

## **Draft Smoke-free Regulations 2007 – E-Consultation on-line response**

### **Response from Down District Council**

Q1: NO

Q1a: The Recreation and Environmental Services Committee of the Down District Council has reviewed and endorsed the comments of GEHOG as representative of its own views, subject to ratification by full Council on 20th November 2006. I have been requested to forward these comments for your attention - Tony McCrory Principal EHO, Down District Council.

CEHOG believe that the requirement for signage at entrances is crucial in securing compliance with smoke-free requirements. We therefore believe that it is essential that signs are correctly positioned and contain the right information. We are concerned that the wording in the explanatory guidance appears to be more stringent than in the draft regulation in a particularly important respect. We have observed that even where no smoking signs comply with the requirement to be displayed in entrances they may still not be visible to persons entering and therefore users of the premises may not be aware that the building is smoke-free.

We recommend that the following wording be used

“ In each entrance to a smoke-free premises there shall be displayed in a prominently visible position at all times to persons entering the premises at least one A5 sign made of durable materials that -”

This requirement should extend to any entrance that is not exclusively providing access to private residential accommodation or in use only as a fire exit.

In order to avoid signs at entrances becoming damaged and defaced they should be required to be of durable material or be suitably protected.

It is our view that signs should also contain details of to whom a complaint should be made should someone observe smoking in smoke free premises. This requirement exists in both Scotland and the Republic of Ireland. We feel that the following could be added to the regulation 3;

“(c) displays the name of the person or holder of a particular post to whom a complaint may be made by any person who observes another person smoke in the smoke-free premises in question and state that a complaint may be so made.”

CEHOG believe that the addition of the above wording is important as it reinforces the message to both the owner of the premises and the public that it is the responsibility of the management of the premises to ensure that premises are smoke-free.

Q2: NO

Q2a: We agree with the proposal in relation to the need for a sign in each compartment of the vehicle including the drivers' compartment. However we believe that there is a need for signage requirements to be consistent across the UK particularly as vehicles will cross between jurisdictions. CEHOG therefore believe that the only sensible way to proceed is to harmonise the signage requirements for vehicles. As Scotland has already enacted requirements for smoke-free signs in vehicles we believe that England, Wales and Northern Ireland should replicate those requirements. In order that the new legislation does not become a burden on transport operators then there is a need for pragmatic enforcement in relation to vehicles fitted with signage that would not meet new

requirements. Such an approach would enable signage to be updated over a period of time. The inclusion of text on vehicle signs stating “No smoking. It is against the law to smoke in this vehicle” would be of assist!

ance to those with responsibilities for ensuring that vehicles are smoke-free.

It is as important for vehicle signs to be prominent, visible and durable as it is for premises signs, we therefore believe that the same wording as proposed for signs above should be used

CEHOG believe that the addition of wording indicating to whom a complaint should be made is also important for vehicles as it reinforces the message to both the operator of the vehicle and the public that it is the responsibility of the operator to ensure that vehicles are smoke-free.

Q3: YES

Q3a: We note that it is not intended to require private residential space per se to be smoke-free unless they are open to the public or used as places of work and CEHOG accepts the principle that in all other circumstances it is for the person who lives in the premises to decide whether or not to permit smoking.

The requirement for communal areas and common parts of private accommodation to be smoke-free is welcomed.

The proposal to exclude certain types of work ( i.e. work that is undertaken to provide personal care for a person living there, to assist with domestic work, to maintain the structure or fabric of the dwelling, or to provide service there), from smoke free requirements for private accommodation causes us concern as we believe that all workers deserve protection form secondhand smoke. However we do acknowledge that there is a need to achieve the correct balance between protection of workers from secondhand smoke and the rights of a person in their own home. If this exemption is to remain there is a need for employers and self employed persons who provide such services to make arrangements about smoking and to adopt model policies that ensure the protection of workers who have to carryout work in private accommodation.

Q4: NO

Q4a: We believe that there is no convincing argument for the inclusion of this exemption in the draft regulations and we feel that in certain instances it is possible that this exemption could be abused so that in effect a smoking room is being created in smoke-free premises. We have recently heard of an incident in the Republic of Ireland where 19 people were smoking in a designated bedroom and being served alcohol in the bedroom.

Should the Department proceed with proposals to enable designated bedrooms to be exempt from smoke-free requirements then we feel that the conditions set out in the draft regulation are appropriate. However we feel that the exemption should only be for the residents of the bedroom and not for guests or employees of the hotel, this would ensure that abuse of the purpose of the designation does not take place.

There is need for clarity in relation to the process of designation and feel that it may be helpful if “designated” was more clearly defined in the regulations. There is also a need for clarity in relation to changing bedroom designations, particularly when a bedroom has been designated as a smoking bedroom. Complaints can be anticipated from non-smoking residents of hotels etc if they are allocated a non designated room and yet

there is evidence of smoking in the room in the past. While there is no need for bedroom designation to be permanent we feel there is a need for some mechanism to regulate the designation process, this may be best achieved through guidance.

Q5: NO

Q5a: In our response to the consultation on the Smoking (NI) Order 2006 CEHOG stated that it believed that all workers deserved the same level of protection from secondhand smoke but acknowledged this may cause difficulties in certain premises. We feel that the Department must put measures in place that ensure the protection of workers from secondhand smoke even where exemptions from smoke-free requirements are permitted. We feel that the exemption from smoke-free requirements can only be justified for residents of such premises and should not extend to visitors or staff similar to what we have stated above in relation to hotel bedrooms.

It is our view that where an exemption is available then conditions should be applied. These should ensure that persons who have to work in premises where a room is exempt from smoke-free requirements are given the maximum protection available from secondhand smoke while not placing an unrealistic burden on the owner of the premises. The requirements could be set out in a code of good practice or guidance to accompany the regulations. CEHOG would be keen to participate in the development of any such

Q6: YES

Q6a: The proposed exemption for research and testing facilities appears appropriate. There is however a need to ensure the protection of any person who has to work in the facility from the effects of secondhand smoke.

We believe that the department should issue guidance that sets out the standards that should be applied in protecting employees who have to work in such facilities.

Q7: YES

Q7a: The proposals for smoke-free vehicles appear appropriate however it is not clear to what extent the regulation applies to a persons private car that they use for business purposes and receive expenses for the running of the vehicle from their employer. If such vehicles are covered by smoke-free requirements by virtue of the fact that they are used for work by more than one person do they then have to display no smoking signs and do they have to be smoke-free at all times? This issue needs to be clarified to ensure there is no confusion.