Full Report on Smokefree Signage at Railway Stations: A Survey of 54 Stations in 11 Local Government Areas

Nick Wilson, George Thomson ASPIRE 2025, University of Otago, Wellington

February 2019

Background

There is a wide literature on the use and significance of railway stations. Part of the significance lies in the large numbers of pedestrians who flow through the stations, particularly from commuter lines.¹ Another aspect of this significance lies in the importance of arrival and departure places within social life and travel.²⁻⁴ Railway stations can have a wide range of social, health and other impacts,⁵ and they provide opportunities for promoting health in heavily used environments.⁶ They are 'public spaces that are a gateway between diverse communities. Stations are also meeting places somewhere to socialize or as a way to access local activities... [They] add to the economic, sociability and diverse vibrancy of communities'.⁷

Within the literature on railway stations, there is a considerable focus on design and other features to reduce adverse behaviour, across a spectrum from litter and loud music to violence.⁸ Some of the research around the use of, and behaviour at, railway stations has also looked at ways to communicate to station users.^{9 10}

Settings at which crowds can gather are relatively high priority areas for smokefree policies, given the potential for exposure to secondhand smoke and smoking normalisation. Making these settings smokefree should contribute to denormalising smoking, which helps quitting and reduces uptake.^{11 12} For railway stations, there is very limited research around the smokefree status, despite the large numbers of people using them in many countries. Some countries have prohibited smoking in the outdoor areas of mass transit systems such as for trains and buses, eg, over 500 US municipalities and three US states,¹³ and 80% of such settings in a US study.¹⁴

It has also been reported that general smokefree laws may decrease smoking in outdoor venues such as transit stations, even if these are not specifically covered by the laws.¹⁵ At least for railway stations, there is also some evidence for majority public support for smokefree stations by both smokers and non-smokers, as per a survey in France.¹⁶ There is also limited evidence that smokefree signage is effective in changing outdoor smoking behaviours – although some favourable evidence exists for signage in smokefree parks.¹⁷

There has been relatively rapid growth of commuter train use in both Auckland and Wellington,¹⁸ making this a domain of interest from a public health and wider research perspective.¹⁹ This is likely to continue as the focus on sustainability and carbon reduction increases in importance.^{20 21} However, we found little New Zealand research specifically on railway stations and their platforms. A discussion of the potential role of the Karangahape Road

Station in Auckland's inner city development explored 'how best to stitch together the heritage of the site and the function of the train station'.⁷ Analysis of the spatial aspects of increased land values around Auckland stations found varied effects²² and an examination of the Christchurch railway station considered the 'potential for train journeys and railway stations to be considered as metaphors for spiritual journeys and milestones'.²³ Nevertheless, much of such New Zealand research has been about accessibility.^{24 25}

In New Zealand, indoor areas which workers or the public use, plus the outdoor areas of schools and pre-schools, are required by law to be smokefree at all times. Businesses, hospitals and tertiary education campuses are increasingly requiring their outdoor areas to be smokefree, but very few local government authorities use the law for such policies.²⁶ Rather, they generally use "educational" policies that indicate smokefree outdoor areas with signs, but are not backed by laws.^{26 27} Many deficits in outdoor smokefree signage exist eg, at schools,²⁸ playgrounds^{29 30} sports grounds and racecourses,³¹ and various other outdoor settings.³² Given this background, we therefore aimed to identify the extent and nature of outdoor smokefree signage at a sample of railway stations in an area of New Zealand.

Methods

We surveyed all 54 passenger railway stations in the lower half of the North Island of New Zealand (from National Park in the middle of the island, south to Wellington). This was 47% (54/114) of all such stations in New Zealand. The selection of this area was based largely on convenience. Nevertheless, this area provided a wide mix of stations in urban, small town and rural settings (eg, Figure A1 below), and it also included the capital city. The railway stations in this area are run by Metlink³³ for the Wellington region (the cities of Wellington, Hutt, Upper Hutt, Porirua and Kapiti; and the Wairarapa line), and by New Zealand Rail (for stations from Otaki northwards).

Field observations were conducted between November 2017 and January 2018 by both authors (initially together while developing the methods and then separately). On these visits, the pedestrian entrances to the railway station (specifically where the path meets the platform) and on the platform (when walking around the outside of all the built structures) where photographed and examined for smokefree signage. Any signage was then photographed and measured. Essentially, we were focused on studying signage related to smokefree outside areas, including under verandas or under roofs open at the sides. Platforms were counted as being separate when these were separated by railway lines at the station.

From the collected photographs we examined qualitative issues (eg, evidence of vandalism), along with selected aspects of sign design and content. The latter built on what is known about size and issues around clutter from research on tobacco and alcohol warning labels.³⁴⁻³⁶

Since Google Street View (GSV) is becoming increasingly used for this type of research,^{37 38} we also plan to evaluate its use for detecting smokefree signage was performed. Nevertheless, this

was abandoned after pilot work, owing to its fairly limited utility. That is, while many of the observed railway stations do have GSV imagery available for them, it was typically of just one point on the station platform or from an adjacent street which was often quite distant or which did not permit views of the station platform.

Results

Station descriptions: The 54 surveyed railway stations provided passenger services on seven different train lines (Table A1). These stations were run by two different train companies and the stations were located in 11 different local government jurisdictions (territorial authorities) in the southern half of the North Island. They were in five cities (population of 40,000+ and including the capital: Wellington), nine towns and three rural areas. These comprise 47% of all of the functioning railway stations used by rail passengers in New Zealand (54/114).

The stations typically had just one platform (80%; 43/54), with the rest having two platforms (except for the Central Wellington station with 9). There were an average of 2.9 well-defined pedestrian entrances to the platform/s per station (range: 1 to 10) but also less well defined areas at an average of 0.5 per station (range: 0 to 3). An example of such a less defined entrance area where there is pedestrian access from an adjoining grassed area is in Figure A1.

Station use of smokefree signage: At the studied stations there were a total of 301 outdoor smokefree signs, and 77.8% (42/54) of the stations had some smokefree signage (although 18.5% [10/54], had only one sign for the whole station). The median number of signs per station was 2.0, but the range was up to a very large total of 192 (Wellington station, which had 9 platforms). The Capital Connection Line had the most such stations with no signs within the surveyed area at five stations, followed by the Northern Explorer Line at four stations. Each of the seven train lines had at least one station with no smokefree signs.

When considering separate platforms, 76.4% (55/72) of these had some smokefree signage. The median number of signs per platform was also 2.0 (range: 0 to 21.3). There were no smokefree signs at the 186 pedestrian entrances to all the platforms (ie, 0/159 for well-defined entrances and 0/27 for more general areas where pedestrians could access the platform). Most signage was attached to the outside of platform structures at 88.1% (37/42), the rest being on just poles (4.8%, 2/42) or a mix of both (7.1%, 3/42) (eg, see Figures A2, A3 and A4 for examples). We found no well-defined areas where smoking was or wasn't allowed on any of the outside areas of the platforms. However, signs at the main Wellington station implied there was one or more "designated" smoking areas (Figure A5). Indeed, observations were made of staff smoking in an unmarked area off to the side of one of the nine platforms (probably such a designated smoking area).

Sign characteristics: There were 10 different types of smokefree sign observed (see Figures A2, A5 and A6 for examples). The median number of sign types per station was one, but it ranged up to eight different types (Wellington station). Most signs in the Wellington region and on the

Wairarapa line had the name of the regional government public transport agency ("Metlink") on them, though some also had the name of a specific local government (Hutt City).

Smokefree signage was often part of other signage (eg, prohibiting skateboarding and cycling) and was also located near to other types of signs (Figures A2, A3, and A4). The smokefree signs were sometimes positioned quite high off the ground (eg, Figures A3 and A4). There was no smokefree signage painted on the actual platform or entrance surface, in contrast to Figure A7 for a sign banning alcohol.

Sign size was relatively modest overall (median = 300 cm^2 [Figure A8] similar to "A4" size) and ranged from 50 cm² (Figure A9) to a very large 18,000 cm² (Figure A6). Vandalism levels were relatively high for the signs that were just small stickers (at 63% [10/16], Figure A9) but were extremely low for all the other signs (0.4%, 1/285).

None of the signs found indicated that railway staff could or would enforce the outdoor smokefree policy, with no references to any legislation that would empower staff to require non-smoking behaviour in outdoor areas.

Discussion

Main findings and interpretation: The results for this survey of railway stations indicate highly diverse, but generally poor levels of smokefree signage at both stations and at the platform level. Particularly problematic was that there were no such signs at any of the 186 pedestrian entrances to the platforms – which means that train users could easily miss seeing those smokefree signs that did exist, typically on the platform buildings. Added to this were the problems that some of the signs were placed high up on buildings or poles above eye level, and were sometimes very small (ie, only 5 x 10 cm).

So overall this situation suggests substantial scope for improvements to smokefree signage by relevant agencies (transport authorities, local or central government) in these particular settings. Such improvements could specifically include:

- Ensuring that all railway station platforms have at least some smokefree signage (eg, up from the current 76% of platforms as per this study).
- Ensuring that the signage is frequent enough to be readily visible for people arriving via the main entrances to the platform (ie, improving on the current level of zero entrances with signage found in this study). This could involve using signs painted onto the pavement (as per Figure A7 for alcohol), as these might be relatively low-cost compared to normal signs.
- Considering ways to reduce the visual clutter of signage possibly by separating the different types of signs so that each stand out more.
- Considering ways to improve signage visibility by lowering sign height, while recognising that this may also increase the risk of vandalism.
- A national standard for the minimum size and legibility of smokefree signs in all outdoor settings.

The observed pattern of suboptimal smokefree signage (both quantity and quality) is consistent with other outdoor smokefree areas in New Zealand (see *Background above*). Nevertheless, some railway stations did stand out as having extensive signage: particularly Wellington station with 192 outdoor signs (with even yet more signs on the entrance to various underground passageways leading to the station that were not included in this study given its "outdoor" focus).

Study strengths and limitations: A strength of this study is that it is the first one anywhere internationally of railway station smokefree signage, that we know of. It also covered nearly half of all the passenger railway stations in the country. The methods provide a simple way of examining signage for railway stations. We considered such basic aspects of sign design such as size, and the level of visual clutter when combined with other signage etc (as per the *Methods*).

Nevertheless, the results may not be readily generalisable to the other 60 passenger railway stations in New Zealand – many of which (n=39) are in the Auckland Region (only 18 are in the South Island). Other limitations included the lack of research data on what comprises an optimal

smokefree sign design – which could be used to more formally evaluate the 10 different smokefree signs we identified.

Research is also needed on the effectiveness of the signs used, and the wider communication about smoking in public places. There appears to be no research using field observation to get objective data on the extent of smoking outdoors at New Zealand railway stations. This could be achieved by observing smokers (eg, as per these type of studies: ³⁹⁻⁴²) and/or by assessing cigarette butt litter on platforms and adjacent tracks (eg, as per this type of study: ⁴³).

Possible implications: The presence of some smokefree signs indicates that a number of New Zealand health promoters and transport authorities have grasped the potential for health promotion in transport environments.⁶ A potentially fruitful direction for New Zealand transport planners and managers would be to move beyond the incorporation of physical exercise into their plans, to a wider consideration of how to make healthy spaces.⁴⁴ Such broader elements of healthy spaces include ease of access to public transport and an environment free of adverse behaviour (eg, littering, playing loud music, and violence⁸). A particularly rigorous assessment of improving such settings may also consider the greater use of public art works to improve the experience of using the train network.

In addition to the dot points above for improving smokefree signage at railway stations in this area, there is probably a strong case for national leadership on smokefree signage in a wide range of outdoor settings (ie, railway stations, but also all: bus stops, all childrens' playgrounds, sports fields, all outdoor dining areas, etc). This could be done by amending national laws (eg, the Smoke-Free Environments Act in New Zealand) to require all such settings to be completely smokefree, along with signage requirements. There may also be a need to give local government powers to pass smokefree bylaws for other areas where there is a case for localised decisionmaking (eg, smokefree beaches and shopping streets). This type of efficient national-level approach, including a signage requirement, has already been successfully taken for New Zealand settings such as smokefree school grounds.⁴⁵ Such national legislation could also define optimal signage placement, minimal levels of signage size, and quality of signage. For example, small smokefree stickers (as per Figure A9), should probably not be permitted, as these appear to be at high risk of vandalism. All such actions would be consistent with moving towards the New Zealand Government's goal of achieving a Smokefree Nation by 2025.⁴⁶ Nevertheless, if central government failed to act in the above way, then local governments could still consider trying to upgrade their own bylaws around smokefree signage for settings such as railway stations.

Conclusions

In this sample covering nearly half of the passenger railway stations in the country, there appeared to be substantial scope for improvement in the quantity, placement and size of smokefree signage. Policy options to achieve more complete smokefree status of such settings include an upgraded central government law, or use of bylaws by local governments.

Funding: Nil **Competing interests:** Nil

Table A1: Full list of the 54 railway stations providing passenger services that were surveyed (with some stations on the same lines)

Train line	Station name	Territorial Authority (local government)	Railway operator/s
Melling Line	Station name		
5	Wellington	Wellington City	Metlink / KiwiRail
	Ngauranga	Wellington City	Metlink
	Petone	Hutt City	Metlink
	Western Hutt	Hutt City	Metlink
	Melling	Hutt City	Metlink
Johnsonville Line			
	Wellington	Wellington City	Metlink / KiwiRail
	Crofton Downs	Wellington City	Metlink
	Ngaio	Wellington City	Metlink
	Awarua Street	Wellington City	Metlink
	Simla Crescent	Wellington City	Metlink
	Box Hill	Wellington City	Metlink
	Khandallah	Wellington City	Metlink
	Raroa	Wellington City	Metlink
	Johnsonville	Wellington City	Metlink
Hutt Valley Line			
	Wellington	Wellington City	Metlink / KiwiRail
	Ngauranga	Wellington City	Metlink
	Petone	Hutt City	Metlink
	Ava	Hutt City	Metlink
	Woburn	Hutt City	Metlink
	Waterloo	Hutt City	Metlink
	Epuni	Hutt City	Metlink
	Naenae	Hutt City	Metlink
	Wingate	Hutt City	Metlink
	Taita	Hutt City	Metlink
	Pomare	Hutt City	Metlink
	Manor Park	Hutt City	Metlink
	Silverstream	Upper Hutt City	Metlink
	Heretaunga	Upper Hutt City	Metlink
	Trentham	Upper Hutt City	Metlink

Train line	Station name	Territorial Authority (local government)	Railway operator/s
	Wallaceville	Upper Hutt City	Metlink
	Upper Hutt	Upper Hutt City	Metlink
Wairarapa Line			
	Wellington	Wellington City	Metlink / KiwiRail
	Petone	Lower Hutt City	Metlink
	Waterloo	Lower Hutt City	Metlink
	Upper Hutt	Upper Hutt City	Metlink
	Maymorn	Upper Hutt City	Metlink
	Featherston	South Wairarapa District	Metlink
	Woodside	South Wairarapa District	Metlink
	Matarawa	Carterton District	Metlink
	Carterton	Carterton District	Metlink
	Solway	Masterton District	Metlink
	Renall Street	Masterton District	Metlink
	Masterton	Masterton District	Metlink
Kapiti Line			
	Wellington	Wellington City	Metlink / KiwiRail
	Takapu Road	Wellington City	Metlink
	Redwood	Wellington City	Metlink
	Tawa	Wellington City	Metlink
	Linden	Wellington City	Metlink
	Kenepuru	Porirua City	Metlink
	Porirua	Porirua City	Metlink
	Paremata	Porirua City	Metlink
	Mana	Porirua City	Metlink
	Plimmerton	Porirua City	Metlink
	Pukerua Bay	Porirua City	Metlink
	Paekakariki	Kapiti Coast District	Metlink
	Paraparaumu	Kapiti Coast District	KiwiRail / Metlink
	Waikanae	Kapiti Coast District	KiwiRail / Metlink
Capital Connection			
	Wellington	Wellington City	KiwiRail / Metlink
	Paraparaumu	Kapiti Coast District	KiwiRail / Metlink
	Waikanae	Kapiti Coast District	KiwiRail / Metlink
	Otaki	Kapiti Coast District	KiwiRail
	Levin	Horowhenua District	KiwiRail
	Shannon	Horowhenua District	KiwiRail

Train line	Station name	Territorial Authority (local government)	Railway operator/s
	Palmerston North	Palmerston North City	KiwiRail / Metlink
Northern Explorer (going north up to National Park)			
	Wellington	Wellington City	KiwiRail / Metlink
	Paraparaumu	Kapiti Coast District	KiwiRail
	Palmerston North	Palmerston North City	KiwiRail
	Ohakune	Ruapehu District	KiwiRail
	National Park	Ruapehu District	KiwiRail

Figure A1: Railway platform in a remote rural area which also shows a large grassed area over which pedestrians could easily traverse and which we defined as an "entrance area" (Matarawa railway station, Wairarapa).



Figure A2: Two common smokefree signs on a railway platform – a dedicated one (on a green background) and one as part of a multi-sign. Note the crowded signage on the wall of this structure on Epuni railway station, Lower Hutt.



Figure A3: Smokefree signage that is placed high on a railway station structure – possibly to reduce vandalism risk but also probably making it less noticeable (Woburn railway station, Lower Hutt).



Figure A4: A smokefree sign that is high off the ground on a pole away from the main platform structures but also showing the crowded signage (Khandallah railway station, Wellington, Johnsonville Line).



Figure A5: Sign that implies that designated smoking areas exist (first item in the list on the right) (Wellington main railway station, Wellington City).



Figure A6: The largest smokefree sign observed in this study which was at the Wellington main railway station (100 cm x 180 cm).



Figure A7: Liquor-ban sign at a railway station platform entrance – with no such approaches used for smokefree signage in this study (Naenae railway station, Lower Hutt).





Figure A8: Common smokefree signs on many of the supporting posts on Wellington main railway station platforms (n = 164 such signs at this station).

Figure A9: Smokefree sticker sign showing evidence of vandalism (Waterloo railway station, Lower Hutt). Of note is that such stickers appear to be frequently subject to such vandalism.



References

- 1. Antos J, Jia W, Parker J. Is It Too Crowded in Here? In Search of Safety Standards for Pedestrian Congestion in Rail Stations. *Transportation Research Record* 2017:126-33.
- 2. Revill G. Points of Departure: Listening to Rhythm in the Sonoric Spaces of the Railway Station. *Sociological Review* 2013;61:51-68.
- 3. Gerodetti N, Bieri S. (Female hetero) Sexualities in transition train stations as gateways. *Feminist Theory* 2006; 7:69-87.
- 4. Raynsford A. Swarm of the Metropolis: Passenger Circulation at Grand Central Terminal and the Ideology of the Crowd Aesthetic. *Journal of Architectural Education* 1996;50:2-14.

- 5. Jones P, Lucas K. The social consequences of transport decision-making: clarifying concepts, synthesising knowledge and assessing implications. *Journal of Transport Geography* 2012;21:4-16.
- Springer AE, Evans AE, Ortuno J, Salvo D, Varela Arevalo MT. Health by Design: Interweaving Health Promotion into Environments and Settings. *Front Public Health* 2017;5:268.
- 7. Tyrrell N. Karangahape Road train station : an urban catalyst for revitalisation. Auckland: Unitec, 2016.
- 8. Diec J, Coxon S, de Bono A. Designing a public train station shelter to minimise anti-social behaviour and crime in Melbourne's metropolitan rail environment. 33rd Australian Transport Research Forum. Canberra, 2010.
- 9. Takeyama R. Standardization of the Information Design in Public Transportation Facilities. Sixth Annual Asian Design Conference. Tsukuba, 2003.
- 10. Meng-Cong Zheng, Ming-Shih Chen, Li P-Y. Post-Occupancy Evaluation of Information Signs and Pre-Boarding Behavior in a Historic Railroad Station. *Journal of Asian Architecture and Building Engineering* 2010;9:177-84.
- 11. Baha M, Le Faou AL. Smokers' reasons for quitting in an anti-smoking social context. *Public Health* 2010;124:225-31.
- Betzner AE, Boyle RG, Luxenberg MG, Schillo BA, Keller PA, Rainey J, Capesius T, Saul JE. Experience of smokers and recent quitters with smokefree regulations and quitting. *Am J Prev Med* 2012;43:S163-70.
- 13. American Nonsmokers' Rights Foundation. Municipalities with Smokefree Outdoor Public Transit Waiting Area Laws. Berkeley: American Nonsmokers' Rights Foundation, 2017.
- 14. Klein EG, Kennedy RD, Berman M. Tobacco control policies in outdoor areas of high volume American transit systems. *J Community Health* 2014;39:660-7.
- 15. Fernandez E, Fu M, Perez-Rios M, Schiaffino A, Sureda X, Lopez MJ. Changes in secondhand smoke exposure after smoke-free legislation (Spain, 2006-2011). *Nicotine Tob Res* 2017;19:1390-94.
- 16. Fong GT, Craig LV, Guignard R, Nagelhout GE, Tait MK, Driezen P, Kennedy RD, Boudreau C, Wilquin JL, Deutsch A, Beck F. Evaluating the Effectiveness of France's Indoor Smoke-Free Law 1 Year and 5 Years after Implementation: Findings from the ITC France Survey. *PLoS One* 2013;8:e66692.
- 17. Platter HN, Pokorny SB. Smoke-free signage in public parks: impacts on smoking behaviour. *Tob Control* 2017.
- 18. Ministry of Transport. Metro rail. (Last updated on: 19/07/2017). http://www.transport.govt.nz/rail/metro-rail/. 2017.
- 19. Officer A, Kearns R. Experiencing everyday train travel in Auckland: An autoethnographic account. *New Zealand Geographer* 2017;73:97–108.
- 20. Heatley D, Schwass M. Rail Transport in New Zealand. In: Findlay C, ed. Priorities and Pathways in Services Reform Part II. Singapore: World Scientific, 2013:pp. 151-84.
- Shaikh R, Vale R, Shaikh W. Wellington- the role of transport in creating "the coolest little low-carbon capital" Passive and Low Energy Architecture 2017 "Design to thrive". Edinburgh, 2017.

- 22. Grimes A, Young C. Spatial effects of urban rail upgrades. *Journal of Transport Geography* 2013;30:1-6.
- 23. Barthelmeh M. Journeys: An Interpretive Critique of the Christchurch Railway Station. *Spaces and Flows* 2011;1:37-53.
- Harrison PG, Stefan; Crawford, Kevin. It's all about the customer: Enhancing the experience at the Panmure bus rail interchange. CORE 2016: Maintaining the Momentum. Melbourne, 2016:145-53.
- 25. Williams T, Te Brömmelstroet M. Combining the power of bicycle use and public transport implementing the Bike-Train. IPENZ Transportation Group Conference. Hamilton, 2017.
- 26. Thomson G, Wilson N. Local and regional smokefree and tobacco-free action in New Zealand: highlights and directions. *N Z Med J* 2017;130:89-101.
- 27. Marsh L, Robertson LA, Kimber H, Witt M. Smokefree outdoor areas in New Zealand: how far have we come? *N Z Med J* 2014;127(1389):51-66.
- 28. Wilson N, Thomson G, Edwards R. The potential of Google Street View for studying smokefree signage. *Aust N Z J Public Health* 2015;39:295-6.
- 29. Wilson N, Thomson G. Survey of smokefree signage at playgrounds: the potential value of comparisons with dog control signage. *Aust N Z J Public Health* 2016;40:395.
- 30. Thomson G, Wilson N. Smokefree signage at children's playgrounds: Field observations and comparison with Google Street View. *Tob Induc Dis* 2017;15:37.
- 31. Thomson G, Wilson N. Smokefree signage at New Zealand racecourses and sports facilities with outdoor stands. *N Z Med J* 2017;130:80-86.
- 32. Wilson N, Thomson G. Surveying all outdoor smokefree signage in contrasting suburbs: methods and results. *Health Promot J Aust* 2017;28:264-65.
- 33. Metlink. Metlink Railway Stations. <u>https://www.metlink.org.nz/getting-around/metlink-railway-stations/</u>.
- 34. Hammond D. Health warning messages on tobacco products: a review. *Tob Control* 2011;20:327-37.
- 35. Al-Hamdani M, Smith SM. Alcohol Warning Label Perceptions: Do Warning Sizes and Plain Packaging Matter? *J Stud Alcohol Drugs* 2017;78:79-87.
- 36. Kersbergen I, Field M. Alcohol consumers' attention to warning labels and brand information on alcohol packaging: Findings from cross-sectional and experimental studies. *BMC Public Health* 2017;17:123.
- 37. Schootman M, Nelson EJ, Werner K, Shacham E, Elliott M, Ratnapradipa K, Lian M, McVay A. Emerging technologies to measure neighborhood conditions in public health: implications for interventions and next steps. *Int J Health Geogr* 2016;15:20.
- 38. Wilson N, Pearson AL, Thomson G, Edwards R. Actual and potential use of Google Street View for studying tobacco issues: a brief review. *Tob Control* 2017;(E-publication 30 June).
- 39. Thomson G, Russell M, Jenkin G, Patel V, Wilson N. Informing outdoor smokefree policy: Methods for measuring the proportion of people smoking in outdoor public areas. *Health Place* 2013;20:19-24.
- 40. Patel V, Thomson G, Wilson N. Objective measurement of area differences in 'private' smoking behaviour: observing smoking in vehicles. *Tob Control* 2013;22:130-5.

- 41. Parry R, Prior B, Sykes AJ, Tay JL, Walsh B, Wright N, Pearce K, Richmond G, Robertson A, Roselan J, Shum PY, Taylor G, Thachanamurthy P, Zheng TT, Wilson N, Thomson G. Smokefree streets: a pilot study of methods to inform policy. *Nicotine Tob Res* 2011;13:389-94.
- 42. Pearson AL, Nutsford D, Thomson G. Measuring visual exposure to smoking behaviours: a viewshed analysis of smoking at outdoor bars and cafes across a capital city's downtown area. *BMC Public Health* 2014;14:300.
- 43. Oliver J, Thomson G, Wilson N. Measurement of cigarette butt litter accumulation within city bus shelters. *N Z Med J* 2014;127:91-3.
- 44. Koohsari M, Badland H, Giles-Corti B. (Re)Designing the built environment to support physical activity: Bringing public health back into urban design and planning. *Cities* 2013;35:294-98.
- 45. Wilson N, Oliver J, Thomson G. Ten years of a national law covering smoke-free school grounds: a brief review. *Tob Control* 2016;25:122.
- 46. New Zealand Government. Government Response to the Report of the Māori Affairs Committee on its Inquiry into the tobacco industry in Aotearoa and the consequences of tobacco use for Māori (Final Response). Wellington: New Zealand (NZ) Parliament, 2011. <u>http://www.parliament.nz/ennz/pb/presented/papers/49DBHOH_PAP21175_1/government-final-response-to-reportof-the-m%c4%81ori-affairs</u>