

**Internal consultation feedback received in relation to the Code of Conduct –
Issued for consultation between 22 September 2022 to 21 October 2022**

ID no	Section	Feedback	Response to feedback
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sent to Leadership Group 22 September 2022 • Presented to Joint Consultation Forum 21 September 2022 and taken back 08 December 2022 • Workshop held with Trade Union representatives 29 November 2022 • Published on intranet for wider feedback 22 September 2022 • Presented to Business Transformation Board 05 January 2023 	
1.	3.0	We would like to see a rewrite on the first step of the Nolan principles. Whilst we agree, firefighters strive to deliver the best possible service to our local communities, we cannot agree that this should come at the potential expense of firefighter in the nature of their employment. We feel uncomfortable with the wording around 'public interest, service user and community interest coming first' when this could potentially be seen to be at odds with a firefighter's rights to strike, for example.	The Core Code sets of five ethical principles, which have been produced specifically for Fire and Rescue Services by the National Fire Chiefs Council, the Local Government Association and the Association of Police and Crime Commissioners
2.	8.3	Vehicles - In relation to using a privately owned vehicle for work purposes. I do worry that the wording could be misconstrued to include travel to and from work which of course is not part of the working day and is unpaid. I think maybe the wording needs to be amended slightly.	Additional wording added to bullet point - 'excluding employees own personal time, i.e. travel to and from work and lunchbreaks'
3.	8.3	Vehicles - Perhaps rewording this will be more suitable. As it may be difficult to enforce people making their own decisions in their own vehicles, it may be more beneficial to state something like, 'When driving a privately owned vehicle for work purposes, when identifiable as a member of the authority, e.g. signage, uniform, parking permits'. If not, I am unsure how suitable it is to be in place, as if a member of staff is in their own vehicle for work businesses, will we be prohibiting smoking and vaping when an employee is working from home?	Noted
4.	8.3	Smoking - Needs some clarification as work time could constitute travel to and from work or where there is no fixed place of work. Vaping also has no known negative health effects on third parties so should we consider this to have slightly less restriction to users.	Noted
5.	8.3	Exclusion - Perhaps it would be beneficial to state members of the Authority cannot smoke/vape in provided day crewed housing, houses	Noted

**Internal consultation feedback received in relation to the Code of Conduct –
Issued for consultation between 22 September 2022 to 21 October 2022**

ID no	Section	Feedback	Response to feedback
		<p>which are owned/leased by the Authority, e.g. Gerrards Cross Smoking inside a property will damage the property, if gardens are provided, these should be expected to be used to smoke/vape in, not inside an Authority owned/leased premises.</p>	
6.	15.1	<p>Uniform - November's BTB approved the introduction of a branded jacket for all employees. The jacket will be classed as uniform and support staff will wear the garment in conjunction with non-issued clothing whilst carrying out work activities. The first sentence therefore needs to be altered slightly</p>	<p>Wording removed from first paragraph</p>
7.	15.2	<p>Jewellery and adornments - Why is it not considered in keeping with a professional image? Multiple other industries and sectors indiscriminately employ people who have facial piercings. I personally do not believe the way someone expresses themselves should be a barrier to employment, as long as it is not offensive, e.g. inappropriate models/figures of piercings.</p> <p>Also, Hinduism has a tradition of having nose piercings, putting this barrier in place as a 'blanket ban' to all staff may discourage those from diverse backgrounds applying.</p>	<p>Section amended to remove wording on visible piercing not being considered in keeping with a professional image. Sentence on jewellery being restricted to a minimum also removed. The focus in this section is on health and safety</p>
8.	15.3	<p>Hair - What is the reasoning behind that hair must remain within naturally occurring colours? As previously mentioned, a lot of people express themselves within their hair colour. As an organisation which celebrates self-expression, diversity, and inclusivity, a blanket ban on all hair colours that are not natural I believe is the wrong way to go. Again, putting a blanket ban in place may put up barriers to diverse protected groups.</p> <p>Also, what is the definition of natural hair colours? People may have brilliant red hair as their naturally occurring colour, but if a member of staff dyes their hair to this colour if it is not their own natural, is this forbidden?</p>	<p>Wording removed on naturally occurring hair colours</p>

**Internal consultation feedback received in relation to the Code of Conduct –
Issued for consultation between 22 September 2022 to 21 October 2022**

ID no	Section	Feedback	Response to feedback
9.	15.3	<p>Hair - It is our belief that to specify a 'mohawk' as unacceptable is outdated and should be removed. Similarly, restriction on hair colours within naturally occurring colours can be problematic, restrict expression and the representation of the communities in which we serve. Applying these could be difficult, give rise to mistreatment and be open to differing personal opinions on acceptability. We request these sections are removed/rewritten to reflect.</p>	<p>Wording removed on naturally occurring hair colours</p> <p>Reference to Mohicans removed</p>
10.	15.4	<p>Tattoos - Why is this prohibited? Again, as a forward thinking and evolving service, putting a blanket ban on all visible tattoos will discourage people from applying who may be the correct fit for the role.</p> <p>Also, multiple religions encourage and pride themselves of visible, including facial tattoos: Māori, Inuit, Alaskan and Canadian Natives, Native Americans, Atayal, Ainu</p> <p>As long as a tattoo is not visibly offensive, or cannot be interpreted as offensive, such as 'tears', barbed wire, which have criminal and negative associations.</p>	<p>Section amended to have the focus on offensive tattoos</p>
11.	15.4	<p>Tattoos - Rewrite required or potentially the first paragraph only being necessary. Again, not applied in practice, outdated and open to differing interpretations of an individual's perceptions of acceptability</p>	<p>Wording amended within this section</p>