

Alcohol strategy consultation

User Details - 5474416

Date Started: 06/02/2013 14:21:21

Date Ended: 06/02/2013 14:38:00

Time taken: 16 mins, 39 secs

IP Address: n/a

Unique ID: n/a

Page 1: About you

Q1. Please select if you would like your response or personal details to be treated as confidential.

No Response

Score

0

Q2. Which of the following best describes you or the professional interest you represent? Please select one option from the menu below.

Local government (other)

Please specify which organisation, licensing authority or police force you represent in the box below:

Oxfordshire Health Improvement Board

Score

0

Q3. If you are responding on behalf of an organisation or interest group, please write in the box below the number of members in your group or organisation.

20

Q4. How did you obtain the views of your members? Please explain in the box below keeping your response to a maximum of 100 words.

Two meetings and email exchanges

Q5. Please indicate in which region you or your organisation is based. Please select one option from the menu below.

South East England

Score

0

Q6. If you are responding as a member of the public, what is your gender? Please select one option.

No Response

Score

0

Q7. If you are responding as a member of the public, what is your age? Please select one option.

No Response

Score

0

Page Score

0

Page 2: A minimum unit price for alcohol

Q8. In the alcohol strategy, the government committed to introducing a minimum unit price for alcohol in England and Wales. This consultation will contribute to the debate on the most appropriate price per unit and the mechanism by which, once set, minimum unit pricing would remain effective. It is also an opportunity for interested parties to raise other issues around minimum unit pricing. The purpose of minimum unit pricing is to reduce alcohol consumption, particularly by the most hazardous and harmful drinkers who tend to show a preference for the cheapest alcohol products. By doing so the government estimates there will be a reduction in the associated crime and health harms, especially the numbers of hospital admissions, alcohol-related deaths and alcohol-related crimes. Minimum unit pricing is not intended disproportionately to affect responsible drinkers or particular social groups but to reduce the availability of alcohol sold at very low or heavily discounted prices. More information (including the definitions of hazardous and harmful drinkers) is available in the full consultation document and the impact assessment. Do you want to answer questions on minimum unit pricing? Please select one option.

Yes

Score

0

Page Score

0

Page 3: A minimum unit price for alcohol

Q9. The impact of minimum unit pricing will depend on the price per unit of alcohol. The government wants to ensure that the chosen price level is targeted and proportionate, whilst achieving a significant reduction of harm. The government is therefore consulting on the introduction of a recommended minimum unit price of 45p. The government estimates a reduction in consumption across all product types of 3.3 per cent, a reduction in crime of 5,240 per year, a reduction in 24,600 alcohol-related hospital admissions and 714 fewer deaths per year after ten years. Do you agree that this minimum unit price level would achieve these aims? Please select one option.

No

If you think another level would be preferable, please set out your views on why this might be in the box below (keeping your views to a maximum of 200 words):

Yes, setting a minimum unit price would help reduce alcohol related harm. We urge the Government to set this at 50p per unit. The Home Office has considered the evidence demonstrating a relationship between cost, consumption and alcohol-related harm in 'The likely impacts of increasing alcohol price: a summary review of the evidence base' which demonstrates the health and social impact of increasing unit price on harms. The evidence shows that MUP would affect harmful drinkers the most and they would also benefit the most from this measure, though all groups would derive a benefit in health terms.

The proposed minimum unit price of alcohol of 45p would be less than the minimum unit price of 50p in Scotland. It is clear from the evidence in the impact assessment that the higher the MUP the greater the benefits that could be expected to accrue. The higher unit price of 50p will have greater benefits. The rationale for choosing the proposed unit price of 45p is not clear. There are clear advantages in having the same unit price as in Scotland in eliminating cross border effects. As such, we would favour the higher unit price of 50p per unit. We support a MUP of 50p as the actual impact of minimum unit pricing will depend on the price per unit of alcohol. The previous Chief Medical Officer called for a 50p MUP of alcohol in 2008 which at today's value would be around 54p. This will better protect vulnerable younger and heavier drinkers who are more likely to drink cheap alcohol and are likely to have the most potential health gain from the measure. The impact of the MUP on the public purse has been considered in terms of the loss of alcohol duty but should also consider the longer terms savings to the NHS and wider society from reduction in health harms, disorder and crime.

Score

0

Q10. Should other factors or evidence be considered when setting a minimum unit price for alcohol? Please select one option.

Yes

If yes, please specify these in the box below (keeping your views to a maximum of 200 words):

As other evidence is available it should be considered, but we consider that the currently available evidence is sufficient to introduce MUP without delay. Currently available evidence has been considered in informing this proposed policy but further evidence will need to be gathered, particularly in relation to the link of alcohol to disorder and crime and the impacts of these measures.

Score

0

Q11. The government wishes to maintain the effectiveness of minimum unit pricing and is therefore proposing to adjust the minimum unit price level over time. How do you think the level of minimum unit price set by the government should be adjusted over time? Please select one option.

The minimum unit price should automatically be updated in line with inflation each year

Score

0

Q12. The aim of minimum unit pricing is to reduce the consumption of harmful and hazardous drinkers, while minimising the impact on responsible drinkers. Do you think that there are any other people, organisations or groups that could be particularly affected by a minimum unit price for alcohol? Please select one option.

No

If yes, please specify in the box below (keeping your views to a maximum of 100 words):

We consider the impact of this measure will be proportionate in reducing harm to those most at risk as it is directly linked to level of consumption. The most important groups affected by this measure have been considered and we would suggest that protecting those harmed by alcohol, including individuals, communities, and wider society should be the primary consideration. Other groups who could be affected by a MUP could include young people drinking in an unsupervised environment who would benefit from the measure and lower income responsible drinkers who would face a moderate adverse effect. There may be a minor impact on organisations or groups that are not object of the controls. Groups such as schools or churches who choose to sell items such as mulled wine or "Pimms" in conjunction with community events could be caught out by the legislation when due to diluting the product it may be difficult to determine the quantity of alcohol being sold therefore an exemption to the legislation for such organisations may be prudent.

Score

0

Page Score

Page 4: A ban on multi-buy promotions in the off-trade

Q13. The government is consulting on introducing a ban on multi-buy promotions in the off-trade (e.g. shops and off-licences) as part of its wider strategy to reduce excessive alcohol consumption, and alongside the introduction of a minimum unit price. A ban on multi-buy promotions would therefore not apply to pubs, clubs, bars or restaurants. The term 'multi-buy promotions' refers to alcohol promotions that offer a discount for buying multiple items. The aim of a ban would be to stop promotions that encourage people to buy more than they otherwise would, making it cheaper (per item) to purchase more than one of a product than to purchase a single item. As well as being part of a wider strategy to reduce consumption and tackle irresponsible alcohol sales, a ban on multi-buy promotions would also contribute to the government's aim of encouraging people to be aware of how much they drink and the risks of excessive drinking, so that they can make informed choices. The aim of this consultation is to assess support for such a ban and contribute to our understanding of the impact a ban on multi-buy promotions may have. The types of promotion it is proposed that a ban would include, are: two for the price of one, three for the price of two, buy one get one free, buy six and get 20 per cent off, 24 cans of lager costing less than 24 times the cost of a single can of lager in the shop, a case of wine sold cheaper than the individual price at which the same bottles are sold in the shop, 3 for £10 where each bottle costs more than £3.33. More information is available in the full consultation document and the impact assessment. Do you want to answer questions on a ban on multi-buy promotions in the off-trade? Please select one option.

Yes

Score

0

Page Score

0

Page 5: A ban on multi-buy promotions in the off-trade

Q14. Do you think there should be a ban on multi-buy promotions involving alcohol in the off-trade? Please select one option.

Yes

Score

0

Q15. Are there any further offers which should be included in a ban on multi-buy promotions? Please select one option.

Yes

If yes, please specify in the box below (keeping your views to a maximum of 100 words):

We urge the Government to ban multi-buy promotions of alcohol. Multi-buy promotions contribute to the availability of irresponsibly priced alcohol, particularly through promotions which encourage large volumes of alcohol to be purchased. We support a ban which would stop promotions that encourage people to buy more than they otherwise would, making it cheaper (per item) to purchase more than one of a product than to purchase a single item. There should be a ban on multi-buy promotions involving alcohol in the off-trade, and this should also include deals which are linked to discounting individual items. In supermarkets, where most of this deep discounting occurs, alcohol is often sold below cost as a 'loss leader' to entice customers into the store. This means that food prices have to be increased to make up that lost income. In other words cheap alcohol is being subsidised by more expensive food. We would prefer to see supermarkets reduce food prices and use income from more expensive alcohol to subsidise healthy food such as fruit and vegetables. Discounts on sale of single items should not allow a discounted price below the MUP.

Score

0

Q16. Should other factors or evidence be taken into account when considering a ban on multi-buy promotions? Please select one option.

No

Score

0

Q17. The aim of a ban on multi-buy promotions is to stop promotions that encourage people to buy more than they otherwise would, helping people to be aware of how much they drink, and to tackle irresponsible alcohol sales. Do you think that there are any other groups that could be particularly affected by a ban on multi-buy promotions? Please select one option.

Yes

If yes, please specify in the box below (keeping your views to a maximum of 100 words):

There may be a minor impact on organisations or groups that are not object of the controls. Groups such as schools or churches who choose to sell items such as mulled wine or "Pimms" in conjunction with community events could be caught out by the legislation when due to diluting the product is may be difficult to determine the quantity of alcohol being sold therefore an exemption to the legislation for such organisations may be prudent.

Score

0

Page Score

0

Page 6: Reviewing the mandatory licensing conditions

Q18. In its response to the 'Rebalancing the Licensing Act' consultation in 2010, the government committed to review the impact of the current mandatory licensing conditions. More recently, the alcohol strategy made a commitment to review these mandatory licensing conditions to ensure they are sufficiently targeting problems such as irresponsible promotions in pubs and clubs. The government has also committed to consult on whether these mandatory licensing conditions should, where relevant, apply to both the on- and off-trade. This consultation forms part of that review, and will contribute to the government's understanding of how these mandatory conditions are perceived. The five mandatory licensing conditions currently set out in regulations in relation to the supply of alcohol are: a ban on irresponsible promotions a ban on dispensing alcohol by one person directly into the mouth of another a requirement to provide free tap water on request to customers a requirement to have an age verification policy to prevent the sale of alcohol to persons under 18 years of age, and a requirement to make available to customers small measures such as half pints or beer or cider or 125ml glasses of wine More information is available in the full consultation document. An explanation of each of these terms can be found on page 20 of the consultation document, in the glossary at the end. Do you want to answer questions on reviewing the mandatory licensing conditions? Please select one option.

Yes

Score

0

Page Score

0

Page 7: Reviewing the mandatory licensing conditions

Q19. Do you think each of the mandatory licensing conditions is effective in promoting the licensing objectives? For more information on the licensing objectives please see the glossary at the end of the full consultation document. Please select one option (Yes, No, Don't know) from each drop down menu.

	Prevention of crime and disorder	Public safety	Prevention of public nuisance	Protection of children from harm
Irresponsible promotions	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Dispensing alcohol directly into the mouth	Yes	Yes	Yes	Don't know
Mandatory provision of free tap water	Yes	Yes	Yes	Don't know
Age verification policy	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mandatory provision of small measures	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Score

0

Q20. Do you think that the mandatory licensing conditions do enough to target irresponsible promotions in pubs and clubs? Please select one option.

No

If no, please state what more could be done in the box below (keeping your views to a maximum of 100 words):

Increased provision to target irresponsible promotions in pubs and clubs would be welcomed. We believe that no conditions should be removed from the mandatory licensing codes. While we believe that the licensing conditions address the licensing objectives, we believe that the objectives are not sufficiently addressed by the current licensing conditions and the conditions need to be strengthened with respect to irresponsible promotions such as the provision of welcome drinks free of charge. The licensing conditions have a positive impact to some extent and in particular with regards to obvious examples of irresponsible drinks promotions. However, there is still some ambiguity by the trade and responsible authorities as to whether other less obvious promotions qualify.

Score

0

Q21. Are there other issues related to the licensing objectives which could be tackled through a mandatory licensing condition? Please select one option.

Yes

If yes, please specify in the box below (keeping your views to a maximum of 200 words):

Reducing harm to health should be considered in licensing objectives. Prevention of health harms from excessive or irresponsible alcohol consumption would be a reasonable licensing objective given the well-developed evidence base on the links between alcohol consumption and health harms described in the 'The likely impacts of increasing alcohol price: a summary review of the evidence base'. Local evidence of alcohol related health harms from the NHS or Public Health could be used to inform this objective where available. We would like to see minimum staff training requirements regarding the sale of alcohol to individuals who appear to be already drunk or buying to supply someone who is already drunk would be beneficial as it would help tackle the significant issue of premises serving customers who are already intoxicated.

Score

0

Q22. Do you think that the current approach, with five mandatory licensing conditions applying to the on-

trade and only one of those to the off-trade, is appropriate? Please select one option.

No

If no, please explain why you think the current approach is not the best approach (keeping your views to a maximum of 100 words):

We think that the licencing condition banning irresponsible promotions would also be applicable to the off-trade. It would be appropriate for Trading Standards to enforce the ban given the existing role in enforcing pricing legislation. It would be difficult if a business was receiving advice and enforcement challenges from the Police or licensing authorities on pricing in relation to alcohol and from Trading Standards in relation to pricing practices on all other products. Many larger businesses have Primary Authority relationships with Trading Standards Services for the provision of advice and guidance on consumer protection legislation, including pricing controls, and there may be a conflict with this scheme if pricing controls on alcohol were outside its scope (i.e. if the Police or licensing authority had responsibility for pricing on alcoholic products then the business would have to seek advice from a different bodies on the pricing of alcohol and this advice would be outside the scope of their primary authority partnership).

Score

0

Page Score

0

Page 8: Health as a licensing objective for cumulative impact policies

Q23. We want to ensure that licensing authorities are able to take alcohol-related health harms into consideration when making decisions about cumulative impact policies (CIPs) which can be used to manage problems linked to the density of premises in specific areas. A CIP introduces a rebuttable presumption that all new licence applications and variations in that area will normally be refused if the licensing authority receives a relevant representation stating that the application will add to the cumulative impact. However each application must still be considered on its own merits and the licensing authority may still grant the application if it is satisfied that the application will not contribute to the cumulative impact. We are proposing that licensing authorities will be able to take evidence of alcohol-related health harm into account in deciding whether to introduce a CIP and the extent of that CIP. This would be a discretionary power and not an obligation. We expect that those areas with the highest levels of alcohol-related health harm, or fast rising levels of harm from alcohol, will be most likely to use this power. It will allow local health bodies to fully contribute to local decision making and mean licensing authorities can restrict the number of licensed premises in the local area on the basis of robust local evidence. More information is available in the full consultation document and impact assessment. Do you want to answer questions on health as a licensing objective for cumulative impact policies? Please select one option.

Yes

Score

0

Page Score

0

Page 9: Health as a licensing objective for cumulative impact policies

Q24. What sources of evidence on alcohol-related health harm could be used to support the introduction of a cumulative impact policy (CIP) if it were possible for a CIP to include consideration of health? Please specify in the box below (keeping your views to a maximum of 200 words):

Harm to health should be a consideration in cumulative impact policies and also in setting licensing conditions.

Alcohol-related health harms should be taken into consideration by licensing authorities given the well-developed evidence base on the links between alcohol consumption and health harms described in the impact assessment of minimum unit price for alcohol. Alcohol related health harm should not be tied only to cumulative impact policies, but should also inform the licensing conditions. Data from the NHS (CCGs, NCB, and provider trusts) as well as data from Public Health (local authority Public Health teams and Public Health England) on alcohol related health harms could support the consideration of health in CIP. Permitting the consideration of alcohol related health harms in CIP would empower local authorities to respond to the needs of their communities.

Evidence sources would include:

- Joint Strategic Needs Assessment
- Hospital admission data
- Police alcohol related crime data /intelligence
- Reliable intelligence /data provided by local health professionals
- Information from Universities /Colleges on health related issues raised by students with them

Q25. Do you think any aspects of the current cumulative impact policy process would need to be amended to allow consideration of data on alcohol-related health harms? Please select one option.

No

If yes, please specify which aspects in the box below (keeping your views to a maximum of 200 words):

We do not think that any amendment to the process would be necessary to allow consideration of the relevant data. We would want the enforcement regime to link to the licensing regime to provide a mechanism for challenge and remedy other than prosecution. We would suggest some funding should be available for local business engagement and education concerning the ban. This is a fairly complex change to explain with the different pricing options that the consultation outlines and the link to existing pricing controls.

Score

0

Q26. What impact do you think allowing consideration of data on alcohol-related health harms when introducing a cumulative impact policy would have if it were used in your local area? Please specify your answer in the box below, providing evidence to support your response (keeping your views to a maximum of 200 words):

It would be very difficult to link health data to individual premises or area. There would have to be significant evidence of alcohol-related harm that could be pinned to a particular area so it may not be possible to create a CIP on the basis of health alone. However, it would widen the debate and consideration of licensing applications to include the fundamental issue of health as a licensing objective.

Page Score

0

Page 10: Freeing up responsible businesses

Q27. The government has committed to consult on giving licensing authorities greater freedom to take decisions that reflect the needs of their local community. Following the government's Red Tape Challenge in 2011, three areas of reform were specified: alcohol licensing for certain types of premises providing minimal alcohol sales, temporary event notices (TENs) and the licensing of late night refreshment. This section asks for views on these proposals and suggests further ways to reduce burdens on business. The proposals set out here can be seen alongside work undertaken by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport to remove unnecessary red tape from regulated entertainment. More information on each of these areas for reform is available in the full consultation document. There are five subjects covered in this section. They are: ancillary sales of alcohol, occasional provision of licensable activities at community events, an extension of the temporary event notice limit at individual premises, late night refreshment, and further proposals to reduce burdens on business. Do you want to answer questions on freeing up responsible businesses? Please select one option.

Yes

Score

0

Page Score

0

Page 11: Freeing up responsible businesses

Q28. Ancillary sales of alcohol For many businesses, the sale of alcohol is only a small part of, or incidental to, their wider activities, and occurs alongside the provision of another product or service (which this consultation refers to as an 'ancillary sale'). For example, a guesthouse might wish to provide wine to its guests with an evening meal or a complimentary bottle of wine in a guest's room, while a hairdresser might wish to offer clients a glass of wine. Should special provision to reduce the burdens on ancillary sellers be limited to specific types of business, and/or be available to all types of business, providing they meet certain qualification criteria for limited or incidental sales? Please select one option in each row.

	Yes	No	Don't know
The provision should be limited to a specific list of certain types of business and the kinds of sales they make		X	
The provision should be available to all businesses providing they meet certain qualification criteria to be an ancillary seller		X	
The provision should be available to both a specific list of premises and more widely to organisations meeting the prescribed definition of an ancillary seller, that is both the above options		X	

Score

0

Q29. If special provisions to reduce licensing burdens on ancillary sellers were to include a list of certain types of business, do you think it should apply to the following? Please select one option in each row.

	Yes	No	Don't know
Accommodation providers, providing alcohol alongside accommodation as part of the contract		X	
Hair and beauty salons, providing alcohol alongside a hair or beauty treatment		X	
Florists, providing alcohol alongside the purchase of flowers		X	
Cultural organisations, such as theatres, cinemas and museums, providing alcohol alongside cultural events as part of the entry ticket		X	
Regular charitable events, providing alcohol as part of the wider occasion		X	

Score

0

Q30. Do you have any suggestions for other types of businesses to which such special provision could apply without impacting adversely on one or more of the licensing objectives? Please write your suggestions in the box below, keeping your views to a maximum of 200 words:

No Response

Q31. The aim of a new 'ancillary seller' status is to reduce burdens on businesses where the sale of alcohol is only a small part of their business and occurs alongside the provision of a wider product or service, while minimising loopholes for irresponsible businesses and maintaining the effectiveness of enforcement. Alternatively, a second option is to broaden the definition of 'ancillary sales' to include all businesses (and/or not for profit activities) through the use of a general set of qualification criteria, for example, to the effect that: alcohol must be sold or supplied as a small part or proportion of a sales transaction or contract for a wider service, and the amount of alcohol that could be supplied as part of that contract cannot exceed a prescribed amount. Do you think that the qualification criteria proposed meet this aim?

No

Please use the space below to provide further comments (keeping your views to a maximum of 200 words):

We urge the Government NOT to allow the ancillary licensing of alcohol sales in other businesses such as hair or beauty salons. The prospect of special provisions being granted that would allow alcohol to be sold alongside hair or beauty treatments would have the effect of changing the societal perception of alcohol and would further encourage and further normalise alcohol consumption to the detriment of health. No measures should be introduced that will lead to an increase in alcohol consumption or that seeks to further promote the further normalisation of alcohol. The case for the benefits of allowing this ancillary sale of alcohol has not been made in terms of the economic benefit to businesses or to communities and the potential harms from this have not been considered.

Score

0

Q32. Do you think that these proposals would significantly reduce the burdens on ancillary sellers? Please select one option in each row.

	Yes	No	Don't know
Allow premises making ancillary sales to request in their premises licence application that the requirement for a personal licence holder be removed		X	
Introduce a new, light-touch form of authorisation for premises making ancillary sales - an ASN but retaining the need for a personal licence holder		X	
Introduce a new, light touch form of authorisation for premises making ancillary sales - an ASN - with no requirement for a personal licence holder		X	

Score

0

Q33. Do you think these proposals would impact adversely on one or more of the licensing objectives? Please select one option.

	Yes	No	Don't know
Allow premises making ancillary sales to request in their premises licence application that the requirement for a personal licence holder be removed	X		
Introduce a new, light-touch form of authorisation for premises making ancillary sales - an ASN but retaining the need for a personal licence holder	X		
Introduce a new, light touch form of authorisation for premises making ancillary sales - an ASN - with no requirement for a personal licence holder	X		

Score

0

Q34. What other issues or options do you think should be considered when taking forward proposals for a lighter touch authorisation? Please specify in the box below keeping your response to a maximum of 200 words:

No Response

Page Score

0

Page 12: Freeing up responsible businesses

Q35. Do you agree that licensing authorities should have the power to allow organisers of community events involving licensable activities to notify them through a locally determined notification process? Please select one option.

No

Score

0

Q36. What impact do you think a locally determined notification would have on organisers of community events? Please select one option in each row.

	Yes	No	Don't know
Reduce the burden		X	
Increase the burden	X		

Score

0

Page Score

0

Page 13: Freeing up responsible businesses

Q37. Should the number of TENs which can be given in respect of individual premises be increased? Please select one option.

No

Score

0

Q38. If you answered yes, please select one option to indicate which you would prefer. Please select one option.

No Response

Score

0

Page Score

0

Page 14: Freeing up responsible businesses

Q39. Do you think that licensing authorities should have local discretion around late night refreshment in each of the following ways? Please select one option in each row.

	Yes	No	Don't know
Determining that premises in certain areas are exempt		X	
Determining that certain premises types are exempt in their local area		X	

Score

0

Q40. Do you agree that motorway service areas should receive a nationally prescribed exemption from regulations for the provision of late night refreshment? Please select one option.

No

Score

0

Q41. Please describe in the box below any other types of premises to which you think a nationally prescribed exemption should apply (keeping your views to a maximum of 100 words).

No Response

Page Score

0

Page 15: Freeing up responsible businesses

Q42. Do you agree with each of the following proposals? Please select one option in each row.

	Yes	No	Don't know
Remove requirements to advertise licensing applications in local newspapers		X	
Remove the centrally imposed prohibition on the sale of alcohol at MSAs for the on and off-trade		X	
Remove the centrally imposed prohibition on the sale of alcohol at MSAs, but only in respect of overnight accommodation - lodges		X	
Remove or simplify requirements to renew personal licences under the 2003 Act		X	

Score

0

Q43. Do you think that each of the following would reduce the overall burdens on business? Please select one option in each row.

	Yes	No	Don't know
Remove requirements to advertise licensing applications in local newspapers		X	
Remove the centrally imposed prohibition on the sale of alcohol at MSAs for the on and off-trade		X	
Remove the centrally imposed prohibition on the sale of alcohol at MSAs, but only in respect of overnight accommodation - lodges		X	
Remove or simplify requirements to renew personal licences under the 2003 Act		X	

Score

0

Q44. Do you think that the following measures would impact adversely on one or more of the licensing objectives (see glossary)? Please select one option in each row.

	Yes	No	Don't know
Remove requirements to advertise licensing applications in local newspapers	X		
Remove the centrally imposed prohibition on the sale of alcohol at MSAs for the on and off-trade	X		
Remove the centrally imposed prohibition on the sale of alcohol at MSAs, but only in respect of overnight accommodation - lodges	X		
Remove or simplify requirements to renew personal licences under the 2003 Act	X		

Score

0

Q45. In addition to the suggestions outlined above, what other sections of or processes under the 2003 Act could in your view be removed or simplified in order to impact favourably on businesses without undermining the statutory licensing objectives or significantly increasing burdens on licensing authorities? (Please keep your views to a maximum of 200 words.)

No Response

Page Score

0

Page 16: Impact assessments

Q46. Impact assessments for the proposals in this consultation have been published alongside the full consultation document. Do you think that the impact assessments related to the consultation provide an accurate representation of the costs and benefits of the proposals? Please select one option in each row.

No Response

Score

0

Q47. Do you have any comments on the methodologies or assumptions used in the impact assessments? If yes, please specify in the box below, clearly referencing the impact assessment and page to which you refer (keeping your views to a maximum of 400 words).

No Response

Page Score

0

Scoring Summary

Pages	Total
1. About you	0
2. A minimum unit price for alcohol	0
3. A minimum unit price for alcohol	0
4. A ban on multi-buy promotions in the off-trade	0
5. A ban on multi-buy promotions in the off-trade	0
6. Reviewing the mandatory licensing conditions	0
7. Reviewing the mandatory licensing conditions	0
8. Health as a licensing objective for cumulative impact policies	0
9. Health as a licensing objective for cumulative impact policies	0
10. Freeing up responsible businesses	0
11. Freeing up responsible businesses	0
12. Freeing up responsible businesses	0
13. Freeing up responsible businesses	0
14. Freeing up responsible businesses	0
15. Freeing up responsible businesses	0
16. Impact assessments	0
Total Survey Score:	0