2016-121 Windy Shorted.

Department for
Business, Energy
& Industrial Strategy

Consultation on updating the Furniture and Furnishings (Fire) (Safety) Regulations (FFRs) response form

The consultation is available at: www.gov.uk/government/consultations/furniture-and-furnishing-fire-safety-regulations-proposed-changes-2016

The closing date for responses is **11 November 2016**.

The form can be submitted by email to: furniture.consultation2016@bis.gsi.gov.uk or submitted by letter to:

Christine Knox
Regulatory Delivery
Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy
Second Floor
1 Victoria Street
London
SW1H 0ET

Please be aware that we intend to publish all responses to this consultation.

Information provided in response to this consultation, including personal information, may be subject to publication or release to other parties or to disclosure in accordance with the access to information regimes. Please see the section on confidentiality and data protection on page 7 of the consultation for further information.

If you want information, including personal data, that you provide to be treated in confidence, please explain to us what information you would like to be treated as confidential and why you regard the information as confidential. If we receive a request for disclosure of the information we will take full account of your explanation, but we cannot give an assurance that confidentiality can be maintained in all circumstances. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, of itself, be regarded as binding on the department.

I want my response to be treated as confidential ☐

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Questions

Name: [redacted]
Organisation (if applicable): WENDY SHORTER INTERIORS LTD
Address: COURSERS FARM, COURSERS ROAD, COLNEY HEATH, HERTFORDSHIRE, AL4 0PG.

	Respondent type
	Business representative organisation/trade body
☐	Central government
☐	Charity or social enterprise
☐	Individual
☐	Test House
☐	Manufacturer
☐	Retailer
☐	Large business (over 250 staff)
☐	Legal representative
☐	Local government
☐	Medium business (50 to 250 staff)
x	Micro business (up to 9 staff)
☐	Small business (10 to 49 staff)
☐	Trade union or staff association
x	Other (please describe) Training Provider - Upholstery & Soft Furnishings Training Centre

Questions on scope

Q1 Do you agree with the revised definition of the Regulation's scope?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: I hope that this will clear up some of the uncertainties in the current regulations, making it clearer for all.

Q2 Do you agree with the proposals relating to sleeping bags and mattress protectors (i.e. those which can be put in a washing machine are explicitly removed from scope and do not have to meet the requirements of the regulations)?

Yes ☐ No X Not sure

Comments: I think the definition of a mattress protector and the washing instructions needs more clarification

Q3 Do you agree with the proposals relating to cushions and seat pads (i.e. that they remain excluded from cover tests but the definition of these products to be specified more clearly)?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: I agree that this is a better definition but rather than two different measurements for scatter cushions and seat pads, I think that cushions and seat pads should be defined with only one measurement of 60cm x 60cm.

Q4 Do you agree with the proposals relating to outdoor furniture (i.e. that outdoor furniture unsuitable for use inside the home, and clearly labelled as not complying with the Regulations) should be out of scope?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Q5 Do you agree with the proposals relating to baby products (i.e. that items covered by covered by BS EN1888 (wheeled child conveyances) and BS EN1466 (carry cots and stands) are removed from scope, with padded playpens treated in the same way as mattresses)?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Q6 Do you agree with the proposed treatment of second-hand products (i.e. that they would be required to bear the relevant permanent label)?

☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: The proposal does not work for re-upholstered furniture. If a piece with its original label is to be re-upholstered, it will have its "original" permanent label removed in the process. I think the word "original" should be removed from the proposed amendments. Provided that a second-hand piece has a permanent label stating that all filling and fabrics comply, I see no reason why a new permanent label cannot be used. Without the removal of the word "original" it would be impossible to re-upholster a piece of domestic furniture and then up-cycle it to sell. If the word "original" is not removed it would undoubtedly lead to more furniture going into landfill or become non-compliant.

Questions on testing

Q7 Do you agree to removing the Filling 1 option?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Q8 Do you agree that the specifications set out in the draft Regulations for the test foam and fibre wrap are sufficient to achieve the objectives of the Regulations?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Not sure

Comments: There are various densities of fibre wrap. This would need to be defined for the test to be accurate.

Q9a Do you agree that the regulations should provide a protective cover option?

☐ Yes No X Not sure

Comments:

Q9b If yes, do you agree with our proposed definition of protectiveness?

☐ Yes ☐ No X Not sure

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Q10 Do you agree with the proposed requirements for components close to the cover?

☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: This would mean that an upholsterer would not be able to only re-cover a piece of furniture with new fabric as they would not be able to confirm that all the underlying components within 40mm of the surface at compliant. Therefore, this would mean more perfectly good furniture going to landfill.

Q11 Do you agree that there is no need for the cigarette test for covers that pass the revised match test?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: Click here to enter text.

For business respondents:

Q12 Which of the routes to compliance do you expect to follow for most of your products?

☒ Schedule 3 interliner ☒ Protective cover

☐ Non-protective cover + compliant components ☐ Not sure

Comments: As a re-upholsterer we would probably have to use all variations at some point. The Schedule 3 interliner being the most commonly used process and the only way we could hope to comply with the regulations, but it does mean that there would be more use of chemical treatments and the additional costs involved.

Q13a What do you expect the impact of the testing proposals to be on your use of flame retardants in covers?

☒ Increase ☐ Decrease ☐ No change ☐ Not sure

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Q13b What do you expect the impact of the testing proposals to be on your overall use of flame retardants?

☒ Increase ☐ Decrease ☐ No change ☐ Not sure

Comments: Due to the increased use of interliners or having to remove and replace non-compliant components within 40mm.

Questions on traceability and enforcement

Q14 Do you agree with the product record/technical file requirements for manufacturers and importers?

☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: Must exclude re-upholstery and bespoke furniture. Re-upholsterers would not be able to gain much of the required information as we only use small amounts of materials from various different fabric companies and suppliers. Every piece is different.

Q15a Do you agree with the requirements for the single permanent label, and the proposal to remove the requirement for additional display labels?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Q15b What do you think is the most effective means of conveying the use of flame retardants in the cover of this product eg by text, symbol?

Comments: Text but re-upholstery would find it difficult to access some of the information required for one-off individual pieces.

Other questions on the proposals

Q16 Do you agree that a 24 month transition period is sufficient, and that the changes should be reviewed in five years?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Comments:

Q17 Do you have any other comments on the proposals or draft regulations?

X Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: The current proposals do not specifically state re-upholstery. This will only cause more confusion within the small and micro upholstery sector. Those working on one-off individual re-upholstery jobs or bespoke pieces and those up-cycling furniture for re-sale on the internet would either add FR interlines in the hope of complying or simply not comply.

Questions on the Impact Assessment

Q18 Do you agree with our estimate of traceability time in the Impact Assessment – ie one-off input of 16 hours per firm and ongoing per year time of 48 hours per firm? If not can you provide additional evidence to support your answer?

☐ Yes X No Not sure

Comments: Every individual piece of re-upholstery or one-off bespoke piece would have to be assessed and documented individually.

Q19 How much do you estimate you would save per year from the removal of the cigarette test?

Amount saved: Nothing. I expect it to increase my costs.

☒ Nothing ☐ Not sure

Q20 How much do you estimate you would save per year from reduced use of flame retardants?

Amount saved: Nothing. I expect it to increase my costs

☒ Nothing ☐ Not sure

Q21 Are you aware of any further costs or benefits we have not identified in the impact assessment? Please support with any evidence you have.

☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Not sure

Comments: I suspect it would increase my costs by the inclusion of FR interlines the cost of materials having to be replaced within 40mm of the top cover as well as the time spent on admin and enforcement of the requirements.

Q22 To what extent do you agree that, overall, these proposals represent a reasonable compromise – bearing in mind the information in this consultation document, feedback on the previous (2014) consultation, and other stakeholder input during the review?

☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Not sure ☒ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree

I expect this review will mean even more chemicals having to be used or perfectly good furniture going into landfill.

Thank you for taking the time to let us have your views. We do not intend to acknowledge receipt of individual responses unless you tick the box below.

Please acknowledge this reply X

At BEIS we carry out our research on many different topics and consultations. As your views are valuable to us, would it be okay if we were to contact you again from time to time either for research or to send through consultation documents?

X Yes ☐No

BEIS/16/11/RF