough and tumble" environment of the Police Force, and indeed the Fire Brigade. However to make an informed decision I would like to know what is the opinion of the chaps and chapesses who are in the front line of both the police force and the fire brigade. They are the people who often bear the brunt of things and so their views should be carefully considered. My considered guess is that you hold a similar view as myself so could well enlighten me please.</p>
7.8.18	<p>Dear Mr. Green, Although I am all for modernizing and re thinking of existing services and thinking outside the box I also do believe in NOT concentrating too much power in one person or organization. £1.5 million spending on the change over process and associated costs does not sound cost effective to me. Please listen to what the public and other people have to say and at the very least give us ALL the information, not just the bits that suit your purposes. Hoping that you will follow a democratic process.</p>
7.8.18	<p>Absolutely no change. People have been fighting against weakening the fire service for years. This threat is just the latest attempt to do so. This time the danger is from a different direction which makes it even more worrying. I say again NO.</p>
8.8.18	<p>Dear ██████ and Lorne I am writing to you as elected representatives (although I did not vote for either of you) supposedly accountable to the people of North West Norfolk and Norfolk. I wish to register in the strongest of tones my objection to the proposal for the PCC to assume the governance of the county's fire and rescue service. Lorne, when you were elected it was on 27.6% of votes cast. However, only 23.2% of those eligible to vote did so and so the 42,928 people who voted for you only equate to 13% of the total electorate. This is absolutely not a mandate to assume governance and neither was this talked about pre-election. Lorne, you are a former active member of the Conservative Party. The police have been, previously,</p>

	<p>strongly Conservative. The Fire and Rescue Service are a unionised workplace that has now reestablished affiliation with the Labour Party. This could be viewed as a blatant attempt to hamstring the union, silence critics and move funds from one service to another. Lorne, you claim that because the FRS are overseen by a committee at Norfolk County Council, that this is evidence of duplication as it means "twice the governance" but in matter of fact, this is only the case because of a costly and unnecessary introduction of PCC. Prior to this, it would not have been considered so. One could argue that as your post is the newest form of governance, that you are the duplication of governance and should cease. If there is any kind of agreement that the FRS should have a commissioner overseeing its governance, than the public should at least have the option of voting for a person who actually knows and understand the needs of the service, not a former ambassador who has no history, knowledge or understanding. However, there is no consensus that this governance is necessary. Indeed, Norfolk County Council that is led by a Conservative majority, has argued against this proposal.</p> <p>Lorne, you have also let is slip at meetings that you intend to introduce smaller appliances which will be sent to assess the needs at fires. This could well lead to a doubling of appliances sent, as it became clear that the smaller pump wasn't appropriate and it could also lead to a loss of lives. Particularly as Norfolk has many rural and geographically isolated communities.</p> <p>I would like to know when you plan to hold a public consultation meeting in King's Lynn? I understand you've shown up at Tesco, but most of the local public weren't given advance notice of this and neither was it convenient. While i have responded to the survey with my views it is not satisfactory to use that as the main reason to base any decision on. I'd expect that such an important decision should be directed by the public at face to face meetings.</p> <p>Many of my trade union colleagues have indicated the same dissatisfaction in not being able to attend a face to face meeting for the sole purpose of gaining and providing feedback on this matter. The consultation ends on September 5th. Please advise me when you will be holding a meeting in King's Lynn and I expect, in order for you to be able to assure the public you've been inclusive, that there will be both a day time and an evening meeting.</p> <p>Best wishes</p>
10.8.18	<p>I am emailing to question why there has been no public meeting to consult on this proposal and also to formally register my objection. The policing in the area has not been dramatically improved under the governance of the PCC and taking on further responsibility for another public service is therefore a questionable decision. NCC are more than adequately places to continue their role.</p> <p>Your proposals were not part of the platform on which you stood. It is disappointing that these matters are not being more widely publicised.</p>
11.8.18	<p>In my opinion this is utter madness. You can't manage the police, so how on earth can you manage both. The police are not able to attend half the incidents they should.</p> <p>We need more staff and funding, not less.</p> <p>Get rid of the top brass sat behind desks doing nothing and give the money to those who actually SAVE our lives.</p>
11.8.18	<p>Dear Commissioner Green,</p> <p>Please re-consider your proposal to close 17 local police or fire stations simply to save money. We in this Village in particular have fought</p>

	<p>long and hard to save our Fire Station. A campaign led by the late Ms Tracey Swann was successful in retaining this extremely important service and to see her work destroyed is an insult to her memory.</p> <p>The Fire station is even more important now as more building and traffic build up in this area, making our lives more vulnerable to disasters on the roads.</p> <p>The recent unseasonably hot and stormy weather has seen our Brigade stretched to it's limit and rather than closing the Station it would be advisable to invest in more engines, not removing the Fire Service.</p>
12.8.18	<p>Dear Lorne,</p> <p>I have to tell you that I am completely opposed to your plans to take the running of the fire service under your auspices. I think proposals you have made to reduce the size of some of the appliances and to merge buildings with the Police Service would reduce the efficiency of the services and lead to longer attendance times. With the Fire Service there would at times be initially inadequate equipment at the fire. This would inevitably lead to an increase in deaths.</p> <p>I also am generally in favour of services being run by a committee rather than be one person as it is more democratic and brings a wider range of experience to governance.</p>
15.8.18	<p>Dear Lorne</p> <p>I completely disagree with the idea that the Police Service should take over the Fire Service. Policing is best run by the police and the fire service is best run by the fire service. The emergency services have always co-operated without the need for a take-over. I can only think that it is either a power-grab or a cost cutting exercise. If funding is the problem then council tax needs to be increased to maintain it at the current level. Too many of us expect the services when we need them without having to pay a proper level of tax to maintain them.</p>
17.8.18	<p>Hi,</p> <p>I'm hoping you can help me with some questions regards the PCC business case for Norfolk fire and rescue. I attended the Meeting last night at Kings Lynn North fire station and i am a retained Fire Fighter [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] Whilst last nights meeting was useful and i feel more informative than the County Hall meeting i still think I've come away with some unanswered questions both as a Fire fighter within Norfolk but also as a Norfolk resident and am hoping that i can get these answers here please?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Regarding the map with the missing stations and proposed smaller appliances, where did that map derive from and who compiled it? Was this a proposed vision of the future of Norfolk fire and rescue for the next 5 years, 10 years or was it compiled by the PCC office based upon data provided. I ask this because at least one of the proposed RRV positions is a single pump station. Operationally replacing that appliance with a small RRV contradicts what was said last night regards operational</li> </ol>



decisions being made by the PCC if it was made/suggested by the PCC that is. However the source of that information does of course change how it is viewed and received. Some clarity on that would be great.

2. After this public consultation of the draft proposal which has many self admitted errors will a full finalised proposal be put back out for public consultation? No one in reality can make a decision on a draft document if it contains errors that can be decision making, the public are being asked to vote and have an opinion on this but the errors are only really visible to those involved with and affected by the decision making. The public don't know that two stations are missing from the map, they don't know what an RRV is, they do not know if putting a Police officer on Fire engines would work or not as they don't really understand the demands of each services work, they don't know if we have overlapping skill sets which even last night couldn't be fully answered . These are all statements and suggestions but not concrete ideas to put in place. Above all else though the obvious one for me is our missing station. This has been said many times as a genuine mistake but for us it is a very large error. We could be the turkeys voting for Christmas. Without a newly amended proposal with all of these errors taking in to account and firmer detailing i feel that we are not being presented with the full business case as it might be sent to the home office. You could not present a business plan to a bank with such errors and expect them to make an informed choice based on acknowledgement of them finding your mistakes. I feel the same exists here. You can go to the bank with an idea but they won't lend based upon that until they have a clearly defined plan. Will a finalised document be put out for public consultation?
3. In your 2016-2020 Plan you listed clearly set out goals, objectives and what you hoped to achieve within the Police force. Within which was mention of becoming more involved in the fire service and finding ways to join the two services. Within this proposed takeover of the Fire service I don't feel that the same has happened; there are no clear defined goals for us in this instance to get on board with. There are lots of assumptions made and lots of proposed efficiency savings but no clearly defined way that this is going to happen. How have the figures quoted been arrived at? An often used phrase last night was 'if you're being asked to pay for more then what is the tax payer going to get for their money'. A very noble sentiment and one that i hope will continue should the PCC take over, however this proposed business case has been presented on the platform of efficiency savings, better value for money yet there we were last night discussing increasing council tax and asking for more money from the council pot/central govt. Perhaps i am wrong here so please feel free to correct me but If NCC are being asked to make savings and the PCC budget comes from NCC partly then where will any increase come from. I'm sorry but it's not clear to me how you can say you'll make savings on the one hand which according to the meeting at County hall is why removing the county council could make sense and save the tax payer money yet assure us that if more money is asked for then it'll be found or attempted to be found. It's all a little confusing and grey from the outside. In order to find money for something else without being allocated any more then you need to reduce other area's. These are cuts and one thing that has been stated is that there will be no cuts and no station closures. Herts PCC is attempting exactly that at the moment, station closures and job losses and the selling off of fire service assets so I'm sure you can appreciate this very worrying situation, especially given our missing station on the Map.
4. Will Norfolk fire and rescue assets remain theirs under the sole control of the Chief fire officer or will they be turned over to the PCC or will they be owned by NCC and rented to NFRS/PCC? Land for development in certain key areas in Norfolk can be quite profitable and in the short term could provide a cash injection but these are only one time deals and once used the money can not be found again and the locations not regained.
5. If the PCC do take control and for e.g. ring fence say £20m as the NFRS budget my understanding is this, If the Chief fire officer

	<p>asks for more budget for staff or equipment then he needs to present his case, totally understandable. The PCC, if in agreement, then lobbies central govt for further funding i believe and hopefully some extra budget or allowance to increase the council tax occurs. What happens if the opposite occurs. Central Govt says that Norfolk PCC needs to reduce it's expenditure on police and fire by 5% annually and will receive 5% less on both budgets. What negotiations can occur, does the PCC just pass this down to the Chief fire officer and leave it to him to sort out or are there safe guards in place to stop central govt handing down further cuts once the County council are no longer in charge of the budget for NFRS and able to partially protect the Fire service by looking at other depts to spread their burden being placed upon them. Some clarification on this would be greatly appreciated please</p> <p>I very much believe that change can sometimes be for the better but in our current climate of public services being stretched further and further and with fewer and fewer resources this type of decision and change in the status quo may not be of any advantage. NFRS is already extremely efficient with regards of its cost per head to the tax payer, the fat has been trimmed, the carcass has been stripped and now it feels like the bones are being picked over. I personally just don't feel there is anything left for NFRS or its staff to give. Some clearly defined goals, objectives and ways that these might be achieved will really help in being able to see the vision of the fire service that the PCC has. Things can always be more efficient and at the very least this situation may shake the tree to push some discussed ideas forward to create better collaborations with the fire service and other agencies to put more budget back in to the front line staffing by reducing wastage behind the scenes. We would be naive and foolish to stand in the way of that.</p> <p>I hope you can answer my questions and i look forward to hearing from you soon.</p>
18.8.18	<p>I wish to object to the joining of Norfolk Fire Service to the PPC Office. I heard the radio broadcast and wanted to point out that this is an emergency SERVICE not a BUSINESS as stated by the PPC Commissioner when making his case on the radio.</p>
20.8.18	<p>Dear Sir</p> <p>Can you help us please.</p> <p>We live in Cringleford, the other day a man knocked on our door announcing himself as Mr Clive Lewis MP, asking my wife to sign a petition against the PCC making a power grab for the fire service. He said we all need to get together and stop the PCC.</p> <p>My wife was confused and said that she had already voted on line on the PCC Website and was worried now which one was the right one to do to have our say. When she told Mr Lewis she had already voted in favour he didn't seem impressed and he questioned her why.</p> <p>She said she had read about the change on social media and went on the PCC website to vote. We both have, we think it was the right thing to do, it makes sense for the services to work closer together and if they can be more efficient it helps us all. At that point Mr Lewis said so you're not going to change your mind then? She said no, therefore he went next door. It looked like he was doing the whole</p>

	<p>estate.</p> <p>We are all for democracy but how on earth can any of my neighbours or anyone actually understand what is going on, it's all very confusing. Have we got it wrong? Did we do the right survey to register our vote? If not what one?</p> <p>Please let us know.</p>
22.8.18	<p>I am writing to object to the proposals to replace fully operational fire appliances and replace them with lightweight 4x4 vehicles to eight local villages. This is an ill-conceived plan resulting in a significant reduction in fire service response capabilities in rural areas. I am not sure how someone could determine that a 4x4 with limited equipment and personnel would be an effective fire-fighting alternative to a fire appliance.</p> <p>Response times for an appliance to respond to significant fires would be greater, potentially risking lives as they would be coming from further away. This would create a significant strain on the main fire stations with a limited number of appliances serving a larger area. This may be perceived as a cost-saving measure but it will put lives at risk with the potential for relatively small fires escalating due to the lack of personnel and equipment to effectively deal with fires.</p> <p>PCC Lorne Green is clearly demonstrating his lack of knowledge of the fire service - its challenges and limitations and the fire service should be governed by someone who has a suitable background. If you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>
23.8.18	<p>I have already had my say and do not support any proposal that involves the PCC taking over Fire and Rescue services in Norfolk</p>
23.8.18	<p>I do not wish to see a change to the current situation of the County Council running the Fire Service. Any proposals to have one individual even if elected, dilutes the opportunity of residents of this county to have their say through their councillors.</p> <p>Democracy works well as we now have it now. Even the costs of an election would be unnecessary. Please leave it alone and stop empirebuilding. Concentrate on the police services.</p>
30.8.18	<p>I assume that by having Lome Green in charge of the Fire Service instead of a Committee democratic control is lost as presumably is the case already of the Police Service. This is not to denigrate in any way Mr Lome who may be very good in being Commissioner for the Fire Service</p>
30.8.18	<p>I have received a newsletter from [REDACTED] which stipulates the closer of the Downham Market Fire station and rescue services I</p>

	urge you strongly to think very closely <b>not to do so</b> being a Downham Market Resident .
2.9.18	<p>Please do not merge the fire service with the police service as they are completely separate specialist services and require independent management that is specialist orientated for the service they provide. The three emergency services are already joined at the hip through the 999 emergency call service that coordinates appropriate responses and works well despite non-emergency calls that plague the operators.</p> <p>A first rate fire service can only be sustained by a self-governing body that monitors needs and performance without having to balance funding priorities and apportionment with another public service.</p> <p>As seen recently, if an entire council is disbanded for incompetent management, putting two key services under one roof creates a potential for a simultaneous risk to both services if management fail. The NHS is struggling - what next? This strategy to merge the Police and Fire Services is nonsense and risky, we may as well let the current NHS management manage all three services as then there would only be one management expense by the current reasoning behind this cost saving exercise but multiple services risk proposal.</p> <p>Thank you for your kind consideration,</p>
2.9.18	<p>I have been trying to complete the public consultation survey on the proposal for the Fire service to come under the authority of the Norfolk Police. Unfortunately a problem with the website did not allow me to access the survey. I will therefore send an email to you instead.</p> <p>I wish to disagree with the takeover proposal, because I believe the fire service should remain a stand alone emergency service. The cuts in the police budget over many years have had a detrimental affect in the response to local crimes and I do not want to see this management mindset affecting the reliability and efficiency of our fire Service.</p>
2.9.18	<p>Re the consultation and proposal for the Fire Service to be come within the remit of the PCC, I most strongly disagree with the proposal.</p> <p>The management of the Fire Service should remain as it is</p>
3.9.18	<p>Re the above, the fire service has been extremely well managed by the Chief Fire Officer and the Norfolk County Council for many years, and the current arrangements should be kept.</p> <p>I do not agree with the proposal that the PCC should have oversight of the Fire Service</p>
3.9.18	<p>I wish to register that I do not agree with the Proposal to Swich the Fire Service governance to Norfolk's PCC.</p> <p>I tried to use the link on Your PCC web site but any attempt to open Any page within the site promptly crashed with a message that there was no link on your server was down. (frustrating)</p>

3.9.18	<p>I have studied the business case for changing the governance of the Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service and I also attended a meeting held in the Dereham Memorial Hall, when the proposals were explained in more detail by you and your staff.</p> <p>I have concluded that there is a compelling case to change the governance of Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service to the Police and Crime Commissioner for Norfolk</p> <p>The potential to unlock £10m of financial efficiencies over the next 10 years, must be welcomed and also the intention to reinvest this into the Service cannot be dismissed</p> <p>The opportunity, under a new governance arrangement, to ring fence and protect the funding for the Fire Service gives much needed reassurance and certainty for future years</p> <p>The assurance that operational command would remain with the Chief Fire Officer, in a similar manner as currently exercised by the Chief Constable with Norfolk Constabulary, is an important aspect of the proposal</p> <p>I believe that there will be a number of opportunities for collaboration between the services, however both remaining independent, which are only possible with the proposed change of governance</p> <p>I support the change of governance as detailed in the business plan published in July 2018</p>
4.9.18	<p>I have been unable to access the consultation on your website, it seems not to be working at present, but I wish to inform you that I disagree with your proposal to take over governance of the Norfolk Fire Service.</p> <p>I have not been impressed with the changes you have made to date to our policing with the loss of the valuable Community Support Officers and the talk of closing police stations and front desks to the public. I fear that if you become responsible for the Fire Service, the "financial benefits" you will find will mean cuts in service.</p> <p>The time is fast approaching when all of us must dig deeper into our pockets to maintain our critical public services and that there is a growing willingness by the public to do this is shown by the recent petition to raise taxes to fund the NHS. I expect you to campaign for better funding for our police service not to follow the misguided present government policy of a financial stranglehold on our local services.</p>
4.9.18	<p>I would like to register my strong objection to the present Police and Crime Commissioner's, (Lorne Green), plan to change the governance of the Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service.</p> <p>There is very little in the plans that stresses public safety, which I feel is the most important feature of our Fire and Rescue Service, as seen by the amazing bravery of firefighters on the horrific night that the Grenfell Tower went up in flames.</p>

The plans Lorne Green has outlined all seem to stress ways to save money - Lorne Green- "Bureaucracy would be cut and efficiency would be improved. The fire and rescue service would have financial independence and efficiencies would be ploughed straight back into frontline services - hardly cost cutting."

But the fire service is not a manufacturer churning out products in a factory, it is an emergency service, and as such every case the firefighters respond to is unique. Accountants cannot cost the outcome of a fire engine leaving the station, but they easily come up with figures to say several fire stations could close to save money. That is not serving the public safety.

Lorne Green talks of - "The Police, Fire and Crime Commissioner will be able to raise a separate portion of the council tax for Norfolk Fire & Rescue Service, meaning it will be easier for people to see where their money is spent, and how much is being spent on fire & rescue services in the county."

I would never question the amount of tax paid to fund our emergency services, so please do not make a generalisation that we, the tax payer, would see where the money goes. Our money goes where it is needed. I do not feel more money from my taxes should go to a new layer of bureaucracy that Lorne Green would need to help him run the Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service.

The three main emergency services already collaborate, let them get on with that without Lorne Green's interference, unless he wants to lobby Westminster for more funding for services already under strain from Osborne's 'austerity' cuts and May's,(when she ran the Home Office), budget constraints.

Lorne Green should apply himself to the one job, one that he was elected to; he should not try to go for a political 'power grab' by appropriating the fire service into his present remit.

5.9.18	<p>We object to the Office of Police and Crime Commissioner for Norfolk taking over the governance of the Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service. They are entirely different Services and the proposed cuts to the Fire Service, such as closing Stations and using smaller vehicles, will put lives at risk. It is essential that all Emergency Services stay close to communities where the quick response is fundamental to the confidence and safety of the public. Efficiencies usually spell redundancies of manpower and current 'efficiencies' are seeing huge problems with lack of local Police availability, Prisons in crisis and even the Railways where they want to cut out Guards on trains. These are all public safety issues and the savings which cause issues and consequences in the long run are seen as detrimental to society.</p>
5.9.18	<p>With regards to safety to the public and property at Heacham and other areas of Norfolk. My Wife and I find it an extremely foolhardy idea of getting rid of a number of fully equipped and operational fire appliances which can carry almost all that might be required in the case of an emergency and replacing them with 4x4 vehicles which can only carry a limited amount of equipment and in an emergency callout could find it necessary to send for a larger appliance, this would mean wasting valuable time during which property can be destroyed and more important lives can be lost.</p> <p>Surely the whole purpose of the Fire Service is to avoid such risks where possible and to save lives and protect property.</p> <p>We think the whole idea should be given much more thought, saving money cannot ever be more important than saving lives</p>