

Alcohol strategy consultation

User Details - 5356237

Date Started: 16/01/2013 11:15:51

Date Ended: 06/02/2013 03:24:04

Time taken: **496 hrs, 8 mins, 13 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.

Other

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

Halton Borough Council and Halton Health & Wellbeing 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.

No Response

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.

Discussion

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

North West 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.

Yes

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):

We agree with the Drinkwise NW view that setting the minimum unit price level at 50p would achieve far better outcomes than a minimum unit price at the 45p price level. Our view is based on the findings of the SchARR model (University of Sheffield, 2009), which is the only UK independently peer reviewed evidence base for minimum unit pricing. It predicted that after 10 years a 50p price level would save: 3,060 lives, 1,020 more than 45p level; 97,700 hospital admissions, 31,500 more than 45p level; 442,300 days absent from work, 176,000 more than 45p level; and, 42,500 crimes, 18,400 more than 45p price

level. These are significant savings of lives, for society and the economy and only cost the moderate drinker 6p per week more than a 45p minimum price level.

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):

In the North West of England there may be cross border issues if the price level is set at 45p as the Scottish Government is proposing a minimum unit price of 50p. This will create a price differential which will encourage people to visit England, particularly Northern England, to purchase and consume alcohol. Inflation since the SchARR study was published in 2009 would mean that 50p is now valued at 54p, this means that minimum unit pricing should be measured in terms of success against revised levels from 2014 when this policy will be implemented. The price level should be regularly revised to ensure that alcohol doesn't become more affordable. Additional money earned by retailers should be recouped by the Treasury and directed to local services which reduce alcohol harm. Public houses, bars and other on-trade premises will greatly benefit from the introduction of a minimum price as the differential in prices for alcohol retailed in the off-trade and on-trade would be reduced. We believe that this would result in a shift of drinking patterns to on-trade premises which is not only generally a safer and regulated environment to consume alcohol but also good for community pubs. This is particularly important at a time when The Campaign for Real Ale is reporting that 16 pubs every week are closing down.

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.

Yes

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

Children and young people in particular would be more protected from alcohol harms by raising the cost of alcohol. By ensuring that alcohol is less affordable, children and young people will be able to afford to purchase and consume less.

Score

0

Page Score

0

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):

There should be a general principle that the purchase of any goods should not be linked to the purchase of alcohol at a lower than normal sale price. Some further examples of offers which we believe should be banned are: • Buying other goods and getting alcohol free, or at a reduced price which would fall below a minimum unit price of 50p • There should be a consistency across the on- and off-trade so there should be a ban on multi-buy promotions in on-trade premises also • There is a potential to circumvent the multi-buy ban by selling alcohol in different sized packaging. There should be a consistency of price per volume regardless of the size or quantity that the alcohol is sold in, for example 4 bottles of wine should cost the same as one 3 litre box of the same wine. • Loyalty point schemes which are in anyway linked to alcohol – i.e. sales of alcohol should not contribute points in any loyalty scheme. Also, alcohol sales should be exempt from any loyalty scheme. • Any money off coupons should not include alcoholic products

Score

0

Q16. Should other factors or evidence be taken into account when considering 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 200 words):

• The SchARR study found that there is a far greater impact of the multi-buy ban policy when enforced in

concert with a minimum unit price policy, we believe that a multi-buy ban will be more effective if implemented with a 50p minimum unit price rather than 45p • Marketing of alcohol should be covered by legislation to ensure that it does not circumvent the spirit and intention of this legislation. • Multi-buy promotions in the off-trade encourage people to buy more alcohol than they intend which means there is greater access to alcohol in the home environment. We already know that children access alcohol from the home more than any other place, so a ban would reduce the access to alcohol for children. • Trading Standards needs a strengthened operation to monitor and enforce a multi-buy ban effectively as it is unlikely that relying on consumers policing the ban will be effective enough.

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):

• The general population may benefit as the pervasiveness of marketing for cheap alcohol makes excessive consumption more culturally acceptable. • Pubs may benefit as people are less likely to preload on alcohol bought from off-licensed premises and shift their consumption of alcohol to on-licence premises • Young people may benefit as a ban could reduce access and availability of alcohol in the home environment • Some of these measures may only be effective alongside minimum unit pricing

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 promotionsa ban on dispensing alcohol by one person directly into the mouth of anothera requirement to provide free tap water on request to customersa requirement to have an age verification policy to prevent the sale of alcohol to persons under 18 years of age, anda 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 | Yes |
| Mandatory provision of free tap water | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 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):

• Promotional materials are banned if they glamourise the promotion of alcohol; we believe that this 'glamourisation' test should be replaced by a ban on all irresponsible drinks promotions. • The unit content of all drinks, including mixed drinks, should be clearly visible at the point of sale ensuring that any customer should have easy access to know what they are drinking. • Age verification schemes should have a written policy on all premises and should be, at a minimum a 'check 25' scheme, and include mandatory signage to make patrons aware of the policy. • Staff training should be formalised ensuring that licence holders train and re-train their staff to be accredited to a national standard for the safe and responsible retailing of alcohol.

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):

• A proportionate seating and standing ratio should be dictated by the capacity of the premises. • Soft drinks should be priced cheaper than the cheapest alcoholic drink thus removing a possible encouragement for people to drink alcoholic drinks if they are cheaper. • Beer should be decanted from bottles at the bar. As there are more bottle related incidents involving beer bottles than glasses we believe that by ensuring that beer bottles are removed from the drinking environment there will be a safer drinking environment for all patrons. • A ban on irresponsible drinks promotions should be applied to the off-trade. • Loyalty point schemes which are related to the purchase of alcohol (which encourages increased consumption) should be banned. • Offering shots of spirits away from the bar area (e.g. table to table selling of shots of pre-poured vodka) should be banned. • Happy hours should be banned as they sell discounted alcohol. • Organised commercial pub crawls should be banned as they encourage the consumption of excess alcohol in a short space of time in many premises which leads to drunkenness and anti-social behaviour. • Ladies nights, (where there are discounted or free drinks based on a customers' sex) should be banned as they encourage excessive consumption of alcohol.

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):

There should be as many or as few mandatory licensing conditions as deemed appropriate by the Government. This should include extending the ban on irresponsible drinks promotions to cover off-trade licensed premises to create a consistency across the on- and off-trades.

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):

A robust Joint Strategic Needs Assessment would provide consistency in approach, we recommend that it would include:

- Accident and Emergency data

- Ambulance data
- Paramedic data
- GP data
- Urgent care/walk in centre data
- Treatment data including specialist treatment
- Demand/unmet demand for alcohol treatment
- Alcohol related mortality (including suicides and self harm)
- Mental health and wellbeing indices
- Foetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorders data
- CEM Home Office monitoring data on violence
- Trauma and Injury Intelligence Group (TIIG) data from the North West Public Health Observatory
- Other Alcohol-related hospital admissions data NI39 e.g. specific (drunkenness) and non specific (cancers)
- Map out licensed premises and correlate alcohol related admissions, crime data etc
- Domestic abuse data including child protection issues

Public health should be a licensing objective in its own right and not tied to CIPs. This would not be disproportionate as suggested in the impact assessment, and would play a role in the economic development and health of an authority area. Experience from Scotland suggests that public health should be taken into consideration across the whole authority area rather than at smaller scale when assessing the over-provision of alcohol to take into account all points of sale.

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.

Yes

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

Currently only the police can object to licence applications due to a Cumulative Impact Policies (CIP). We believe that all responsible authorities should be able to object to the application therefore widening the process to consider health data and the impact on health harms. For example if there is a health harm issue but no crime issue, health bodies may object on the grounds of a CIP.

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):

- In addition to the impact on controlling alcohol related crime the health data can impact upon all policy areas and licensing objectives giving stronger evidence and improving the all round data picture to set a baseline and allow for more informed decision making.
- Including health data in consideration of a CIP would enable local links between alcohol and health harm to be better established.
- There will be a positive impact on people's mental health and wellbeing because there is less violence, improving healthiness of the population, increased life expectancy and increased economic productivity.
- Where there is a saturation of licensed premises, for example in a city centre, competition drives down the price of alcohol which encourages additional consumption. Saturation of licensed premises is also correlated to higher incidences of crime and anti social behaviour.

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 | | | |
| 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. Any sale of alcohol should be regulated. Therefore there are no types of premises for alcohol sales which should be unregulated. Unregulated alcohol sales would create a situation where the objectives of the Licensing Act 2003 would be unenforceable.
- The licensed sale of alcohol protects and ensures a standard of 'due diligence' is adhered to by those selling alcohol.
- This proposal could create a third tier of licensed premises as it could create a category outside Early Morning Restriction Orders/Late Night Levy and CIPs. This could create confusion for consumers and enforcement officers and lead to increased costs for public sector organisations dealing with the harmful effects of alcohol.
- This extra category of licensed premises could be contributing to the harm of excessive alcohol consumption but would not contribute to the costs, for example through a Late Night Levy being applied to licensed premises.

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 don't agree with the 'ancillary seller' status because there is no mechanism to 'police' these businesses, and ensure that they retail alcohol responsibly. The scheme would also take the sale of alcohol out of the remit of the four objectives of the Licensing Act 2003 and the proposed objective of 'Public Health' thus undermining the Licensing Act. The 'ancillary sellers' of alcohol in the retail environment would not come under the same protection afforded by the Licensing Act or necessarily receive appropriate training therefore creating a three tier system which cannot be monitored, supported or enforced. In addition people purchasing from an 'ancillary seller' need to understand they are purchasing from an unregulated 'ancillary seller' and are therefore not necessarily making a reputable or safe purchase, for example safeguarding underage sales.

Score

0

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

No Response

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:

We do not agree with any proposals for a lighter touch authorisation.

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).

We do not agree that any premises should be covered by a nationally prescribed exemption.

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 | | | |
| 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.)

There are no processes that could be removed or simplified without having an adverse effect on the licensing objectives or increasing the burden on responsible authorities or the local community

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.

| | Yes | No | Don't know |
|---|-----|----|------------|
| Minimum unit pricing | | X | |
| Multi-buy promotions | | | |
| Health as a licensing objective for cumulative impact | | | X |
| Ancillary sales of alcohol | | | X |
| Temporary event notices | | | X |
| Late night refreshment | | | X |
| Removing the duty to advertise licence applications in a local newspaper | | | X |
| Sales of alcohol at motorway service stations | | | X |
| Personal licences | | | X |

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).

We have not seen the methodologies used to support the conclusions for the effectiveness of a 45p minimum unit price in section 5 of the consultation. As this information is not available we have used as evidence the findings of the University of Sheffield's SchARR report (2009) as this is the only UK peer reviewed research into the effects of minimum unit pricing.

Q16 A. – Halton Borough Council cannot answer this question as we believe that, as a matter of principle, we do not believe that there should be any reduction in the regulation of alcohol.

Q20 - As a matter of principle, we do not believe that there should be any reduction in the regulation of alcohol.

Re Q31 A. - The question is constructed in such a way that seems to assume the outcome of the proposal to remove this requirement. We disagree with this proposal and believe that this will increase alcohol consumption which increases burdens to businesses. The cost of alcohol harm affecting the workforce and the wider economy in the North West amounts to over £1.2billion/year

Q34 B. - The principles adopted by the impact assessment look good, we do not feel there is sufficient information given to enable us to answer this question.

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 |