

## 5. REPORT FROM THE ALCOHOL POLICY SUBCOMMITTEE

<b>Officer responsible:</b> The Alcohol Policy Subcommittee	<b>Author:</b> The subcommittee
--	------------------------------------

During submissions on the Liquor Control Bylaw 2004, a submission was received with an accompanying petition requesting that the Council consider introducing a liquor ban in the Ilam area.

This matter was considered at a Regulatory and Consents Committee meeting held on 9 July 2004, and the Committee resolved:

*“That the Alcohol Policy Subcommittee continue to work through the issues of alcohol related disorder in Ilam with:*

- *The Police,*
- *The University,*
- *Local residents’ associations,*
- *Neighbourhood Support,*
- *The Riccarton/Wigram Community Board and community advocate,*
- *Local elected members,*
- *Holders of liquor licences in the Ilam area,*
- *The District Licensing Agency, and*
- *Other representatives the Subcommittee considers relevant*

*and report back to the Regulatory and Consents Committee with its recommendations.”*

The Subcommittee met on 13 July 2004 to discuss the consultation to be undertaken. The Subcommittee decided that it would be more constructive to meet with interested parties individually than collectively. It was requested that information on the venues operating in the Ilam area (including hours of operation) be made available to Subcommittee members.

An invitation to attend the University Neighbours Monitoring Group meeting scheduled for 15 July 2004 had been extended to the Subcommittee at the Regulatory and Consents Committee meeting on 9 July 2004. The Subcommittee decided to thank the Group for this invitation, but agreed not to accept the invitation, as it wished to undertake a set programme of individual consultation with interested parties to clearly establish what the nature of the problems in Ilam were, and whether a liquor ban would be likely to address these.

### CONSULTATION

#### Meeting with Police

The Subcommittee met with Senior Sergeant Peter Laloli and Senior Sergeant Colin Campbell on Thursday 15 July 2004.

The Police reported that they considered the incidents described in the submission to the Council requesting the introduction of a liquor ban in Ilam to be strictly Police matters. The Police indicated that they believed that, in some cases, incidents in Ilam may have been over reported or misreported.

The Police considered that there were some problems with disorder and vandalism occurring in Ilam, particularly in the Bush Inn car park which was an area where ‘hoons’ congregated. However, in general the problems in Ilam were not necessarily more severe than in other parts of the city. It was also noted that the nature of the crime was not serious, and Police resources needed to be focussed on responding to serious offending. Although the Police reported that they were open to discussions about committing more resources to the Ilam area on a short-term basis, they would need to be available to respond to serious problems.

The Police reported that they no longer offered diversion to University students and that they had previously visited University lectures to discuss their expectations and what enforcement action would be taken for any offending. The Police also reported that they had worked with various students associations in the past about event management and this had resulted in events being conducted more responsibly.

The Police indicated that they did not think introducing a liquor ban in Ilam would be effective as:

1. The Police do not have sufficient resources to police an area the size of the ban area proposed in the submission to the Council, and
2. Privately owned areas (such as the Bush Inn car park and University grounds) could not be covered by the ban, and
3. Drinking in public places, which is legal, was not necessarily the main problem in the area - problems were more closely associated with (possibly) intoxicated individuals walking between liquor outlets or licensed premises and their homes or from one house to another.

The Police indicated they considered, in general, the University bars operated responsibly and that there was sufficient security at 'The Bush Bar' at the Bush Inn. However, they reported that most disorder and damage reported in Ilam occurred on Wednesday night when 'The Bush Bar' ran cheap drink promotions. It was noted that there were a significant number of licensed venues in the Ilam area.

Supermarkets in the area were reported by the Police to have good systems in place to prevent the sale of liquor to underage individuals.

The Police noted that there may be a misconception that in February when students return from holidays, crime peaked, whereas they considered this was due to people returning from holiday and reporting burglaries at this time. An issue the Police considered would be likely to increase problems was the increase in the development of high density accommodation in the area.

#### **Meeting with University of Canterbury Student's Association**

The Subcommittee met with Pete Martin (President), Phil Ryan (Chief Executive) and Mike Halliday (Food and Beverage Manager) of the University of Canterbury Student's Association on 15 July 2004.

The Association reported that the bars operated on University grounds ('The Foundry' and 'Bentley's Bar') were owned by the Association and provided income for activities and the Association was keen to operate the bars responsibly so as not to jeopardise their future. Bentley's Bar was operated as a more sophisticated bar and only operated Wednesday to Friday nights. Both bars were open to members of the public. The Foundry has a limit of 200 patrons allowed inside the venue but there was no limit on the number of patrons who could be in the area outside the bar, and the association had erected a fence to control the number of people in the outside area of the venue.

The Association reported that it was licensed to operate until 1am, seven days per week, but that it didn't usually operate on Saturday nights, and closed earlier than this on Monday and Tuesday nights. Wednesday to Friday nights were the busiest times for the bar.

The Association reported that most of the staff who worked in the bar were students. The Association provided quite a large security staff and up to 12 security staff would operate at night. The Association reported that the Police had not had significant problems with the operation of the bars in the past. It was reported that there were problems associated with students drinking in Halls of Residence, and that the lowering of the legal drinking age had also exacerbated problems with student drinking. The Association had recently raised the price of drinks, and charged a door fee for events with bands.

The Association reported that during Orientation, security staff would patrol the University and residential area with loud speakers, and reported they had found this to be an effective measure in preventing problems. The Association reported that it had recently audited its sales records to check if after hours sales had been made and found virtually no sales had been made after 1am.

The Association indicated that it could provide the Subcommittee with information (since received) on its host responsibility policy, security measures and other information which confirmed their general practices etiquette.

#### **Meeting with Representatives of the University of Canterbury**

The Subcommittee met with Alan Hayward (Registrar), Hamish Cochrane (Proctor) and Russell Park (Facilities Management) on 23 July 2004.

The University reported that a meeting had been held in early 2004 to discuss problems of disorder in the area with local residents. As a result of this meeting a Neighbourhood Monitoring Group had been set up to monitor the problem. The Group included representatives from the community, Halls of Residence, Community Watch, the University, the University of Canterbury Student's Association, ALAC and the Police.

The University reported that it considered that in the future the Neighbourhood Monitoring Group may evolve to become a working party which considered options to address the problems associated with disorder in Ilam.

The University reported that they considered that the majority of problems with disorder in Ilam were Police matters. It was noted that some of the disorder and vandalism in the area could be identified as being problems that were not associated with either students or venues with on licenses in the area.

The University indicated that, where students who had been responsible for vandalism or other disorder problems could be identified, disciplinary action would be taken by the University and the Police alerted if this was appropriate. However, in most cases the perpetrators of offences could not be identified. Thirteen students to date this year had come to the attention of the Proctor for disciplinary action. The Proctor reported that the introduction of a liquor ban would not assist him in his disciplinary role at the University, as none of the students he had disciplined had been under the influence of alcohol at the time.

The University reported that 12,500 students attended the University, of which around 1,500 lived in Halls of Residence nearby. It was estimated that only around 30% of students lived in the residential area around the University, as do academic and University support staff.

Various ideas to address the problems in Ilam were discussed at the meeting, including educating students about socially responsible behaviour and the consequences of their actions, the development of a joint working party with representatives of the University, local residents and community board, to address problems in Ilam, working with licensed venues in the area to address problems associated with drinking and disorder, and increased security patrols on University premises.

#### **Meeting with Riccarton/Wigram Community Board**

A joint meeting of the Subcommittee with the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board was held on 23 July 2004. Waimairi ward Councillors were also invited to attend this meeting.

Chairman Mike Mora reported that the main issue the Board was concerned about in Ilam was broken bottles and glass. Mr Mora considered that this may be able to be addressed by licensed venues in the area.

Peter Laloli spoke on the issues in Ilam and noted that he also represented the Police view on this. Mr Laloli reported that one of the worst areas for crime was Hornby, and that he considered there may be some over reporting of crime in Ilam. The incidents of disorder that occurred in Ilam were reported to be due to people drinking elsewhere, rather than on the streets, and so could not be addressed by a liquor ban. Mr Laloli reported that he considered that the problems in Ilam had been blown out of proportion and had created a perception that the area was unsafe.

Bob Shearing considered that there were real problems associated with behaviour in Ilam, and that these problems had existed in the area for some time. Mr Shearing also considered that licensed venues in the area may be able to address some of these issues and thought that it would be productive for the Subcommittee to talk with these venues.

Neville Bennett spoke on the issues in Ilam and noted that he also worked at the University. Mr Bennett reported that he considered that there were problems associated with drinking and disorder in Ilam, but that these weren't necessarily serious enough to warrant the introduction of a liquor ban. Mr Bennett also noted that the University provided jobs and brought wealth into the City and that, in his view, the introduction of a liquor ban could damage the attractiveness of Christchurch to students. Mr Bennett expressed doubts as to whether it would be appropriate for a liquor ban to be introduced and whether a ban could be enforced.

Martin Maguire (Community Advocate) also reported that during six years in his role he had never had a complaint about the behaviour of students in Ilam, and he considered that the issue may have been blown out of proportion.

There was some discussion amongst Board and Subcommittee members about other matters such as litter, street cleaning and rubbish collection days which could help address the problems in Ilam or minimise damage. It was suggested to the Community Board these matters be further investigated by staff and a report prepared to the Board on this.

It was noted that vandalism was not unique to Ilam but also occurred on an ongoing basis in other parts of the City.

### **Meeting with Neighbourhood Support**

The Subcommittee met with Pat Creasey, the Coordinator of Neighbourhood Support Canterbury, as part of a series of meetings held on 28 July 2004.

Mr Creasey reported that he thought that vandalism and disorder problems existed in Ilam and that neighbourhood support groups could help address these problems. It was noted that previously, neighbourhood support groups had not operated in the University area, but that four groups were currently in the process of being set up around the University vicinity.

Mr Creasey considered that a liquor ban would not resolve the problems in Ilam, but that education of students and liquor retailers about responsible practices could assist.

### **Meeting with Riccarton Community Watch**

The Subcommittee met with Joan Pearson of Riccarton Community Watch on 28 July 2004. The Watch covered a large area from Riccarton to Avonhead and also incorporated the University area. The Watch operated a vehicle which patrolled this area and reported suspicious activities to the Police. Patrols were operated during the day and at night from around 8pm to midnight during the week or until 2am on Saturday and Sunday mornings.

Mrs Pearson reported that she had seen mass exits of students when 'The Foundry' bar closed early in the morning and had observed young people behaving in a disorderly manner on their way home after this. On some occasions students had been observed drinking on the streets as they walked between flats or home from a licensed venue. Mrs Pearson reported that she supported the introduction of a liquor ban in Ilam as this could help address this problem.

### **Meeting with Ilam Neighbourhood Watch**

The Subcommittee met with Geraldine McMullan of Ilam Neighbourhood Watch on the 28 July 2004. Prior to this meeting, Councillor Withers had advised the Subcommittee that he was related to Ms McMullan and the Subcommittee had indicated that it was comfortable with his being part of the discussion.

Ms McMullan reported that she had lived in the Ilam area for the past 25 years and that, in her opinion, the problems with disorder in the area had worsened in recent years so that there was now an element of violence present. Broken glass was also reported to be chronic problem around the University area. Wednesday night was reported to be the worst night for vandalism in the area.

Ms McMullan reported that she considered that the problems in Ilam were of a complex nature and would be difficult to address, but identified a number of actions that could help address the problems. She considered that a strict stance from the University on what kind of behaviour was acceptable from students would help address these problems. Ms McMullan also expressed some concern about the operating hours of some venues in the area.

Ms McMullan reported that she considered that a liquor ban would help address the problem of drinking on streets and broken glass, although it was noted that a ban could not cover privately owned area such as car parks and University grounds which were identified as major sites for drinking and littering of bottles.

### **Meeting with Ilam/Upper Riccarton Residents' Association**

The Subcommittee met with Judy Sinclair, the President of the Ilam/Upper Riccarton Residents' Association on 28 July 2004. Ms Sinclair reported that she had met with a committee of the Residents' Association to discuss their views on disorder issues in Ilam.

In summary, the association were sympathetic to the problems Ilam residents had experienced with disorder and vandalism but believed that the problems in the area were caused by a minority. The association considered that the problems in Ilam resulted from behavioural issues and that the introduction of a liquor ban would be unlikely to address these issues, and may in fact escalate the problems in the area by presenting people with a challenge in avoiding detection. The association also noted that it would be difficult to enforce a ban, and that a solution which focused on education and cooperation would be more likely to be successful.

The association put forward ideas for addressing the problems in Ilam which included students and residents working with neighbourhood watch associations and establishing street clean ups. It was noted that, while some residents had experienced problems with vandalism and other disorder, other residents had not noticed these problems.

### **Meeting with Juliana Venning**

The Subcommittee met with Juliana Venning on 28 July 2004. Ms Venning had made a submission requesting that the Council consider introducing a liquor ban in Ilam during the consultation period on the Christchurch City Liquor Control Bylaw.

Ms Venning reported that, although initial meetings between local residents and the University had been set up to discuss the problems in Ilam, issues of vandalism and disorder had not been effectively addressed. Ms Venning suggested further action that could be taken by the University, and Students Association, such as banning the advertisement of alcohol in CANTA which she considered could help address this issue.

Ms Venning reported that she considered that disorder problems in Ilam were at least partly caused by drinking in the streets, and that the introduction of a liquor ban in the area could help address these issues. It was reported that there were also problems with students drinking in cars outside 'The Foundry' bar due to the limit on the number of patrons allowed inside and causing problems either there or in the surrounding areas.

Ms Venning considered that more concentrated Police enforcement in Ilam could help address problems of disorder and vandalism.

### **Further Consultation Considered**

A copy of all submissions received by the Regulatory and Consents Committee during consultation on the Christchurch City Liquor Control Bylaw were also tabled at the Subcommittee meeting on 28 July 2004 and considered by the Subcommittee.

The Subcommittee considered whether further meetings should be arranged with the newly formed neighbourhood support organisations in Ilam but considered that as these had been very recently established they may not yet have operational experience to share with the Subcommittee. The Subcommittee had consulted with a number of community safety organisations in the area already and considered that further consultation with similar kinds of groups would result in similar feedback.

### **Meeting with Ben France-Hudson**

The Subcommittee met with Ben France-Hudson, a student at the University of Canterbury and resident of Ilam, on 3 August 2004. The Subcommittee considered that Mr France-Hudson could provide a valuable perspective on the reported disorder problems in Ilam as he was a permanent resident of the area and a mature student who had been studying for several years, both at Canterbury and overseas. Mr France-Hudson reported that he considered that 'The Foundry' bar and 'Bentley's Bar' at the University were operated in a responsible, professional manner in terms of their security and management.

Mr France-Hudson had noticed problems with broken glass around his area but he did not consider that this came from the University bars. Mr France-Hudson had not experienced problems with late night noise but indicated that a relative living in the area had experienced this problem.

Mr France-Hudson reported that he had not experienced problems associated with student behaviour in the area, except during the Orientation period. He considered that if the University bars stopped serving alcohol this would not address any disorder problems in Ilam as consumption in private residences would increase. Mr France-Hudson considered that it may be better for students to drink at the University bars which provided a controlled environment than in private residences.

In Mr France-Hudson's opinion disorder problems in Ilam had not increased over the past few years, however, he did consider that these kind of problems would increase as the density of accommodation in the area increased.

### **Meeting with Sale of Liquor Inspectors**

The Subcommittee met with Klaus Prusas (Environmental Effects Team Leader), Martin Ferguson (Sale of Liquor Inspector) and Paul Spang (Sale of Liquor Inspector) on 3 August 2004.

Sale of Liquor Inspectors reported that they had not had any complaints about the operation of 'The Foundry' and 'Bentley's Bar' at the University. The bars were licensed to open until 1am, but did not necessarily operate this late every night. The bars occasionally applied for Special Event licenses and had previously been granted these based on their operational history. No applications for special licenses had been received from the bars within the past six months. It was reported that District Licensing Agency staff visited both University bars frequently. Both bars had had their license applications publicly advertised as part of a license renewal in 2003 and no objections had been received in response to this.

Sale of Liquor Inspectors reported that they had some concerns about the operation of cheap drink promotions at 'The Bush Bar' on Wednesday nights, however, this type of promotion was reasonably common. It was noted that the drinks provided at these nights were relatively low strength. While Inspectors were aware of problems with intoxication and drinking in the Bush Inn car park (often inside cars), there was not evidence of intoxication inside 'The Bush Bar.' There would need to be a significant amount of evidence of intoxication and other poor management practices inside the venue for a change to the conditions of license to be considered. Inspectors believed that 'The Bush Bar's' license until 2am was related to its zoning and resource consent.

It was also noted that people often purchased alcohol at off-licenses and drank this before they went out to clubs and pubs at night. Sale of Liquor Inspectors reported that young people preferred to drink RTDs.

Sale of Liquor Inspectors undertook two night visits to 'The Foundry' and the 'Bush Bar' following the meeting with the Alcohol Policy Subcommittee. Inspectors reported that on both occasions no minors or intoxicated individuals were located in either 'The Foundry' or the 'Bush Bar.'

### **Meeting with District Licensing Agency**

The Subcommittee met with the Chair of the District Licensing Agency (DLA) on 3 August 2004. The Chair reported that the DLA only came into contact with licensed venues where a license application was contested and most other functions associated with DLA functions were performed by staff. The DLA did not routinely receive reports on the exercise of delegated authority by officers.

There was discussion regarding the role of the Police, community organisations, individuals and the Council in relation to the reported disorder problems in Ilam.

### **Site Visits to Licensed Venues**

The Subcommittee visited a number of licensed venues around the Ilam area on 10 August 2004. The venues and individuals visited were:

- Ilam Liquor Centre (Lindsay McIntyre, Owner)
- Bush Inn Liquor King (Tony Kalksma-Smith, Manager)
- Bush Inn Hotel/Bush Bar (Gary Keast, Director and Julian Eagle, Manager)
- Woolworths Bush Inn (Chris Watkins, Manager)
- Countdown Church Corner (Richard Lough, Manager)
- Riccarton Club (Chris Hay, Manager)
- Pak n' Save Riccarton (Ken Adams, Store Manager, Brent Little, Liquor Manager and Steven McDonald, Owner)

In addition to this, the Subcommittee met with Mr Brian Williams, the Manager of the Bush Inn Centre, and Constable Alastair Lawn of the Christchurch Police, who is involved in monitoring the operation of licensed venues.

In general the Subcommittee considered that most venues visited appeared to be operating responsibly, however, there may be some areas where the operation of venues could be improved. Signage was displayed at all venues warning that underage liquor sales could not be made and all venues reported that they had either formal or informal training systems in place for staff on sales to underage or intoxicated individuals. Nearly all venues reported that they had a policy of asking for identification when people purchasing alcohol appeared to be under 25.

The Subcommittee was particularly impressed with the systems in place in the supermarkets visited to prevent the sale of liquor to underage patrons, through computer warning systems which remind staff to request identification when liquor sales are made to people appearing under 25. The supermarkets and some other venues also displayed signage informing patrons that liquor could not be sold to intoxicated individuals.

Most venues did not report significant problems with vandalism or other trouble from customers or young people generally. However, problems were reported with loitering, drinking and vandalism in the Bush Inn car parks from a number of sources. People drank in cars or waited in long queues to enter the 'Bush Bar.' Wednesday nights were the busiest times for the 'Bush Bar', with queues stretching across the car park and up to 100 people in the car park area. The Bush Bar reported that they employed security staff to patrol inside and outside the venue (including the car park area) and also had skips outside the exit to the bar where people were required to dispose of bottles before leaving the venue. Some individuals the Subcommittee spoke to reported that the problems in the Bush Inn car park had decreased over the past year, however, Bush Inn management reported that the costs of vandalism around the centre car park continued to be significant. It was noted during discussions that the management of the car park was complicated by the fact that various areas of the car park had been leased to other businesses.

Constable Lawn reported that he considered that there was room for improvement in the operation of some specific licensed venues in the Ilam area, and that this would require additional efforts to educate these operators and, thereafter, monitoring and enforcement. Constable Lawn reported that he considered that well trained security guards were essential to the responsible operation of venues with an on-license.

Constable Lawn reported that the Police had the resources to increase their monitoring of venues in Ilam almost immediately, in conjunction with the District Licensing Agency. Constable Lawn considered that increased education, monitoring and enforcement would be effective in addressing any problems associated with the operation of licensed venues in the Ilam area.

### **Meeting with Acting Director of Student Health Centre**

On 16 August 2004 the Subcommittee met with Dr Geoff Stevens, the Acting Director of the University of Canterbury Student Health Centre to discuss health issues around the consumption of alcohol by young people. Dr Stevens reported that the centre did come across some cases of drinking problems and that these were referred to counselling staff. Chronic alcoholics were mainly older students, while binge drinking was more likely to be a problem for younger students. Young people who were binge drinkers were unlikely to become alcoholics in later life.

The Student's Association organised events during Orientation, such as the Stein, which centred around drinking, and may not promote responsible behaviour. The Student Health Centre had been called to attend to students at the Stein in past years. There was some discussion about developing stronger links between the Student Health Centre, the University Student's Association and the bars on campus in order to promote responsible student behaviour. Another matter that was discussed was the level of Police presence at Orientation events. It was also noted that the University was, for most of the year, the area with the highest concentration of young people within Christchurch.

Dr Stevens reported that, in his opinion, a liquor ban in Ilam would not address disorder problems in the area, as a liquor ban could not prevent people consuming alcohol in their homes or in Halls of Residence. Dr Stevens noted that he considered that illegal activity rather than alcohol consumption was the cause of problems in Ilam and should therefore be addressed.

### **Meeting with Chair of Liquor Licensing Authority**

A meeting with Judge Bill Unwin, the Chair of the Liquor Licensing Authority was also held on Thursday 19 August 2004 to discuss the legislation and procedures the Authority operates by and other matters related to liquor bans.

Judge Unwin reported that most of the liquor bans he was aware of had been implemented in Central City areas and had reduced disorder problems. His impression was that liquor bans were effective in situations where there was a problem with people walking around a City drinking. Judge Unwin indicated that he was surprised that a liquor ban had been requested around the University as this would only address the carriage and consumption of alcohol in public places, and he considered it unlikely that this would be a major problem in this area. The Judge noted that liquor bans could be expensive to implement, and that he was not aware of liquor bans having been introduced in residential areas in New Zealand.

The Judge commented that signs of unsatisfactory performance by a venue included regular appearances in the 'Last Drink Survey', and repeated evidence of intoxicated patrons in the venue. When venues with these problems applied to have their licenses renewed, licensed conditions could be varied and a venue may even have its license suspended.

Judge Unwin considered that the liberalisation of trading hours had resulted in increased consumption of alcohol. The Judge believed that in recent years the sale of liquor to minors in Christchurch had decreased and the main problem in the City was the sale of liquor to intoxicated individuals in licensed venues. This problem was difficult to address as it was difficult to prove that intoxicated persons had been served.

In recent years, Judge Unwin reported that he had only had one case brought before him in Court where student drinking had caused problems.

### **Meeting with Community and Public Health**

A meeting with Barry McDonald (Health Promoter and Liquor Licensing Officer) and Michael Morris (Health Promoter) of Community and Public Health was held on 26 August 2004.

Mr McDonald reported that he had visited 'The Foundry' and 'The Bush Bar' with the Police on a number of occasions and there was no evidence of intoxicated patrons being at these venues. He noted that he had observed patrons being turned away from 'The Bush Bar' for being intoxicated and later loitering or drinking in the car park area.

Mr McDonald considered that drinking problems amongst young people were the result of constant marketing and promotion by liquor retailers which helped to create a culture of youth drinking. Mr McDonald indicated that existing research suggested that education about responsible drinking alone was unlikely to be effective in changing drinking habits.

Mr McDonald supported the introduction of a liquor ban as part of a range of strategies that could be used to address reported disorder problems in Ilam. He considered that a liquor ban alone would be unlikely to be effective in addressing these problems, which were of a complex nature and required multiple strategies to resolve these issues. Mr McDonald suggested that these strategies could include:

- Host responsibility measures by licensed venue,
- Decreasing the marketing of liquor to University students,
- Increased education of young people about responsible drinking,
- A strict stance on the enforcement of University codes by University management for misbehaviour,
- Greater Police presence in Ilam and at University events where alcohol was available.

Mr McDonald reported that Community and Public Health had been involved in the planning of Orientation events previously, and had promoted a responsible attitude to drinking through radio adverts and posters around the University of Canterbury campus and the Lincoln University campus.

### **Meeting with the Medical Officer of Health**

The Subcommittee met with Dr Mel Brieseman, Medical Officer of Health, on 26 August 2004.



Dr Brieseman also considered that reported disorder problems in Ilam would need to be addressed through a range of strategies. A liquor ban alone would not be effective in addressing problems in the area, although may be able to assist in conjunction with other actions.

However, Dr Brieseman considered that implementing a liquor ban in a particular part of Ilam could result in problems shifting to another nearby area. He considered that the carriage and consumption of alcohol in public was not an issue, but rather people drinking in private residences or licensed venues and then creating problems in the neighbourhood.

Dr Brieseman also noted that he considered that some cases of disturbance or vandalism were due to risk taking behaviour by young people, and were not necessarily linked to alcohol consumption. Young people were also influenced by societal values and it was not easy to change existing behaviour through education alone.

## **CONSIDERATION OF ISSUES**

Following meetings with the parties listed above, the Subcommittee considered the nature of the reported disorder problems in Ilam, and its recommendations.

The Subcommittee took into account the results of the latest 'Last Drink Survey.' The survey is conducted by the Police, who ask all individuals involved in alleged alcohol related offences to provide information about where they had their last drink. None of the participants in the survey reported that they had been served their last drink by venues in the Ilam area.

The Subcommittee was in agreement with the Police that it considered that the disorder and vandalism problems reported in Ilam were Police matters which the Council did not have the power to address. The Subcommittee considered that increased police enforcement in Ilam would be effective in addressing these issues.

It was noted that some vandalism problems had been reported in the Bush Inn car park. As this area was privately owned, a liquor ban could not be imposed in the car park, however, the Police could enter this area to deal with offending, and the owners of this area also had the power to remove trespassers or to monitor behaviour through security patrols. The Subcommittee considered that the reported problems in the car park could be dealt with through increased security and police presence in this area.

It was also noted through discussions that a liquor ban could not address drinking in privately owned areas and residences. Drinking in public places, which a liquor ban is designed to prevent, had not been reported as a major problem to the Subcommittee. Very few of the groups the Subcommittee spoke to considered that it would be appropriate to introduce a liquor ban in Ilam or that a ban would be effective in addressing vandalism and disorder in the area. Another key point was that the Police, who would be responsible for implementing a ban, did not support the introduction of a liquor ban in Ilam and reported they did not have the resources to enforce a ban the size of the area proposed in the submission to the Council. For the above reasons the Subcommittee does not support the introduction of a liquor ban in Ilam.

Through the site visits undertaken, the Subcommittee had observed the operation of a number of key licensed venues in the Ilam area. In general, the Subcommittee were satisfied that these venues were operating responsibly and that systems were in place to prevent the sale of alcohol to minors and intoxicated individuals.

The Subcommittee considered that the University Students Association had a key role to play in promoting good conduct amongst students and working with the community and other groups to ensure that Students Association events were undertaken responsibly, and the Subcommittee encourages the Association to continue working with Police, local residents and others so that events are carried out with minimal adverse impact on the community.

During discussions with various parties, several ideas had been suggested which could help address the reported disorder and vandalism problems in Ilam or minimise their impact. The ideas proposed included changing the day on which rubbish was collected in Ilam, promoting good relations between Ilam residents and students, introducing neighbourhood 'Clean Up' days, increased liaison between the Students Association and local residents and Police, and the promotion of socially responsible behaviour by the Students Association.

These proposals were not within the Subcommittee's jurisdiction, but the Subcommittee encourages stakeholders to investigate these ideas further.

It was noted that, as part of the review of the Liquor Control Bylaw 2004 to be undertaken within the next year, the introduction of the bylaw in the whole City and in parts of the City would be considered. If appropriate, the introduction of a liquor ban in Ilam could be further considered as part of this review.

At the Regulatory and Consents Committee meeting the following amendment was moved to recommendation 4:

*"That the Council write to the Police Commander asking that there be increased patrols in the Ilam area on problem nights. "*

(Note: The above amendment on being put to the meeting was declared **lost** on Division No 2 by four votes to three, the voting being as follows:

**For (3):** Councillors Broughton, Rutland and Sheriff

**Against (4):** Councillors Cox, Ganda, Wells and Withers.)

A further division was then called on a motion to adopt the original recommendation 4:

*"That the matters raised during the Alcohol Policy Subcommittee's investigation into reported alcohol related disorder issues in Ilam which are Police issues be brought to the attention of the Police for consideration and action where appropriate."*

The motion was declared **carried** on Division No 3 by seven votes to nil, the voting being as follows:

**For (7):** Councillors Broughton, Cox, Ganda, Rutland, Sheriff, Wells and Withers.

**Against (0):**

Recommendations 1-7 were then put to the meeting and declared **carried** on Division No 4 by six votes to one, the voting being as follows:

**For (6):** Councillors Cox, Ganda, Rutland, Sheriff, Wells and Withers.

**Against (1):** Councillor Broughton.

#### **Committee**

- Recommendation:**
1. That the Council not support a variation under clause 4.1 of the Liquor Control Bylaw 2004 to introduce a liquor ban in Ilam.
  2. That the University of Canterbury Students' Association be encouraged to liaise with relevant parties to promote the responsible conduct of students and events organised by the Students' Association where alcohol is available.
  3. That matters raised during the Alcohol Policy Subcommittee's investigation into reported alcohol related disorder issues in Ilam within the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board's jurisdiction be referred to the Board for its consideration and action where appropriate.
  4. That the matters raised during the Alcohol Policy Subcommittee's investigation into reported alcohol related disorder issues in Ilam which are Police issues be brought to the attention of the Police for consideration and action where appropriate.
  5. That University of Canterbury management, through the University Students Association and Student Health Centre, and the management of licensed venues owned by the Students Association be encouraged to work together to promote a responsible attitude towards the consumption of alcohol and promote health services available to students.

6. That Community and Public Health be encouraged to continue working with other relevant agencies, such as the University Student Health Centre, to continue to educate University of Canterbury students about the responsible consumption of alcohol.
7. That the Council promote residents' rights under liquor licensing legislation through the 'City Scene' magazine.
8. That thanks be extended to the Chair of the Alcohol Policy Subcommittee and the Committee Secretary.

(Note: Councillor Megan Evans took no part in the discussion or voting on this item.)