

City Of Port Phillip Alcohol Action Plan (2008-2013)

Survey Results

1. Demographics of the Respondents

The table below shows the demographic characteristics of the respondents in each of our samples. 86 people were surveyed on public drinking at the Mayor's Lunch in July, 142 people were interviewed in the streets, 125 people completed surveys in licensed venues and 148 people completed the surveys via other means, such as the website, direct e-mail or at town halls & libraries. Other responses were received from Victoria Police, licensees, and some welfare agencies.

Demographics	Mayors Lunch	General	Street Stalls	Patrons	Total	%
Men	53	69	80	62	264	52.7
Women	29	62	62	59	212	42.3
Other/NA	4	17	0	3	24	4.8
Age Span	21-81	19 to 83	17-85	18-70	17-85	
Ave Age	56	36.7	47	26.9	41.7	
Residents	70	61	104	61	296	59.1
Business	0	12	4	0	16	3.2
Visitors	12	38	31	60	141	28.1
NA	4	13	3	2	22	4.4
Welfare worker	0	18	0	1	19	3.8
Licensee	0	6	0	1	7	1.4
Total	86	148	142	125	501	

2. Public Drinking

Public Drinking bans	Mayor's Lunch	%	General	%	Street Stalls	%	Patrons	%	Total	%
11pm – 7am	38	44.2	68	45.9	109	76.8	67	53.6	282	56.3
Don't Know	2	2.3	11	7.4	7	4.9	12	9.6	32	6.4
No ban	20	23.3	42	28.4	5	3.5	22	17.6	89	17.8
Only festivals	5	5.8	1	0.7	1	0.7	1	0.8	8	1.6
Other hours	0	0.0	7	4.7	1	0.7	3	2.4	11	2.2
24 hrs	10	11.6	6	4.1	2	1.4	9	7.2	27	5.4
24hrs in main streets only	11	12.8	8	5.4	1	0.7	6	4.8	26	5.2
Didn't support 11pm-7am ban, but offered no alternative	0	0.0	4	2.7	10	7.0	3	2.4	17	3.4
Other	0	0.0	1	0.7	6	4.2	2	1.6	9	1.8
Total	86		148		142		125		501	

Conclusion: Current policy supported by most people in all population groups. It was more than twice as popular as the next most favoured: no bans at all (18%). 24 hour bans, either everywhere or in main streets were only supported by 10.6% when combined.

Support for Public Drinking Bans				
	Business (inc Licensees)		Residents	
	#	%	#	%
Night ban	6	32	172	58
24 hour bans	7	36	33	12
No bans	2	11	47	16
Other/Don't know	4	21	44	15
Total	19	100	296	101

- ❖ Police and Liquor Licensing Victoria want 24 hour bans. The business sample was too small to draw conclusions from (N=19), but their views were mixed.
- ❖ Ngwala Willumbong (Aboriginal Drug and Alcohol agency) don't mind if it's banned from main streets as long as chronic street drinkers can drink peacefully elsewhere in a place that's supported with bins, toilets & shelter. The reality is that this population won't stop drinking even if it was outlawed, so it is more practical to reduce the conflict points.

3. Venue Density Guidelines:

Support for Density Guidelines	General	%	Street Stalls	%	Patrons	%	Total	%
Yes	62	41.9	92	64.8	38	30.4	192	46.3
No	68	45.9	37	26.1	67	53.6	172	41.4
Don't Know	18	12.2	13	9.2	20	16.0	51	12.3
Total	148		142		125		415	

Too many venues in these streets? (% who said yes)	GENERAL	STREET STALLS	PATRONS	Ave %
Clarendon St	6.8	10.6	2.4	6.6
Acland St	20.9	20.4	6.4	15.9
Fitzroy St	34.5	38.0	15.2	29.2
Carlisle St	8.8	10.6	5.6	8.3
Bay St	6.8	9.9	2.4	6.3

- ❖ Fitzroy & Acland Sts were most commonly cited as already having too many licensed venues, but the majority of people thought they were all ok – particularly patrons.
- ❖ There's strong research evidence that restricting density and operating hours can reduce harm.
- ❖ Community opinion was split overall and among the general respondents. There was strong support for guidelines from the street survey. Patrons did not favour more restrictions over licensing.
- ❖ There's a national move to develop consistent guidelines, so we can work with that. They may take at least a year to develop.



4. Support for Other Interventions That May reduce the Risk of Alcohol Related harm:

Support for Lockouts	General	%	Street Stalls	%	Patrons	%	Total	%
Yes	37	25.0	68	47.9	8	6.4	113	27.2
No	88	59.5	58	40.8	117	93.6	263	63.4
Don't Know	23	15.5	16	11.3	0	0.0	39	9.4
Total	148		142		125		415	

Conclusion: The majority of respondents (63%) opposed the lockouts as a solution to reducing alcohol-related harm. This was extremely strong among patrons of licensed venues (94%).

The table on the following page shows the average level of support for each intervention we proposed on the long-form of the survey. The 118 respondents who completed the longer version rated each intervention on a scale of 1-5 and had an opportunity to suggest extra interventions or provide comments. 1 = strongly oppose; 2 = oppose; 3= don't know/don't care; 4 = support; 5 = strongly support. The interventions are listed in order from those with strongest support to weakest. They were also provided with an indication of the research support for each intervention before making their choices (G= Good research results; M=Mixed; P=Poor; U=Untested). This research is based on Barbor et al's (2003) book *Alcohol: No Ordinary Commodity*.

Intervention	Average	Support	Oppose	DK	Council's Response
Public transport to operate later during the night (U)	4.7	105	2	11	See Action 1.1
Safe Taxi Ranks (U)	4.47	102	2	14	See Actions 1.2 & 1.9
Meetings between Liquor Licensees, Council and police (e.g., Accords & Forums) to reduce alcohol related harm in and around venues (G)	4.43	102	2	14	See Action 2.1
Responsible service of alcohol programs for staff of alcohol outlets (G)	4.38	103	5	10	See Action 2.2
More treatment & intervention for drinkers (G)	4.37	93	3	22	See Actions 2.3, 2.7 & 2.11
More street cleaning (G)	4.27	100	3	15	See Actions 3.1, 3.2, & 3.3
Install more public toilets (G)	4.16	94	5	19	See Action 1.3
Increase policing and enforcement (G)	3.96	90	13	15	See Actions 2.5, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, & 4.6
Public advertising to reduce alcohol-related harm (e.g., similar to anti-drug campaigns) (P)	3.81	76	11	31	See Action 2.11
Restrict number of alcohol outlets & bottle-shops (G)	3.51	67	30	21	See Actions 1.4 to 1.7
Community education sessions on alcohol (e.g., information and support for parents on teenage drinking, public forums) (M)	3.41	85	4	29	See Actions 2.4 & 2.11
Restrict alcohol promotion further (U)	3.41	58	37	23	See Action 4.6
Self regulation by alcohol industry (P)* * 38 of these were patrons: 28 supported self-regulation; 3 opposed; 7 DK. Among others it was 27 For; 39 Against ; 14 DK	3.01	55	42	21	This intervention did not receive support from the survey respondents and has poor research support. Council will not support it either.
Restrict trading hours of alcohol outlets further (G)	2.82	45	58	15	This intervention was opposed by the survey respondents, but has good research support. The State Government has control over these restrictions.

5. Extra Information

Additional Licensees Surveys (N=9, may have more than 1 response each Q)	
1. What are the main alcohol-related problems that licensees face in the CoPP?	
6	Being blamed for all alcohol related problems
4	Irresponsible venue operators
6	Not enough police
1	Other
2. How do you contribute to reducing the alcohol related harms in our community?	
9	RSA trained staff
9	Security staff
9	The Licensees Accord
1	Assoc. Liquor Licensees Melb. (ALLM)
3. Can you please tell us about some specific examples of recent improvements that you've made?	
4	Reduced promotions on discount alcohol
6	Extra security
1	Internal training of staff with action plan as to 'how to deal with intoxicated patrons in venue'
1	Ongoing education & training of staff and security..
1	Maintain high standards
1	Take responsibility. No passouts.
1	All security and duty mgr to have radio contact. Greater documentation as to issues during bar operation hours
1	Smoking area within venue
4. Are there any other measures that you are looking to implement in the next 2 years to help reduce alcohol-related harm?	
4	No
1	Having more regular training including new VenueSafe program
1	Joined AAM
1	Train all staff in VenueSafe training program, . Train and more closely monitor security staff
1	More security cameras.
1	Less discounted drinks
1	More and updated security cameras
5. What would you like Council to continue to do or do differently in relation to reducing alcohol related harm?	
7	Change local laws on public drinking (add your suggestion below)
5	Restrictions on new licensed premises based on existing/future outlet density
1	24/7 but not in parks etc
1	Reduce Bottle shop trading hrs to 7pm.
1	Ban drinking in public places from 8pm

Police Survey	
1. What are the main alcohol-related problems that police face in the CoPP?	
	Growing rates of alcohol related violence and crime
2. How do you contribute to reducing the alcohol related harms in our community?	
	Security and law enforcement
	Anti-drink driving campaigns
	Liquor Licensing Accord
3. Can you please tell us about some specific examples of recent improvements that you've made?	
❖	Safe Streets Squad – operates in Port Phillip Friday & Sat nights
❖	Extra operations in and around licensed venues – regular targeted operations
❖	Targeted drink driving campaigns - regular
❖	Other - increased structuring of Regional licensing unit
4. Are there any other measures that you are looking to implement in the next 2 years to help reduce alcohol-related harm?	
❖	Yes. Increased & enhanced joint initiatives with Council in regard to kerb side trading, events and planning
5. What would you like Council to continue to do or do differently in relation to reducing alcohol related harm?	
❖	Change local laws on public drinking - 24 hour ban open containers in street
❖	Restrictions on new licensed premises based on existing/future outlet density
❖	Enhanced amenity analysis in relation to outlet density e.g. particularly in relation to vulnerable members of community