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Key Features of LA03

- Flexible opening hours
  - potential 24 hours
  - represented first major change for 50 years
- Responsibility shifted
  - magistrates' courts to local authorities
  - each licensing authority maintain records of each issue
- A single scheme for licensing
  - previously 6 different types of licenses
- Series of new powers/conditions
  - the power to close premises; increase penalty selling to underage; residents views taken into account in reviewing existing licences
- New presumption
  - refuse applications - new licences if likely have cumulative impact
Licensing Act 2003: The Rationale

- Staggered closing hours
- Slower, more orderly dispersal of drinkers
- Less competition for resources
- Less violence and disorder.
- Shallower peaks of disorder at closing time
- Less visible signs of drunkenness.
- Less binge drinking before closing time.
- Less nuisance and noise at closing time
The fears

- Would lead to increases in crime
- Would lead to “24 hour violence”
- Would over burden the police
- Would stretch A&E and ambulance resources
- Would not reduce binge drinking
Introduced on 24th November 2005

- Flashback to news: Key headlines
- 24-hour drinking 'will fuel crime'
  - Daily Telegraph, 20th March 2004
- Licence law reforms could be 'hell'
  - BBC Panorama, 6th June 2004
- 24-hour violence thanks to new drink laws
  - Daily Mail, 12th September 2005
- One violent drink crime committed every 13 seconds
  - Daily Mail 19th November 2005
Accompanying images
National Evaluation Programme

Main national studies (DCMS and Home Office)

- 30 force survey
- British Crime Survey
- A&E Survey
- Injuries caused by drunk drivers
- Opening Hours Survey

Local Case Studies (5 areas): Home Office

- Analysis of crime statistics, A+E and ambulance data, (+ participant observation and interviews with licensees and door staff)
- Residential Surveys
- Interviews with licensees and NTE businesses
- Interviews with Licensing Authorities and Responsible Authorities
ACC Research: Constraints

• Conditions imposed by commissioning body
• Prescribed 5 case study areas
  – Blackpool, Birmingham, Croydon, Guildford and Nottingham
• Focus – urban areas, change near licensed premises
• Baseline and post implementation period
  – 2 years prior
  – 12 months post LA03
• Specific crime and incidents
  – violence against the person, criminal damage, sexual offences and disorder
The ACC Research Study: Questions

- Were there any changes in number of offences/incidents?
- Have the peaks of violence & disorder changed?
- What patterns of crime & disorder exist in and around licensed premises?
- How have these changed post implementation?
- 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?
Evaluation: Methodological Challenges

- Subjective assessment
  - ‘alcohol related’
  - no consistent alcohol flag across police forces
- Mix of premises in area
  - extended/non extended hours
  - those with extended hours (different lengths)
  - difference – hours granted and hours used?
- How attribute incidents to individual premises
- No control (account for counterfactual)
  - blanket policy change across England and Wales
Data Sources

• Crime and Disorder
  – police recorded crime and calls for disorder
  – ambulance data and hospital A+E data

• Contextual Information
  – address information and digital boundaries
  – population denominators
  – local land-use and socio-economic data

• Alcohol Supply Points
  – licensed premises data
## Data Sources

### Alcohol Supply Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Available?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location (Address, Postcode, Easting; Northing)</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venue type (Bar, Pub, Night Club)</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Hours</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Hours</td>
<td>(part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>(part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime &amp; Disorder Incidents Linked to Site</td>
<td>(part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended hours Y/N</td>
<td>(part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net change in hours</td>
<td>(part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of change</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other supply points (restaurants, off licenses, supermarkets)</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical scales</th>
<th>Quantitative</th>
<th>Qualitative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Macro</strong></td>
<td>Annual and monthly change, weekday and weekend, time of day, t tests, alcohol flag</td>
<td>Participant observation in key drinking areas Stakeholder interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire Case Study Area</td>
<td>Hot spots, proportional change by time of day, premise clusters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meso</strong></td>
<td>Resource target tables, (RTTs) Top 15 premises, Spatial distribution</td>
<td>Participant observation in key premises Stakeholder interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Near” Premises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Micro</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“In/at” Premises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
- **Macro**: Entire Case Study Area
- **Meso**: “Near” Premises
- **Micro**: “In/at” Premises
Findings: ACC Research
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## Violence Against the Person

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>Yr2 May05 - Nov05</td>
<td>Yr3 Nov05 - May05</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></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>Yr2 May05 - Nov05</td>
<td>Yr3 Nov05 - May05</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></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>Yr2 May05 - Nov05</td>
<td>Yr3 Nov05 - May05</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>
Proportional Change
(Birmingham VAP by time of day)
Near to premises analysis

Buffer Analysis

Premise Clusters
## 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>
</tbody>
</table>
Hot Spots: Visual
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Post Implementation Period

KDE Hotspots 9.00pm – 10.59pm

Low density

High density
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Post Implementation Period

KDE Hotspots 1.00am – 02.59am

Low density

High density

0 - 0.2
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2.5 - 20
Baseline Period

Post Implementation Period

KDE Hotspots

3.00am – 04.59am
How have hot spots changed over time?

Year 1

Year 2

1.00pm-2.59am
Red areas – increase
Blue areas - decrease

Synthesis Maps

9.00pm to 10.59pm
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Number of offences</th>
<th>Number of premises</th>
<th>Cumulative number of offences</th>
<th>Cumulative number of premises</th>
<th>Percentage of offences</th>
<th>Percentage of premises</th>
<th>Cumulative percentage of offences</th>
<th>Cumulative percentage of premises</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Works Nightclub Fiveways Leisure</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkabout Inn</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflex Bar (Formerly Edwards)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar Risa Quayside Tower</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nightingale Nightclub Essex House</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Cafe Birmingham Limited</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rococo Lounge Quayside Tower</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham Academy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brannigans Bar</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barracuda Bar</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D V 8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidden Night Club</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Public House</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snobs Nightclub Trafalgar House</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subway City Nightclub</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>377</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td>549</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>81.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>549</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>549</td>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**RTT Summary: December 2004 to August 2005**

- Cumulative percentage offences for violence against person
- Baseline period (Dec 2004 to Aug 2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Birmingham</th>
<th>Blackpool</th>
<th>Croydon</th>
<th>Guildford</th>
<th>Nottingham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>66.4</td>
</tr>
<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%)*
### Hours used and hours granted

<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>
ACC Research: Key Findings

• Minimal impact on violence and disorder
• Overall, violent crime fell 3%
  – increases 3 sites – (statistically significant in one )
  – offset by falls in the other two sites
• Evidence of temporal displacement:
  – 4/5 five sites fall in violent crime between 11pm and midnight
  – the small proportion of violent crimes between 3am and 5am grew in the year after the change
• Qualitative fieldwork
  – Small change in opening hours of most pubs and clubs
Findings: National Context

• Alcohol linked crime: 1% fall overall
  – 1% rise in period from 6pm to 6am
  – Reflecting rise in vandalism & harassment
  – Police initiated action (eg PNDs)?
• Night-time violence down
  – But temporal displacement to small hours
  – 3am to 6am
• A&E survey 33 (departments)
  – 2% fall in 2006, 8% fall for women
  – Some large increases reported in other A&E departments
Findings: National Context

• Opening hours: 24 hour drinking?
• 20% didn’t change
• 50% applied for an extra hour
• 30% applied for two hours
• Only 1.5% applied for 24-hour licenses
• 87% of licensees didn’t fully exploit their new hours
Findings: National Context

- Neither the reduction in violence and disorder hoped for by some nor the significant increase in crime feared by others materialised
- Inconsistent with other countries
- Too soon to detect changes?
- Licensing changes were actually small?
- The theory was right?
- Extraneous factors?
Key Lessons for Research

• Need to develop a consistent system to capture information on alcohol supply points
  – hours, capacity, premise type etc
• Should monitor closely premises with repeatedly high numbers of incidents
  – But avoid black listing premises
• Can use qualitative information to fill some of gaps – Triangulate Findings
  – crime analysis used to direct/inform limited resources for qualitative fieldwork
  – examine change at different scales (no control areas)
Further Research Steps

• Number of additional factors to consider
  – Influence of capacity, (ir) responsible host, type of premise, mix of land use, transport routes home
• Hot spot analysis – merely visual
  – Other techniques eg Gi* look significant hot spots
  – Synthesis maps useful – change over time – again only visual
• How does location of different types of alcohol supply points, and their mix influence “use of land” and crime risk
  – Crime type, time of day, day of week etc
• Actual hours used important factor
• Can we develop profile of risk based on supply points
  – cluster analysis based on land use
  – ‘wining and dining’, ‘suburban partying’
Published Material

- [http://www2.hud.ac.uk/hhs/acc/research/abstracts/0509pub.php](http://www2.hud.ac.uk/hhs/acc/research/abstracts/0509pub.php)
  - DCMS findings
  - Home Office findings
  - ACC research findings
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