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24 hour/extended drinking hours
Licensing Act 2003

• Flexible opening hours Potential for 24 hour licenses
• Responsibility shifted from magistrates' courts to local authorities
• A single scheme for licensing Previously 6 different types of licenses
• New powers included conditions on licences; the power to close premises; increase penalties for selling to underage drinkers; residents views taken into account in reviewing existing licences
• New presumption to refuse applications for new licences where they were likely to have a cumulative impact
## The potential impacts of the Licensing Act 2003 on violence and disorder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anticipated Benefits</th>
<th>Causes for Concern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staggered drinking hours</td>
<td>Additional hours would fuel crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More orderly &amp; dispersed departure from venues</td>
<td>Would lead to “24 hour violence”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would allow conditions to be imposed on premises</td>
<td>Would over burden the police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would give police more powers to close premises</td>
<td>Would stretch A&amp;E and ambulance resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research questions

– Have there been any changes in the number of crime & disorder incidents?
– Have the peaks of violence & disorder moved to later or earlier time periods?
– What patterns of crime, violence & disorder exist in and around licensed premises?
– How have these changed post implementation of the Act?
– Are there changes within premises, in the immediate surroundings, or in case study areas generally?
– Has there been any geographical displacement?
– How does this relate to extended trading hours?
– What else could account for any changes?
Methodology

• Five study areas: Birmingham, Blackpool, Croydon, Guildford, Nottingham

• Analysis of crime counts/rates, variation by hour of day, day of week, changes over time

• Geographical Information Systems (mapping crime, land use and pubs, tests for clustering, defining boundaries of clusters)

• Fieldwork (participant observation of bars and drinking areas, interviews with licensees, door staff)
Data Sets

Crime and Disorder

- Recorded Crime: Violence against the Person (VAP), criminal damage, sexual offences
- Police Calls for Service (‘Disorder’)
- Ambulance data
- Accident and emergency data (Hospitals)

Context and Land Use

- Ordnance Survey Address Point & Digital Boundaries
- Population Denominators
- Local land-use and socio-economic data

Alcohol Supply Points

- Licensed Premises Data (pubs, bars and nightclubs)
Licensed Premises Data (pubs, bars and nightclubs)

- **Location** (Address, Postcode, Easting; Northing) ✓
- **Venue type** (Bar, Pub, Night Club) ✓
- **Current Hours** ✓
- **Former Hours** ×
- **Capacity** ×
- **Extended hours Y/N** ×
- **Net change in hours** ×
- **Date of change** ×
- **Crime & Disorder Incidents Linked to Site** ✓
- **Other supply points (restaurants, off licenses, supermarkets)** ×
Scales of analysis

**Macro:**
Entire case study area
E.g. Blackpool Unitary Authority
Croydon Borough

**Meso:**
Hot spots:
Licensed premises clusters
Buffer zones around pubs

**Micro:**
Individual Premises
Resource targeting tables (RTTs)
Top 15 premises for VAP
Evaluation Difficulties

How to account for ‘counter-factual’

- “What happened if Act not introduced”
- Usually identify control group/area and target group/areas
- Examine change before and after (but change occurred everywhere)
- Case study areas: mix of those applied and not applied for additional hours

Need information on former hours, hours applied for, and hours used

Individual premises

- How attribute violence and disorder to alcoholic beverage served in a particular establishment?
Results
Violence Against the Person

Month

Rate per 10,000 persons

Nottingham
Blackpool
Croydon
Guildford
Birmingham adjusted

Average baseline rate
Post Implementation rate
Licensing Act
### Violence Against the Person

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1A2A</th>
<th>1B2B</th>
<th>2A3A</th>
<th>2B3B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>Yr1 Nov03 – May04</td>
<td>Yr1 May04 – Nov04</td>
<td>Yr2 Nov04 – May05</td>
<td>Yr2 May05 – Nov05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackpool</td>
<td>Yr2 Nov04 – May05</td>
<td>Yr1 May04 – Nov05</td>
<td>Yr3 Nov05 – May06</td>
<td>Yr3 May06 – Nov06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Criminal Damage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1A2A</th>
<th>1B2B</th>
<th>2A3A</th>
<th>2B3B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>Yr1 Nov03 – May04</td>
<td>Yr1 May04 – Nov04</td>
<td>Yr2 Nov04 – May05</td>
<td>Yr2 May05 – Nov05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackpool</td>
<td>Yr2 Nov04 – May05</td>
<td>Yr1 May04 – Nov05</td>
<td>Yr3 Nov05 – May06</td>
<td>Yr3 May06 – Nov06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Disorder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1A2A</th>
<th>1B2B</th>
<th>2A3A</th>
<th>2B3B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>Yr1 Nov03 – May04</td>
<td>Yr1 May04 – Nov04</td>
<td>Yr2 Nov04 – May05</td>
<td>Yr2 May05 – Nov05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackpool</td>
<td>Yr2 Nov04 – May05</td>
<td>Yr1 May04 – Nov05</td>
<td>Yr3 Nov05 – May06</td>
<td>Yr3 May06 – Nov06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Key

- Very Significant Increase 1% level $p<0.01$
- Significant Increase 5% level $p<0.05$
- No Significant Change
- Significant Decrease 5% level $p<0.05$
- Very Significant Decrease 1% level $p<0.01$
Figure 1.1 Location of pubs, bars and nightclubs in Birmingham City Centre (police force area F1)

Number of pubs and bars = 179
Number of clubs = 15
Figure 2.13  Violence against the person hot spots (NNHC) in Birmingham City Centre (police force area F1) (average baseline and post implementation periods)

Licensed premises:
NNI = 0.56, p<0.01
Test statistic (Z) = -11.60

Baseline violence against the person
NNI = 0.21, p<0.01
Test statistic (Z) = -104.35

Post implementation violence against the person
NNI = 0.19, p<0.01
Test statistic (Z) = -96.25
Figure 2.15 Comparison of top 15 ranked establishments for violence against the person in the baseline and post implementation periods in Birmingham City Centre (police force area F1)
Chart 1: Proportional changes to violence against the person offences by time of day in Birmingham City Centre (average baseline and post implementation periods)
Chart 5: Proportional changes to violence against the person offences by time of day in Nottingham (average baseline and post implementation periods)
Chart 4: Proportional changes to violence against the person offences by time of day in Guildford (average baseline and post implementation periods)
Chart 2: Proportional changes to violence against the person offences by time of day in Blackpool (average baseline and post implementation periods)
### Birmingham VAP (proportional analysis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of day</th>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>0-50m</th>
<th>Case study area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prop Change</td>
<td>Volume change</td>
<td>Prop Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100-2159</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200-2259</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300-2359</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0000-0059</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0100-0159</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0200-0259</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
<td>-53</td>
<td>-4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0300-0359</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0400-0459</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venue</td>
<td>Number of offences</td>
<td>Cumulative number of offences</td>
<td>Cumulative number of premises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Works Nightclub Fiveways Leisure</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkabout Inn</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflex Bar (Formerly Edwards)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar Risa Quayside Tower</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nightingale Nightclub Essex House</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Cafe Birmingham Limited</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rococo Lounge Quayside Tower</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham Academy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brannigans Bar</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barracuda Bar</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D V 8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidden Night Club</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Public House</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snobs Nightclub Trafalgar House</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subway City Nightclub</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>549</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RTT Summary: December 2004 to August 2005
Cumulative percentage offences for violence against person

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of</th>
<th>Birmingham</th>
<th>Blackpool</th>
<th>Croydon</th>
<th>Guildford</th>
<th>Nottingham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>70.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>73.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Note post implementation figures very similar (+/- 5%)
Figure 2.16 Estimated weekly additional hours applied for by premises in Birmingham City Centre (police force area F1) in the post implementation period.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional hours (granted)</th>
<th>Percentage of premises</th>
<th>Percentage of violence against the person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 8</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 plus</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional hours (used)</th>
<th>Percentage of premises</th>
<th>Percentage of violence against the person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 plus</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key headlines (Impact of Act)

• Little or no effect on opening hours of most pubs and clubs
• Only small impact on violence and disorder
• Overall, violent crime fell by 3%
  – increases 3 sites – (statistically significant in only one)
  – offset by falls in the other two sites
• Some evidence of temporal displacement:
  – Reductions in violent crime between 11pm and midnight in 4 out of 5 sites
  – Increase in the small proportion of violent crimes occurring between 3am and 5am

Neither the reduction in violence and disorder hoped for by some not the significant increase in crime feared by others materialised
Findings Nationally

• 24 hour drinking far from widespread
• Only 1.5 per cent of the 200,000 premises applied for 24 hour licences
• By November 2007 only 470 pubs out of 200,000 in the country had 24 hour licences
• Pubs on average had a 20 minute increase in the availability of alcohol
• Only 50 per cent of the extra hours applied for were used
• Most of the extra hours used were at weekends only 50 per cent of the extra hours applied for were used
• Extended hours not economically viable in most cases
Limitations and Caveats

- Difficulties in generating consistent information on licensed premises
- Unable to capture information on capacity and former opening hours (baseline period)
- Differences may exist between hours granted and hours used
  - cannot assess degree of implementation
  - If little change, then would expect little impact on crime
  - no true comparison groups, therefore cannot rule out:
    - ‘history’ threats (some other policy caused changes)
- Acknowledged need to incorporate additional land use data
Key Lessons for Research

• There is need to develop a consistent system for capturing information on alcohol supply points (trading hours, capacity)
  – Pubs/bars/clubs and hotels, supermarkets etc
• Should monitor more closely premises with repeatedly high numbers of incidents
• Can use qualitative information to fill some of gaps – (Triangulate Findings)
• Policy intervention data often recorded poorly (dosage, cost, input etc)
Professor Alex Hirschfield
a.hirschfield@hud.ac.uk
+44 (0)1484 47 3676

Evaluation Reports:

http://www2.hud.ac.uk/hhs/acc/research/abstracts/0509pub.php