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The Context of Alcohol Harm

- Current outcomes in the Southern Metro Region
- What is the impact of alcohol harm in the Region?
- How can Victoria Police best respond to alcohol harm problems?
- How can partners work together to reduce alcohol harm?
- The need for relevant evidence that identifies the issues
- How can we change public and community attitudes to excessive alcohol consumption?
- The need to change public policy
Characterisation of Alcohol Harm

Immediate: Hotels / Clubs / Pubs
Violence, behaviour at licensed premises, drink driving

Transferred: Packaged Liquor Outlets
Homes, sporting events, public places

The Impact?
- Police
- Ambulance
- CFA / MFB
- Councils
- Communities
Family Violence & Alcohol Harm in the SM Region

- In 2007-2008, Family Violence cost Victoria Police $9.9 billion and has increased annually (Frost 2009) to 13.6 billion in 2013 - 2014

- On a yearly basis, Alcohol Harm is estimated to cost the Victorian Government and community $4.3 billion (Frost 2012)
The impact of alcohol harm in SMR

Assaults involving Alcohol
01-JUL-2009 to 30-JUN-2014 (94% Geocoded)
Alcohol as a driver of crime

• Almost half of all crime in the last 12 months was committed by an offender processed for an alcohol-related offence they had been charged with in the previous five years

• One in three alcohol offenders are Family Violence offenders

• Excessive consumption is a driver for Family Violence assaults, property damage and justice procedure offences

• In 2012/13, alcohol was identified as a possible or confirmed factor in 43% of all Family Violence incidents attended by Police
• 53% of alcohol related offences occur in domestic dwellings and in public places, while 19% of alcohol related offences occur in licensed premises

• 48% of reported assaults occur in domestic dwellings

• Clearly, alcohol consumed in domestic premises and public places is sourced from packaged liquor outlets
Licensed Premises in the SMR

In SMR:

• There are currently 3,474 active licensed premises (VCGLR 2014)

• Hotels and clubs make up 28% of all licensed premises

• Packaged outlets are 10.2% of the total of licensed premises

• VicHealth indicates 75% of all alcohol sold in Victoria is from packaged liquor outlets (2011)

• Packaged Liquor outlets comprise only 10% of licensed premises, but account for 75% - 78% of alcohol sales
Licensed premises by type

Source: Victorian Commission for Gambling and Liquor Regulation
Crime related consumption by location

STATE-WIDE
JANUARY 2014 to DECEMBER 2014

ADRIFT: LAST LOCATION ALCOHOL CONSUMED (TOP 5 LOCATIONS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>January 2014 to December 2014</th>
<th>January 2013 to December 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>9,027</td>
<td>10,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undisclosed</td>
<td>6,447</td>
<td>6,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street/Kerb</td>
<td>3,089</td>
<td>3,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar/Tavern</td>
<td>2,966</td>
<td>3,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>1,424</td>
<td>1,643</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Produced by Corporate Performance. Data extracted from SASEG ADRIFT on February 5, 2015 and is subject to variation.
Crime related consumption by location

DIVISION SD3
JANUARY 2014 to DECEMBER 2014
ADRIFF: LAST LOCATIONAL ALCOHOL CONSUMED (TOP 5 LOCATIONS)

Location
- Residential
- Undisclosed
- Street Park Beach
- Bargain
- Deception Port

Number of Offences
- January 2014 to December 2014
- January 2013 to December 2013

Produced by Corporate Performance. Data extracted from SASEG ADRIFF on February 3, 2015 and is subject to variation.
Packaged Liquor

Australian and international research suggests

• Packaged liquor outlets in neighbourhoods may contribute to increased assaults and Family Violence in the home (Vichealth 2013)

• That when grocery stores in Finland began selling alcohol, there was a sharp increase in alcohol-related harm (Makela 2002)

• On-premises venues, eg, hotels, clubs and nightclubs do not appear to contribute significantly to Family Violence, but packaged liquor outlets do (Frost 2012)
Current enforcement focus

• PIN data indicates enforcement focus is on patrons, not licensees

• There is clear opportunity to re-focus enforcement on licensees (SMR RIMU)

• ADRIFT data clearly shows the majority of alcohol-related offending occurs in domestic dwellings and public places

• Our liquor enforcement focuses on bars, clubs, taverns, with very limited enforcement on packaged liquor outlets
Despite the predominant impact of excessive consumption of packaged liquor as a driver of community harm, our enforcement and regulatory activity focusses on the behaviour of patrons and licensees of premises licensed for on premises consumption.

Responsible sale of alcohol and related codes of conduct focus on regulation of premises licensed for on premises consumption.

These provisions / codes are largely silent with respect to the supply of packaged liquor.
What do we do about it?

- Build the evidence base
- Shift our regulatory and enforcement focus to where most of the harm is
- Enhance regulation of packaged liquor outlets to mitigate scale and adverse impacts of package liquor outlets
- Strengthen the basis for local government and police to object to and mitigate the impacts of proposed outlets at the planning stage
2009 research by Frost determined

- The increased reporting of short-term alcohol harm over 10 years indicated that mitigation strategies were not successful
- The extent of alcohol harms are understated because of shortcomings in data collection, analysis and dissemination
- Effective strategy depends on a clear policy position, timely responses and a robust evidence base
- There is a need for more collaborative approaches to data collection and strategic planning
The need for an evidence base

• The provision of point of sale data from individual outlets must be provided to police and Local Government if we are to be able to conclusively track the relationship between volume of supply and the impact that volume has on the drivers of harm in the community serviced by those outlets.

• Otherwise we are left to rely on proxy measures for sales volume and the evidential burden of proving the link between output from a specific premises and the harm that output causes in the community
Shift our focus

Before there is any noticeable impact in the reduction of alcohol harm, there must be a change in the current approach to strategy development, licensing and enforcement (Frost 2012)

Joint strategies, partnerships and collaboration between all stakeholders is the Best Practice approach to reduce alcohol-related harm in the community (Doherty and Roche 2003, Bullock, Erol, Tilley 2006)
Mitigate harm through better regulation

• Limited opportunities exist to object to / negotiate the size of a proposed packaged liquor outlet at the application stage

• Application of the “amenity” test by the VCGLR imposes on the objector, the evidential burden of proving the proposed outlet will adversely affect social amenity. Given the prospective nature of this argument, it is near impossible to make out

• When harm becomes evident after a license is granted, it is then very difficult to prove harm derives from a specific outlet, due to the absence of sales data.
• Applications are considered on a case by case basis, with little room in package liquor outlet applications, to introduce evidence of cumulative adverse impacts and socio economic disadvantage

• As a result, most objections are lost and most applications to reduce volume of supply are successfully resisted
These outcomes indicate a clear imbalance in the regulatory scheme and reflects a broader public policy failure with respect to the marketing and supply of packaged liquor, to the point where excessive consumption in family homes and public places has become the norm for alcohol related offending.
How can we best respond to alcohol harm?

The issue cannot be solved by arresting our way out of the problem

There needs to be

• A combined approach between all stakeholders
• More education about excessive alcohol consumption impacts
• Greater alcohol industry engagement in reducing the harm
• Increased public and community understanding of the impacts
• 'Third Voices' undertaking relevant research and strong advocacy for Alcohol Harm and Family Violence reduction
• Better regulation
How can we best work together?

- The development of a holistic, alcohol management model requires a range of collaborative strategies between all relevant stakeholders to reduce alcohol-related harm (Holder, Gruenewald, Ponicki et al, 2000)

- The SEM Project has already created a unique model of partnerships

- We have the opportunity to test the existing legal system's approach to alcohol regulation and the potential to make the alcohol industry more accountable for alcohol harm in the community

- The Project can create a platform for future thinking in the public domain and raise more awareness of alcohol harm
Early results from collaboration

• The following couple of slides demonstrate how collaborative research can give us a better line of sight on the harm drivers and so build the case for change.

• These slides are drawn from presentations made to the SEMCA Research Project.

• Acknowledgement to Dr Michael Livingston (UNSW): Alcohol Outlet Density and Alcohol Related Problems
## Summary findings of TP studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pubs</th>
<th>Bottle Shops</th>
<th>Restaurants/Bars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General assault</td>
<td>⬆</td>
<td>⬆</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family violence</td>
<td></td>
<td>⬆</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth heavy drinking</td>
<td></td>
<td>⬆</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic disease</td>
<td>⬆</td>
<td></td>
<td>⬆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economic disadvantage</td>
<td>⬇</td>
<td>⬆</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impact

• 10% increase in pubs ->
  - 3% in assaults (Police)
  - 0.6% in assaults (hospitalisations)
  - 1% in family violence

• 10% increase in packaged liquor outlets ->
  - 1% in assaults (Police)
  - 0.5% in assaults (hospitalisations)
  - 1.9% in chronic disease
  - 3.3% in family violence

• Some evidence that alcohol effects vary across different postcode types
  - Inner-city pubs / suburban bottle shops more problematic
Victoria Police and the SEM Project
A Unique Partnership

Victoria Police SMR PhD on
Packaged Liquor and Family Violence
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