

Accessing Alcohol in Christchurch

Summary of community and stakeholder feedback on potential conditions that could be included in a draft Local Alcohol Policy for Christchurch.

March 2025

Introduction

In 2024, Christchurch City Council began to work towards development of a Local Alcohol Policy (LAP) for Christchurch and Banks Peninsula by gathering data and completing a research report. The [research report](#) identified that alcohol-related harm is occurring in some of our communities.

From this research, discussions with stakeholders, and community feedback, we identified five possible options for conditions and rules that a LAP could include. Community feedback was sought from 17 February until 9 March 2025 to help to test and refine those options and ask whether there were other non-LAP options that could be considered, before drafting a LAP to consult on.

The five options were:

- Reducing trading hours for off-licence outlets at night
- Reducing trading hours for on-licence venues in suburban areas at night
- Placing a temporary freeze on new licensed venues and outlets in high deprivation areas¹
- Restricting new licensed venues and outlets from being located near sensitive community facilities
- Introducing a one-way door restriction for on- licensed venues near closing time.

Feedback was also sought about other mechanisms Council could investigate to reduce alcohol harm that was outside the scope of an LAP.

About this report

This report outlines the results of early engagement on potential options for an LAP for Christchurch and Banks Peninsula. The report sets out the responses to quantitative questions and provides a thematic analysis of the written feedback provided.

The purpose of the thematic (qualitative) component of this report is not to provide analysis on everything that respondents commented on, but rather to provide a summary of the key themes and issues raised by respondents.

The thematic analysis is based on the opinions of respondents, irrespective of whether they are factually correct.

¹ Defined as locations that have a decile score of 9 or 10 on the 2023 version of the New Zealand Deprivation Index.

Key Messages

Respondents provided a range of feedback on the options tested, reflecting diverse perspectives. Overall, there was strong support for freezing new licences in high deprivation areas and for restricting new licences near sensitive community facilities. There was also some support for reducing trading hours and a one-way door policy, but less support for reducing hours for on-licences in suburban areas. A more detailed summary of the response to each option can be found in the [summary of what we heard](#).

More generally, respondents who supported the various options generally expressed concerns about alcohol-related harm, and the associated environmental and social issues. They tended to favour new rules that would encourage responsible drinking and promote consumption in supervised on-licence venues. For many respondents, on-licence venues, like bars and restaurants, were seen as lower risk because they offer controlled environments with trained staff and additional services like food and entertainment.

There was a strong emphasis on the risks associated with licensed premises being close to places frequented by vulnerable groups, including children, young people, and individuals being treated for addiction. The concern is that this proximity may increase exposure to alcohol, potentially normalising alcohol consumption for impressionable young people or hindering the recovery of those in treatment. Respondents highlighted the susceptibility of vulnerable groups to be influenced by their surroundings, expressing concerns that exposure to alcohol consumption and advertising could normalise drinking behaviours, undermining safe environments.

On the other hand, in many instances respondents highlighted the importance of personal responsibility and freedom of choice, arguing that adults should be trusted to make their own decisions about alcohol purchases without overly restrictive Council policies dictating what they can and cannot do. There was a view that decisions about alcohol sales and purchases should be left to individuals. Some suggested that sensible adults should not be penalised for the actions of a minority who engage in harmful drinking behaviours. In general, these respondents felt that adults should have the autonomy to decide when and where they purchase and consume alcohol.

Respondents emphasised the need to balance reducing alcohol-related harm with economic considerations. Concerns were raised that many of the options being tested could negatively impact businesses, potentially leading to revenue loss, job cuts, and even permanent closures. Some respondents worried that local economies could suffer, with restrictions deterring new businesses from opening and discouraging investment in certain city areas. Others stressed the importance of applying restrictions consistently, as inconsistent policies could unfairly benefit some businesses over others, creating an uneven playing field. Generally, fairness and consistency were key themes for respondents discussing economic considerations.

Overall, the community and key stakeholders provided a range of feedback on the options tested, with some receiving more support than others. Generally, the feedback highlights the need to strike the right balance—reducing alcohol-related harm in our communities without causing unintended economic consequences or unduly limiting personal responsibility and freedom.

Table of Contents

Introduction	2
About this report.....	2
Key Messages	3
Table of Contents	4
The Approach	5
Engagement	5
Survey	5
Mana Whenua feedback.....	6
Community Board feedback.....	7
Statutory Consultee and licensed industry representative feedback.....	7
Analysis of feedback	8
Summary of what we heard.....	9
Who did we hear from?.....	12
Why do we collect demographic information?	15
1. Reducing Trading Hours	16
Reduce trading hours for off-licences.....	16
Reduce trading hours for on-licences in suburban areas	24
2. Temporary freeze on new off-licences in high deprivation areas.....	32
3. Restrict new bottle stores, taverns, and nightclubs locating near sensitive sites	38
4. Introduce one-way door restrictions.....	50
5. Other mechanisms	56
6. Other Feedback	63
Appendix One: Survey Questionnaire.....	68

The Approach

Engagement

Engagement started on Monday 17 February and ran until Sunday 9 March.

Engagement details, including links to the project information, were shared on the [Kōrero mai | Let's Talk webpage](#) and advertised via:

- Direct emails sent to approx. 2,500 stakeholders, including statutory consultees (Police, Te Whatu Ora, District Licensing Committee, CCC Alcohol Licensing Team), Te Mātāpuna Hauora, local Rūnanga, licence holders, industry representatives, health advocacy bodies, schools and early learning centres, religious centres, transport providers and residents and business associations.
- Direct emails sent to the Council's research panel (comprised of around 40,000 Christchurch residents who have signed up to give feedback on a range of topics and issues).
- Online and social media campaign on Facebook and Tik Tok.
- Mass marketing campaign including billboards, paper advertising and council venues electronic promotional screens.
- Flyers in all libraries and service centres, with stands in libraries in or adjacent to high deprivation areas.
- Surveyors on-street, at community events and locations where response rates were lower than others across the campaign period including University of Canterbury Orientation 'Clubs day' and 'Lunch on the Lawn' events, Children's Day, Bromley Community Fair, Sunday Riccarton Market, Bus Interchange, Central City, Matatiki Centre, Papanui Library and Te Pou Toetoe Linwood Pool.
- Five in person or online Community Board hosted workshops, which had 36 community representatives and Community Board members participate in total.

The [Kōrero mai | Let's Talk](#) page linked to the survey and had 16,726 views throughout the consultation period. The page was able to be viewed in several languages and also contained links to the research report, issues and options paper, a timeline, and an overview of the options being considered.

Survey

A total of 3,478 valid survey responses were received. This included 107 submitted on behalf of a recognised organisation and 154 who answered that they held a licence.

In addition to the survey responses received, Christchurch Youth Council also asked the same questions of young people in their annual survey, providing the results redacted as part of their feedback. An additional 92 young people (aged 13 – 22) provided feedback this way. Their individual feedback was not included in the overall results set out in this report as the data had been redacted and verification of individuals was not possible. However, the Christchurch Youth Council feedback was included which was formed using their survey results as the basis.

Survey questions

Changes to trading hours:

Respondents were asked whether they agreed that off-licences throughout the city and on-licences in suburban areas should reduce their trading hours, which type of venue a reduction should apply to, and the time that they should stop selling alcohol.

Temporary freeze on new licences in high deprivation areas:

For new licences in high deprivation areas, respondents were asked whether they agreed that there should be a temporary freeze, and which type of venue a freeze should apply to.

Proximity of new licensed venues to sensitive community facilities:

Respondents were asked whether they agreed that there should be restrictions around how close new licensed venues and outlets can be located to sensitive community facilities, which facilities should be considered sensitive and why, and the appropriate distance from such a facility.

One-way door restrictions:

Respondents were asked whether there should be a one-way door restriction across the city for on-licensed venues, the time that it should be in place, and reasons for this.

Other feedback and suggestions:

Respondents were also given the opportunity to provide feedback as to whether there were other measures that Council should consider developing instead of or in addition to a LAP to help reduce alcohol-related harm, and to provide any other feedback about the development of a LAP.

A copy of all survey questionnaire is available in **Appendix One**.

Mana Whenua feedback

Early in the project staff received direction from five Rūnanga to work with Te Mātāpuna Hauora to understand Rūnanga views in the development of a draft Local Alcohol Policy.

Te Mātāpuna Hauora is a committee of Rūnanga appointed representatives who provide advice on health and wellbeing related topics on behalf of five Rūnanga across Christchurch, Banks Peninsula and the Selwyn District. Represented within the group are Te Rūnanga o Ōnuku, Te Rūnanga o Wairewa, Te Rūnanga o Koukourarata, Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke (Rāpaki) and Te Rūnanga o Taumutu.

Staff met with Te Mātāpuna Hauora, discussing the development process and seeking guidance on how they would like to provide feedback. Conversations are ongoing to gather their feedback. Once completed it will be incorporated into the Policy development.

Staff contacted Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tūāhuriri, requesting information on how they would like to participate and also communicated via email to the Rūnanga office when the early engagement began. To date staff have not received formal feedback from Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tūāhuriri. Staff will

continue to provide opportunity for Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tūāhuriri to provide feedback in the next phase of policy development process.

Feedback was received from Ngā Hau e Whā National Marae (Te Rūnanga o Ngā Maata Waka) during this early engagement period. Their feedback has been incorporated under ‘Mana Whenua feedback’ for each option considered.

Community Board feedback

The following Community Boards hosted workshops and provided feedback via the survey;

- Waihoru Spreydon-Cashmere-Heathcote Community Board
- Waipuna Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board
- Waitai Coastal-Burwood-Linwood Community Board
- Waipapa Papanui-Innes-Central Community Board

Te Pātaka o Rākaihautū Banks Peninsula Community Board hosted a workshop online, however, did not submit any further feedback via the survey.

Statutory Consultee and licensed industry representative feedback

In the research phase of the policy development process staff met with 11 stakeholders, including both statutory consultees and licensed industry representatives.

Feedback from these representatives has been summarised in each section. The representatives within this group who provided feedback during this engagement period were;

- Te Whatu Ora
- New Zealand Police
- Christchurch City Council Alcohol Licensing Team
- Hospitality NZ
- Foodstuffs South Island
- Superliquor Holdings Ltd

We have also included feedback from the Restaurant Association of New Zealand in this analysis to help provide viewpoints from the restaurant industry.

In some instances, stakeholders chose not to provide comment at this stage and are awaiting the outcomes of the early engagement before providing any additional feedback.

While feedback was not received on the current options being tested by Liquorland Ltd (South Island representatives), several franchisees provided feedback individually. Their feedback has been incorporated into the general submitter feedback.

Analysis of feedback

Each section of this report is laid out to summarise both survey submitter feedback, and feedback from Mana Whenua representatives, Community Boards, Statutory Consultees and licensed industry representatives.

All other groups and organisations who participated had their feedback incorporated into the general submitter feedback analysis.

Summary of what we heard

What we asked the community		What the community told us		
Reducing Trading Hours	How much do you agree or disagree that Council should reduce trading hours for off licenced outlets across the city and Banks Peninsula?	Strongly agree	33%	33% of respondents strongly agreed and 20% agreed with reducing hours, while 14% disagreed and 22% strongly disagreed. Opinions varied by ward and license type, with a majority of non-license holders (53%) supporting reduced hours. Preferred closing times for different outlets ranged from 6pm to 11pm, with 9pm and 11pm being the most popular choices across various store types.
		Agree	20%	
		Neither agree nor disagree	11%	
		Disagree	14%	
		Strongly disagree	22%	
		Don't know	1%	
	If we did reduce hours in the evening, what time do you think off-licences should stop selling alcohol each day? Please select a time for each type of outlet.	The survey results showed that respondents had different preferences for closing times based on the type of store. Overall, 9pm and 11pm emerged as the most preferred closing times across various store types. <ul style="list-style-type: none">For bottle stores, the most popular closing times were 9pm (25%) and 11pm (27%).Supermarkets show a similar trend, with 9pm (25%) and 11pm (22%) being the preferred hours.9pm (24%) or 11pm (20%) was also favoured for small grocery stores.For Working Men's Clubs and wineries there was a strong preference for 11pm, with 35% and 32% respectively.Specialty stores saw 24% of respondents favouring 9pm and 25% favouring 11pm.		
		Why did you select those hours ?	2,092 respondents provided feedback on why they selected their preferred hours. The feedback on reducing trading hours for off-licences highlighted a strong belief from many respondents that limiting late-night alcohol sales would reduce alcohol-related harm, such as disturbances, anti-social behaviour, and impulse buying. They felt that shorter hours would promote more responsible drinking habits and protect vulnerable groups. However, there were concerns about the economic impact on businesses, the need for consistent policies across different types of off-licences, and the potential shift of binge drinking to earlier in the day. Others emphasised the importance of personal responsibility and freedom of choice, arguing that adults should be trusted to make their own decisions about alcohol purchases. They worried about the impact on people with non-traditional working hours, like shift workers. The feedback highlighted the need to balance the reduction of alcohol-related harm with economic considerations and personal freedoms.	
	How much do you agree or disagree that Council should reduce the latest closing time for on-licenced venues in suburban areas?		Strongly agree	29%
		Agree	21%	
Neither agree nor disagree		11%		
Disagree		12%	Disagreement was most pronounced among on-license holders (63%). Across different wards, agreement ranged from 40-60%, with respondents from most wards favouring earlier closing times. For specific venues, 11pm or earlier was seen as appropriate for most on-licensed venues except nightclubs, where the majority preferred a closing time of 2am or earlier, but 4am was the most popular option of the times tested.	
Strongly disagree		26%		
Don't know		1%		
If we did reduce the latest closing time for on-licenced venues in suburban areas, what time do you think they should stop selling alcohol? Please select a time for each type of venue.	The results show that respondents had different preferences for closing times based on the type of venue: <ul style="list-style-type: none">For nightclubs, the highest proportion of respondents (25%) considered 4am appropriate, but cumulatively, a majority favoured 2am or earlier.For pubs/taverns, 25% of respondents thought 11pm was appropriate, with 48% considering midnight or earlier suitable.In the case of restaurants, 35% of respondents preferred an 11pm closing time, with 59% favouring midnight or earlier. For cafes, 46% of respondents believed 11pm was appropriate, with 64% considering midnight or earlier suitable.			

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 36% of respondents preferred an 11pm closing time for sports clubs, with 58% favouring midnight or earlier. For working men's clubs, 34% of respondents thought 11pm is appropriate, with 57% considering midnight or earlier suitable. 		
Freezing New License Applications	How much do you agree or disagree that Council should include a temporary freeze on new licences in high deprivation areas?	Strongly agree	41%	The majority of respondents (61%) agreed that the Council should implement a temporary freeze on new licenses in high deprivation areas, while 25% disagreed.
		Agree	20%	
		Neither agree nor disagree	12%	Agreement was highest among those without a liquor license (62%), compared to off-license holders (40%), club-license holders (39%), and on-license holders (33%).
		Disagree	10%	
		Strongly disagree	15%	The freeze was most supported for bottle stores (68%), followed by small grocery stores (52%), specialty stores (47%), and supermarkets (40%). Other venues like nightclubs, pubs/taverns, restaurants, cafes, sports clubs, and working men's clubs received less support for the freeze.
		Don't know	2%	
	If we did include a temporary freeze on new licences in high deprivation areas, which of the following venues and outlets do you think a temporary freeze should apply to?	Bottle Stores	68%	Respondents provided mixed opinions on how a temporary freeze on alcohol licenses should be applied. Many felt that off-licenses, such as bottle stores, should be the primary focus due to their higher risk of contributing to alcohol-related harm. In contrast, on-license venues, like bars and restaurants, were seen as lower risk because they offer controlled environments with trained staff and additional services like food and entertainment. Supermarkets were viewed as a grey area, with some respondents noting their dual role in selling both alcohol and essential groceries.
		Supermarkets	40%	
		Small Grocery Stores	52%	
		Specialty Stores	47%	
		Nightclubs	40%	Concerns were raised about the potential negative impact of a freeze on local businesses and the growth of the area. Some respondents suggested that each license application should be reviewed on a case-by-case basis rather than imposing blanket rules. Fairness and consistency were also important themes, with some arguing against targeting specific areas based on deprivation indices, while others felt that standards should be uniformly applied across the city.
		Pubs/Taverns	38%	
		Restaurants	18%	
		Cafes	24%	
		Sports Clubs	31%	The effectiveness of a freeze was questioned by some, with worries that it might lead to unintended consequences such as increased travel to obtain alcohol or more drinking in uncontrolled environments. In some instances, respondents provided alternatives to a freeze, including capping the number of licenses, extending the freeze duration, and focusing on harm reduction methods like restricting trading hours and enforcing existing rules. Some respondents believed that decisions about alcohol sales should be left to individual choice rather than council control.
		Working Men's Clubs	30%	
		None of the above	18%	
		Don't know	6%	
Proximity to Sensitive Sites	How much do you agree or disagree that Council should consider including a restriction on how close new licenced venues and outlets can be located to community facilities considered sensitive ?	Strongly agree	41%	Results showed that 68% of respondents supported the idea of restricting the proximity of new licensed venues to sensitive community facilities. Those without a liquor license (69%) and club-license holders (50%) were more supportive compared to on-license (35%) and off-license holders (35%).
		Agree	27%	
		Neither agree nor disagree	12%	Sites most commonly identified as sensitive included addiction and rehab centres, early learning centres, and primary and secondary schools. Most respondents (83%) who supported restrictions suggested a 200-meter distance, while those against it preferring shorter distances. Results indicated that respondents thought that these restrictions should generally apply to most off-licences, with the exception of supermarkets.
		Disagree	8%	
		Strongly disagree	10%	
		Don't know	2%	
	If we did restrict new licensed venues and outlets being located near community facilities, which of the following do you think should be considered sensitive ? Select all that apply.	Early Learning Centres	66%	Written feedback highlighted key concerns about the proximity of licensed premises to sensitive sites like schools, childcare centres, and addiction services. The main issues were the normalisation of alcohol consumption, the vulnerability of children and individuals in recovery, and the need for greater distance restrictions.
		Primary Schools	69%	
		Secondary Schools	70%	
		Hospitals and Medical Centres	51%	Respondents worried that alcohol outlets near places frequented by young people could normalise drinking and increase exposure to negative behaviours. They also emphasised that
		Addiction and Rehab Centres	80%	

		Marae	46%	proximity to addiction services could hinder recovery efforts. Many advocated for stricter distance restrictions, suggesting more than the proposed 200 meters, to maintain safe environments and reduce exposure to alcohol. Other respondents argued that none of the listed facilities should be considered 'sensitive'. They believed distance restrictions would be ineffective, as people would still travel to buy alcohol. Instead, they suggested focusing on seller behaviour and responsible drinking education.
		Places of worship	39%	
		Other	5%	
		None of the above	11%	
		Don't know	3%	
	How far away should a licensed venue or outlet be located from a community facility that is deemed a sensitive site ?	50 metres	1%	Many emphasised individual choice, arguing that adults should decide for themselves about alcohol consumption and that business owners should choose where to trade. They also felt it was not the Council's role to impose such restrictions. For others, practicality was a concern, with respondents highlighting the difficulty of a blanket policy. They suggested a case-by-case approach, considering the type of site, license-holder, and community needs.
		100 metres	8%	
		150 metres	8%	
		200 metres	83%	

One-Way Door Restrictions	Do you think we should include a one-way door restriction across the city?	Yes	52%	1,691 respondents provided feedback on why they supported or opposed a one-way door restriction. Generally the feedback highlighted that respondents felt we need to take a balanced approach, considering safety and the reduction of alcohol-related harm and balancing it with the impacts that such a policy would have on the nighttime economy. Supporters argued that such a policy could reduce alcohol-related harm by keeping intoxicated individuals in supervised environments, thereby decreasing violence, accidents, and the burden on emergency services. They believed that consistent rules across all venues would simplify enforcement and reduce confusion.
		No	39%	
		Don't know	9%	
	If a one-way door restriction was introduced, what time do you think it should be in place?	1am	72%	Opponents, however, raised concerns about the restriction's effectiveness and potential negative impacts. They argued that it could harm the nighttime economy, limit personal freedom, and push intoxicated people into unsupervised public spaces, potentially increasing harm. Business owners worried about revenue loss and the viability of their establishments. Some suggested a more tailored approach, addressing specific issues at certain venues rather than imposing a blanket policy. Overall, the feedback highlighted the need for a balanced approach that considers both safety and the vibrancy of the nightlife economy.
		2am	23%	
		3am	4%	
		4am	1%	

Other Mechanisms	Are there any other mechanisms you think Council should consider developing instead of or in addition to a LAP to help reduce alcohol-related harm? (Optional)	Many respondents felt that existing laws and regulations were adequate, but would like to see more enforcement of these by authorities and harsher penalties for irresponsible operators and/or for individuals displaying harmful behaviour. Key contributors of alcohol-related harm identified included the licensing process (not deemed onerous enough), pricing and types of alcohol available for sale, widespread advertising, accessibility of outlets, lack of alcohol free zones, the drinking age, and insufficient funding to support communities. It was felt some of these could be addressed by lobbying central government for change, and some could be addressed through a mix of Council regulations, zoning and bylaws.	
		There were mixed views amongst those who would like to see restrictions on new licences. Some would like any freezes to be permanent rather than temporary, and some wanted this to apply city-wide rather than only in areas of high deprivation. Some thought a sinking-lid policy or capping numbers would be effective. This was generally in relation to off-licences. Although on-licences were widely thought to be safer and more controlled environments for drinking, some respondents would like to see improved host responsibility through better training of bar and security staff to identify and deal with intoxicated customers and screening of underage drinkers.	
		Respondents wanted to see us working together with communities to address alcohol harm, including addressing the causes of problem drinking and giving communities a greater voice regarding alcohol harm in their neighbourhoods. Some respondents didn't feel that it was Council's role to set rules and conditions about how alcohol is sold and supplied and thought that we should not be doing anything in this space, with some telling us that people will still find a way to access alcohol regardless of any new restrictions. Others were concerned about the economic impacts of introducing restrictions and how this could negatively affect the vibrancy and liveability of the city.	

Who did we hear from?

A total of 3529 responses were received to the survey. Of the 3,529, 49 were identified as duplicates and 2 were removed due to inappropriate/abusive content, leaving a total of 3,478 valid responses.

Responses	Count	%
Total Completed Responses	3,529	
Duplicates (Removed)	49	1%
Inappropriate/Abusive (Removed)	2	0.1%
Total Valid Responses	3,478	
Individuals*	3,371	97%
Organisations*	107	3%
Licence Holders*	154	4%

** Note that these are not mutually exclusive.*

Organisations	Number of Respondents*	% of Respondents
Hospitality Sector	30	1%
Off Licence Sector	27	1%
Community Groups	26	1%
Sports Clubs	9	0.3%
Addiction Support Providers	5	0.1%
Community Boards	4	0.1%
Wider Business Community	4	0.1%
Statutory Consultee	2	0.1%
Education Providers	2	0.1%

**Please note that this does not include all individuals involved in the hospitality or off-licence sector who responded. The number of licence holders is a more accurate representation.*

In some cases, respondents were included in more than one organisation type.

Number of Respondents by Age

Age	Number of Respondents	% of Respondents
Not Stated	17	0.5%
Under 18 years	16	0.5%
18 – 24 years	321	9%
25 – 34 years	518	15%
35 – 49 years	727	21%
50 – 64 years	844	24%
65 – 79 years	886	25%
80 years and over	149	4%

Number of Respondents by Gender

Gender	Number of Respondents	% of Respondents
Not Stated	33	0.9%
Male	1,904	55%
Female	1,509	43%
Non-binary / another gender	32	0.9%

Number of Respondents by Ethnicity

Ethnicity	Number of Respondents	% of Respondents
NZ European*	2,873	83%
Māori*	233	7%
Pacific Peoples*	55	2%
Asian*	138	4%
Middle Eastern, Latin American & African*	48	1%
Other European*	361	10%
Other*	248	7%

* Note that these are not mutually exclusive. Respondents are able to select all that apply.

Territorial Authority Breakdown

Territorial Authority	Number of Respondents	% of Respondents
Christchurch City	3,275	94%
Hurunui District	3	1%
Waimakariri District	69	2%

Selwyn District	88	3%
Auckland	5	0.1%
Wellington	3	0.1%
Kaikoura	3	0.1%
Dunedin	3	0.1%
Queenstown Lakes	5	0.1%
Other	5	0.1%

Community Board and Ward Breakdown

Community Board	Number of Respondents	% of Respondents
Te Pātaka o Rākaihautū Banks Peninsula	110	3%
Waitai Coastal-Burwood-Linwood	589	17%
Waipuna Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton	647	19%
Waimāero Fendalton-Waimairi-Harewood	557	16%
Waipapa Papanui-Innes-Central	641	18%
Waihoru Spreydon-Cashmere-Heathcote	711	20%

Ward	Number of Respondents	% of Respondents
Banks Peninsula	110	3%
Burwood	179	5%
Cashmere	321	9%
Central	272	8%
Coastal	226	7%
Fendalton	175	5%
Halswell	248	7%
Harewood	226	7%
Heathcote	221	6%
Hornby	117	3%
Innes	255	7%
Linwood	184	5%
Papanui	114	3%
Riccarton	282	8%
Spreydon	169	5%
Waimairi	156	5%

Why do we collect demographic information?

It is important that we understand both who we have and have not heard from when we consult on issues that affect everyone in the city. We include a standard set of demographic questions across our consultations and research that help us better understand this. These questions are optional; respondents do not have to answer them to provide their feedback.

Where possible, we align the questions we ask with the information that StatsNZ collects via the census. This ensures that we are capturing the information that is consistent with the national approach to reporting on demographics but also enables us to benchmark and understand whether we have heard from a representative group of respondents.

1. Reducing Trading Hours

Overall, respondents agreed that Council should implement a reduction in trading hours for off-licence venues across Christchurch and Banks Peninsula, as well as on-licence venues in suburban areas. However, reducing off-licence trading hours was supported at greater rates than reducing trading hours for on-licence venues. Respondents without an alcohol licence were more likely to agree that trading hours should be reduced compared to those who hold any type of liquor licence. Generally, most respondents considered 9pm or earlier as appropriate for supermarkets and specialty stores to stop selling alcohol, with preferences for liquor stores being slightly later at 10pm. For on-licensed suburban venues, the majority of respondents considered 12am or earlier appropriate for restaurants, cafes, sports clubs, and working men's clubs, 1am or earlier for taverns/bars, and 2am or earlier for nightclubs, though 4am was the most popular option of the times tested for nightclubs.

Reduce trading hours for off-licences

The majority of respondents (53%) agreed that Council should reduce trading hours for off-licences, versus 36% who disagreed. Broken down by licence type, those who hold an off-licence disagreed the most (60%), while those who hold an on-licence tended to support this proposal more than off-licence holders. When broken down by ward, respondents from most wards agreed that off-licence hours should be reduced. The Burwood, Central, Fendalton, and Riccarton wards had higher rates that disagreed with reducing off licence hours, but overall, more respondents still agreed than disagreed in these wards. Respondents generally deemed that 9pm or earlier was appropriate for supermarkets, smaller grocery stores, and specialty stores, whereas 10pm was considered more appropriate for bottle stores, working men's clubs, and wineries.

What the community told us:

The results in *Table 1.1* indicate that the more than half of respondents agreed (53%) that Council should reduce trading hours for off-licence outlets across the city and Banks Peninsula, versus 36% who disagreed. Around a third of respondents strongly agreed that Council should pursue this option.

Table 1.1: How much do you agree or disagree that Council should reduce trading hours for off-licenced outlets across the city and Banks Peninsula?		
Total number of responses: 3,473		
Response	Count	%
Strongly agree	1,137	33%
Agree	690	20%
Neither agree nor disagree	367	11%
Disagree	477	14%
Strongly disagree	766	22%

Don't know	36	1%
------------	----	----

Respondents who hold an off-licence agreed the least (27%) that the Council should reduce trading hours, compared with club-licence holders (33%), on-licence holders (41%). Respondents who hold an off-licence tended to disagree the most, while those who hold an on-licence tended to indicate more support for this proposal than those who hold an off-licence or club licence (*Table 1.2*). Overall, those without a liquor licence agreed the most (53%).

Table 1.2: How much do you agree or disagree that Council should reduce trading hours for off-licensed outlets across the city and Banks Peninsula?

Total number of responses: 3,500*

Licence Type	Agree		Neither agree nor disagree		Disagree		Don't know	
I hold an on-licence	32	41%	13	16%	34	43%	0	0%
I hold an off-licence	21	27%	10	13%	47	60%	0	0%
I hold a club licence	6	33%	8	44%	4	22%	0	0%
I do not hold a liquor licence	1,774	53%	345	10%	1,164	35%	36	1%

*Respondents may hold an on and an off licence

Respondents from most wards agreed (>50%) that Council should reduce off-licence trading hours, with the exception of Burwood, Central, Fendalton, and Riccarton. Cashmere agreed the most (62%), while the Riccarton ward agreed the least (46%) (*Table 1.3*). While there was some variation in how much respondents from different wards agreed or disagreed with this proposal, there was no statistically significant relationship between a ward a respondent lives in and whether they agreed or disagreed with reducing trading hours for off-licences.

Table 1.3: How much do you agree or disagree that Council should reduce trading hours for off-licenced outlets across the city and Banks Peninsula?

Total number of responses: 3,261

Ward	Agree		Neither agree nor disagree		Disagree		Don't know	
Banks Peninsula	55	50%	13	12%	41	37%	1	1%
Burwood	84	47%	18	10%	77	43%	0	0%
Cashmere	198	62%	35	11%	87	27%	1	0.3%
Central	133	49%	30	11%	104	38%	5	2%
Coastal	117	52%	23	10%	85	38%	1	0.4%
Fendalton	83	47%	20	11%	72	41%	0	0%
Halswell	137	55%	20	8%	87	35%	4	2%
Harewood	121	54%	29	13%	71	31%	5	2%
Heathcote	127	57%	21	10%	72	33%	1	0.5%
Hornby	66	57%	6	5%	40	34%	4	3%
Innes	134	53%	26	10%	91	36%	4	2%
Linwood	105	57%	21	11%	57	31%	1	1%
Papanui	64	56%	7	6%	42	37%	1	1%
Riccarton	130	46%	32	11%	115	41%	5	2%
Spreydon	93	55%	14	8%	61	36%	1	1%
Waimairi	85	54%	23	15%	47	30%	1	1%

When asked to consider the reduction of evening hours for off-licence venues, 11pm was deemed appropriate by the highest proportion of respondents for liquor stores (27%), working men's clubs (35%), wineries (32%), and specialty stores (25%), as shown in *Table 1.4*. However, when considering these responses cumulatively, the majority of respondents deemed 10pm or earlier as suitable closing times for liquor stores, working men's clubs, and wineries, and 9pm for specialty stores. For supermarkets, 9pm had the highest proportion of support at 25%, which was consistent for smaller grocery stores (24%). Cumulatively, 9pm or earlier was also deemed appropriate for both venues.

Table 1.4: If we did reduce hours in the evening, what time do you think off-licences should stop selling alcohol each day?

*Cumulative results help provide a comprehensive view by showing the progressive total of responses, which can highlight trends and the distribution of responses.

Total number of responses: 3,473

Response		Count	%	Cumulative %*
Bottle Stores	6pm	225	6%	6%
	7pm	208	6%	12%
	8pm	421	12%	24%
	9pm	860	25%	49%
	10pm	743	21%	70%
	11pm	930	27%	97%
	Don't know	86	2%	100%
Supermarkets	6pm	327	9%	9%
	7pm	250	7%	16%
	8pm	437	13%	29%
	9pm	879	25%	54%
	10pm	721	21%	75%
	11pm	930	22%	97%
	Don't know	81	2%	100%
Small grocery stores	6pm	474	14%	14%
	7pm	276	8%	22%
	8pm	513	15%	37%
	9pm	842	24%	61%
	10pm	579	17%	78%
	11pm	687	20%	98%
	Don't know	81	3%	100%
Working Men's Clubs	6pm	183	5%	5%
	7pm	147	4%	9%
	8pm	349	10%	19%
	9pm	641	18%	37%
	10pm	726	21%	58%
	11pm	1,203	35%	93%

	Don't know	223	6%	100%
Wineries	6pm	225	6%	6%
	7pm	187	5%	11%
	8pm	342	10%	21%
	9pm	699	20%	41%
	10pm	698	20%	61%
	11pm	1,121	32%	93%
	Don't know	200	6%	100%
Specialty Stores	6pm	331	10%	10%
	7pm	210	6%	16%
	8pm	423	12%	28%
	9pm	819	24%	52%
	10pm	588	17%	69%
	11pm	866	25%	94%
	Don't know	235	7%	100%

Why did you select those hours?

2,063 respondents provided feedback on why they selected their preferred hours. An overview of the key themes and messages is provided below.

Reducing alcohol-related harm

Much of the feedback received on reducing trading hours for off-licences provided support for the proposal as a mechanism to reduce alcohol-related harm. There was a belief that reducing availability of alcohol, particularly late at night, would lead to a reduction in alcohol-related disturbances and anti-social behaviour, including crime, noise, violence and social harm.

Respondents told us that they believe limiting late-night sales will help to protect vulnerable groups and communities, seeing it as an effective way of curbing impulse buying and limiting the ability for people who have already been drinking to 'top-up'. Some respondents suggested that limiting the availability of alcohol from off-licenses late at night could reduce the likelihood of people making poor decisions when they were already under the influence of alcohol and could reduce poor social behaviour.

“From what I've seen, the larger ratio of harmful behavior is linked with those who start by buying the drinks after 8pm.”

Consumption patterns

Respondents raised concerns about harmful consumption patterns that they felt the current trading hours support and noted that reducing trading hours would likely reduce the harm associated with these patterns. Respondents told us that they thought shorter hours would help reduce hazardous drinking late at night, and could lead to a decrease in pre, side, and post loading, which they believed were closely linked to excessive drinking and the related harm. Generally, these respondents held the view that reducing trading hours would lead to more planned and responsible consumption of alcohol, with people needing to plan their purchases instead of making poor decisions around consumption once they were already intoxicated.

Respondents expressed significant concern about impulse buying and topping up, suggesting that the late-night availability of alcohol strongly encouraged these behaviours. They emphasised the need to balance alcohol availability with measures to curb impulsive purchases, noting that late-night availability often leads to impulse buying once individuals have already started drinking. They expressed the view that if someone had not organised their alcohol purchases by a certain hour, any subsequent purchase was likely to be impulsive, or to top up, which could result in overconsumption. These respondents believed that earlier closing times could promote and support more responsible drinking habits.

On the contrary, some respondents expressed a concern that limiting trading hours may shift binge drinking to earlier in the day, as people stock up earlier to avoid running out over the course of the night.

“Would reduce alcohol purchases once 'partying' has begun. Still plenty of time to shop in advance. Also would reduce chance of intoxicated groups gathering outside outlets.”

“Alcohol is usually being bought from these for future consumption. The later the hour the higher chance of people "topping up" and drinking later, to the detriment of good social behavior.”

Impacts on Businesses

While many respondents provided support for reducing trading hours to help mitigate alcohol-related harm, some expressed a desire to see this balanced with mitigating the economic impacts that it will have on businesses, citing the need to strike the right balance between reducing harm and allowing businesses to continue to operate profitably. Respondents reminded us of the broader economic impacts of reducing trading hours, including that thriving local businesses contributed positively to an area's economy, and that reducing trading hours would have implications for the people who work in these businesses, such as reduced hours or job losses.

“I think that reducing the hours the businesses with off licenses can sell alcohol negatively impacts those businesses which in turn impacts the community.”

In a similar vein, some suggested that more work should be done to refine the policy to differentiate between different types of off-licences, such as supermarkets and liquor stores, to address the differing benefits that they provided to the community. Some respondents pointed out that liquor stores were R18 environments, whereas supermarkets were not. They believed this distinction should be considered when deciding on reducing trading hours.

“Supermarkets provide alcohol and lots of other grocery items, whereas bottle stores only sell alcohol. Not sure about speciality stores,”

On the other hand, the need for consistency was also raised by respondents, who emphasised the need for consistent trading hours across all off-licence types, to ensure that they were operating on a level playing field, and that the policy is not creating an unfair advantage for certain business types. Some expressed concern that inconsistencies could lead to confusion for customers and competitive disadvantage for some outlets. The need for consistency to support enforcement of the rules was also raised.

“Consistent across all sellers to avoid competitive advantage”

Freedom of choice and personal responsibility

Some respondents expressed that the Council should not be involved in determining the opening hours of liquor outlets, emphasising the value of freedom of choice and personal responsibility. These respondents tended to feel that residents should have the freedom to choose when they purchased alcohol, highlighting a belief that adults should be trusted to make their own decisions about alcohol purchases without overly restrictive Council policy. In some instances, they argued that responsible adults should not be punished for the actions of the minority.

Some respondents were concerned about the impacts reduced trading hours would have on people who don't have “traditional” working hours (e.g. shift workers).

“People should have freedom to choose responsibly”

Community Boards' feedback

All four community boards who provided feedback supported a reduction in off-licence trading hours with three of the four boards stating a closing time of 9pm for all off-licence types was appropriate, noting information within the Research Report and Issues and Options Paper.

While the Waihoru Spreydon-Cashmere-Heathcote Community Board supported a reduction of trading hours, they suggested a policy be refined to differentiate between types of off-licences, such as supermarkets and liquor stores, to better address the varying impacts these have on the community.

The Waipapa Papanui-Innes-Central Community Board commented that some residents thought opening time for sales should start later as 7am was viewed as too early. The board preferred 8am-9pm opening hours and suggested the reduced hours should apply across all types of off-licences across the whole district.

Mana Whenua feedback

Ngā Hau e Whā National Marae (Te Rūnanga o Nga Maata Waka) supported a reduction in trading hours for most off-licensed outlets, stating that a reduced trading time to 9pm for supermarkets, small grocery stores, and specialty stores was appropriate. However, for bottle stores, working

men's clubs, and wineries, they stated that a maximum trading time of 11pm was appropriate in their view.

Statutory Consultee feedback

New Zealand Police supported a reduction of trading hours to 9pm and recommended a policy provision to prevent 'same day' order deliveries after 7pm to counter the ability of off-licences to continue fulfilling remote sales orders for delivery up to 11pm despite being required to close their doors at 9pm. They stated that there is currently some ambiguity across New Zealand around the delivery of alcohol from off licences outside of trading hours. Many off-licence bottle store operators believe that, because they offer a delivery service they can be viewed as remote sellers – and therefore continue to trade after their licensed hours have ended solely for delivery sales. The Police view is that it is not the case – as they do not have the relevant endorsement under Section 40 as 'remote sellers'. Police recommend a 9pm closing time for all off licences, other than those endorsed under Section 40. The recommendation of a condition that specifically restricts the same day delivery of alcohol after 7pm (unless they are endorsed under Section 40) would help mitigate this issue.

Te Whatu Ora (NPS Te Waipounamu) also strongly supported reducing trading hours to 9pm to mitigate alcohol harm, recommending that all off-licence types close at the same time to ensure a consistent approach and avoid unintended consequences such as people traveling further to purchase alcohol. They also suggested that the Council consider delaying the opening time of all off-licence outlets to 9am.

The Christchurch City Council Alcohol Licensing Team viewed off-licensed outlets and remote sales as the areas of most concern and strongly supported reducing trading hours to 9pm for all off-licensed outlet types, emphasising that a consistent approach would prevent people from traveling elsewhere to purchase alcohol.

Licensed industry representative feedback

Foodstuffs South Island strongly disagreed with reducing trading times for supermarkets and small grocery stores, noting that the District Licensing Committee can impose more restrictive hours when appropriate for particular off-licence types. They emphasised the importance of providing shoppers with options and flexibility to access a full basket of goods during opening hours, considering the current default hours (up to 11pm) as an appropriate base level.

Superliquor Holdings Ltd also strongly disagreed with reducing trading times for all off-licence types, preferring that hours remain the same to enable flexibility for situations such as shift work hours and trading over holiday periods. While they did not suggest that stores must open until 11pm, they value the flexibility to do so when required. They expressed openness to discussing the reduction of trading hours for off-licences, provided the same hours are applied to all off-licences, including remote sellers. They were unaware of any evidence demonstrating that differentiating between supermarkets, grocery stores, and bottle stores would lead to safer and more responsible alcohol consumption.

They sought a 'level playing field' among all off-licence outlets and strongly opposed any proposal that differentiates based on hours or other discretionary conditions, arguing that inequitable

conditions do not reduce alcohol harm but rather shift customer behaviour and create commercial advantages and disadvantages between alcohol retailers. They stated that differentiating between supermarkets and other off-licence outlets, such as bottle stores, would further consolidate the perceived duopoly retail power in the market.

The Restaurant Association of New Zealand neither agreed nor disagreed with reducing maximum trading hours for off-licensed outlets. While they strongly supported the Council's goal of reducing alcohol-related harm, they saw no evidence from any council that reducing trading hours for off-licence outlets or on-licence venues reduces alcohol-related harm. They believed that any decisions regarding reducing trading hours should be evidence-based rather than intuition-based or speculative about what could reduce alcohol-related harm.

Reduce trading hours for on-licences in suburban areas

Half of respondents (50%) agreed that the Council should reduce the latest closing time for on-licence venues within suburban areas, compared with 38% that disagreed. Half of those who do not hold a liquor-licence agreed that Council should reduce latest closing times, compared with 29% for on-licence holders, and 28% for off-licence and club-licence holders. On-licence holders tended to disagree the most (63%), while those without a liquor-licence disagreed the least (37%). When looking at responses by ward, opinions were mixed. However across all wards, except for Central, more respondents agreed that they support reducing closing times for on-licences than disagreed. Regarding proposed closing times, over 50% of respondents considered 12am or earlier appropriate for restaurants, cafes, sports clubs, and working men's clubs, 1am or earlier appropriate for pubs/taverns, and 2am or earlier appropriate for nightclubs.

What the community told us:

The results in *Table 1.5* show that half of the respondents (50%) agreed that the Council should reduce the latest closing time for on-licence venues within suburban areas, compared with 38% who disagreed.

Table 1.5: How much do you agree or disagree that Council should reduce the latest closing time for on-licensed venues in suburban areas?		
Total number of responses: 3,472		
Response	Count	%
Strongly agree	990	29%
Agree	723	21%
Neither agree nor disagree	392	11%
Disagree	409	12%
Strongly disagree	912	26%
Don't know	46	1%

Consistent with the overall results, half of respondents without a liquor-licence agreed that Council should reduce latest closing times, however a lower proportion of licence holders agreed with the proposal to reduce hours for on-licence venues; 29% of on-licence holders, and 28% of both off-licence and club-licence holders agreed with earlier closing times. On-licence holders disagreed the most, at 63%, compared with 44% for off-licence and club licence holders, and 37% of non-licence holders. *Table 1.6* shows these results.

Table 1.6: How much do you agree or disagree that Council should reduce the latest closing time or on-licenced venues in suburban areas?

Total number of responses: 3,473

Licence Type	Agree		Neither agree nor disagree		Disagree		Don't know	
I hold an on-licence	23	29%	6	8%	50	63%	0	0%
I hold an off-licence	22	28%	17	22%	34	44%	5	6%
I hold a club licence	5	28%	5	28%	8	44%	0	0%
I do not hold a liquor licence	1,671	50%	367	11%	1,239	37%	41	1%

Between 40% and 60% of respondents across all wards agreed that hours should be reduced for on-licence premises in suburban areas, as shown in *Table 1.7*. Statistical testing indicates a significant relationship between the ward a respondent lives in and their view on reducing hours for on-licence venues. Respondents from Cashmere ward were more likely to agree that hours should be reduced and less likely to disagree. Conversely, respondents from Central ward were more likely to disagree with reducing on-licence hours and less likely to agree.

Table 1.7: How much do you agree or disagree that Council should reduce the latest closing time for on-licenced venues in suburban areas?

Total number of responses: 3,260

Ward	Agree		Neither agree nor disagree		Disagree		Don't know	
Banks Peninsula	55	50%	9	8%	42	38%	4	4%
Burwood	77	43%	24	13%	77	43%	1	1%
Cashmere	186	58%	41	13%	91	28%	3	1%
Central	119	44%	29	11%	122	45%	2	1%
Coastal	111	49%	24	11%	88	39%	3	1%

Fendalton	89	51%	23	13%	63	36%	0	0%
Halswell	131	53%	24	10%	89	36%	4	2%
Harewood	113	50%	33	15%	76	34%	4	2%
Heathcote	117	53%	17	8%	84	38%	3	1%
Hornby	60	52%	6	5%	46	40%	4	3%
Innes	125	49%	31	12%	98	38%	1	0.4%
Linwood	102	55%	21	11%	60	33%	1	1%
Papanui	65	57%	12	11%	36	32%	1	1%
Riccarton	123	44%	33	12%	120	43%	5	2%
Spreydon	79	47%	19	11%	70	41%	1	1%
Waimairi	75	48%	16	10%	60	38%	5	3%

Table 1.8 shows the largest proportion of respondents felt that 11pm was an appropriate closing time for all on-licensed venues, except nightclubs. However, over 50% of respondents preferred a 1am or earlier closing time for pubs and taverns, and a 12am or earlier closing time for restaurants, cafes, sports clubs, and working men's clubs. For nightclubs, cumulatively the majority preferred a closing time of 2am or earlier, but 4am was the most popular option of the times tested.

Table 1.8: If we did reduce the latest closing time for on-licensed venues in suburban areas, what time do you think they should stop selling alcohol?

*Cumulative results help provide a comprehensive view by showing the progressive total of responses, which can highlight trends and the distribution of responses.

Total number of responses: 3,473

Response		Count	%	Cumulative %*
Nightclubs	11pm	386	11%	11%
	12am	472	14%	25%
	1am	561	16%	41%
	2am	644	19%	60%
	3am	402	12%	72%
	4am	857	25%	97%
	Don't know	151	4%	100%
Pubs/Taverns	11pm	881	25%	25%
	12am	782	23%	48%

	1am	531	c%	63%
	2am	411	12%	75%
	3am	207	6%	81%
	4am	544	16%	97%
	Don't know	117	3%	100%
Restaurants	11pm	1210	35%	35%
	12am	848	24%	59%
	1am	434	12%	71%
	2am	261	8%	79%
	3am	128	4%	83%
	4am	466	13%	96%
	Don't know	126	4%	100%
Cafes	11pm	1609	46%	46%
	12am	636	18%	64%
	1am	300	9%	73%
	2am	179	5%	78%
	3am	102	3%	81%
	4am	449	13%	94%
	Don't know	198	6%	100%
Sports Clubs	11pm	1257	36%	36%
	12am	767	22%	58%
	1am	390	11%	69%
	2am	257	7%	76%
	3am	128	4%	80%
	4am	493	14%	94%
	Don't know	180	5%	100%
Working Men's Clubs	11pm	1173	34%	34%
	12am	794	23%	57%
	1am	396	11%	68%
	2am	278	8%	76%
	3am	133	4%	80%
	4am	512	15%	95%
	Don't know	187	5%	100%

Why did you select those times?

1,723 respondents provided feedback on why they selected their preferred hours. An overview of the key themes and messages is provided below.

Reducing alcohol-related harm

Respondents who supported reduced hours in general told us that they see reducing trading hours for suburban on-licences as an effective way of promoting safer drinking behaviour and providing for community preferences.

Support for earlier closing times stemmed from the belief that earlier closing times would promote safer and healthier drinking behaviours, help reduce alcohol harm, anti-social behaviour, alcohol-related crime, and vandalism in suburban areas. Respondents argued that there is a specific time after which continued alcohol consumption is likely to result in poor behaviour, which should be discouraged. They felt there was a direct correlation between later closing times and excessive alcohol consumption.

Some also suggested that venues needed to take better care of their patrons, ensuring that water is provided, supporting safe ways to get home, and removing overly intoxicated individuals.

“Hopefully it would reduce alcohol related harm in the suburbs and the middle of the night.”

Different types of venues and environment

While some respondents noted that any change in hours needed to be fair and consistent for all on-licences, many respondents who chose variable times for the different venues expressed the sentiment that since customers visited different types of venues for different reasons, the trading hours should be dependent on this. For instance, many discussed that the time of closing should be enough time for people to go out, eat and socialise. Respondents also expressed the sense that restaurants and cafes were not drinking establishments and therefore did not need to be able to sell alcohol that late, unlike nightclubs which by virtue of their name are meant to be open late at night and has different types of controls. Venues that host events/special events were also noted for possibly needing different/later closing hours.

“Cafes & restaurants are by nature not drinking establishments so don’t need to stay open to sell alcohol late. Working Men’s clubs and pubs and taverns should be able to accommodate later night trade while nightclubs should be allowed extra time to accommodate those wanting to stay out and to avoid having everyone out on the street at closing time all together.”

“Nightclubs are often not located in suburban areas, and don't usually become busy until later in the night. Pubs often close at midnight, and restaurants, cafes and clubs usually close their kitchen at 9pm or 10pm, then subsequently close, so shouldn't be able to sell alcohol later than 11pm.”

Many respondents also differentiated between the central city and more residential / suburban areas. Some for example noted that they did not want the city to become less vibrant and without a nightlife whereas others highlighted that reducing trading hours in suburban areas may have positive impacts on residents’ quality of life, supporting less sleep disruption and stress for residents who live in areas

“Suburbs are for homes not boozing. People can go to the city for more nightlife.”

However some who disagreed with limiting hours in the suburban areas argued that not everyone wants to go into the city, that not all suburbs are the same, and that suburbs should not be disadvantaged in favour for the city.

“Nightlife should be encouraged, even in suburban centres - could have different policies for smaller areas but think it makes sense to allow bars and restaurants in larger suburban areas to sell alcohol later. Gives people the option rather than having to go to town, makes the suburban centres a bit more lively and vibrant at night.”

Freedom of choice, supervised environments and enforcement

Several respondents expressed that since on-licenses are supervised environments the choice really should be with businesses, the hosts, and the patrons visiting those venues. These respondents tended to feel that there are regulations in place already where hosts and managers are required to monitor and control any harmful behaviour it should therefore be more about enforcing those responsibilities and rules rather than reducing the hours of trade.

Similar to off-licenses, in some instances, respondents argued that responsible adults and businesses should not be punished for the actions of the minority. A few were also concerned about the impacts reduced trading hours would have on people who worked late hours.

“They are controlled venues and the licence holder has a responsibility to manage drunkenness and alcohol abuse.”

“If these entities are not meeting their obligations (serving Drunk people), then the police should enforce the current rules”

Impacts on businesses

In relation to the purposes of the venues, some respondents were concerned that restricting growth could negatively affect the area by impacting local businesses’ ability to stay open and generate revenue, along with impacting the local area’s nightlife and vibrancy. Rather, many of these respondents preferred to let the market/businesses decide on their hours.

“Each venue operates until a specific time due to the lifestyle of its clients, to restrict these venues would be financially persecutive and detrimental to their businesses.”

Community Boards’ feedback

The Waipapa Papanui-Innes-Central Community Board and Waipuna Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Boards supported a reduction in trading hours for on-licensed venues in suburban

areas outside of the central city four avenues, both stating that 1am would be an appropriate closing time.

The Waitai Coastal-Burwood-Linwood Community Board neither agreed nor disagreed with the proposal, noting the significant variation across suburban areas and suggesting that a clear delineation between suburban and urban hours would help protect neighborhoods from activities better suited for non-residential areas.

The Waihoru Spreydon-Cashmere-Heathcote Community Board commented that the proposal could have mixed results, as shorter hours at licensed premises might push people to drink privately rather than reduce harm, while longer trading hours in on-licensed suburban venues could promote safer drinking environments. They suggested that the Council seek and review evidence from other regions to determine the most effective approach.

Mana Whenua feedback

Ngā Hau e Whā National Marae (Te Rūnanga o Nga Maata Waka) neither agreed nor disagreed with a reduction in the latest closing time for on-licensed venues in suburban areas. They suggested that different licence types should have varied closing times, with restaurants and pubs/taverns closing at 12am, nightclubs at 4am, and working men's clubs at 2am.

Statutory Consultee feedback

New Zealand Police commented that although most suburban venues closed at midnight or 1am now, there are several 'hospitality precincts' outside the central city that traded beyond 1am with venues that, generally, were not viewed as problematic. They suggested redefining the geographical area for the proposal to exclude some entertainment precincts. They recommended applying a three- or five-kilometre radius from a central point in the central city to enable 'entertainment precincts' such as Merivale and Addington to operate later in the evening. They also suggested that other 'entertainment precincts' like Akaroa and Lyttelton have separate allowances so they could continue to operate until 3am.

Te Whatu Ora (NPHS Te Waipounamu) supported reducing the latest closing time for on-licensed venues in suburban areas to 1am, stating that reducing trading hours may reduce disruption to residential areas and citing evidence from the 'Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs' (2020) that closing bars and pubs earlier leads to fewer physical harms, including assaults.

The Christchurch City Council Alcohol Licensing Team expressed strong support for a reduced maximum trading hour for on-licences in suburban areas. They viewed 11pm as an appropriate maximum trading time for all on-licensed venues except nightclubs and supported the movement of those wishing to enjoy evening entertainment into the central city. They considered a 4am maximum trading time appropriate for nightclubs in both suburban areas and the central city, as people typically attend them later in the evening.

Licensed industry representative feedback

Hospitality NZ did not support reducing trading hours to 1am for on-licensed venues in suburban areas at night, citing Life in Christchurch data that suggests the Council should retain the status quo. They reiterated that well-managed on-premise environments are the safest for alcohol consumption due to robust host responsibility practices. They expressed concerns about revenue

loss due to reduced hours, the knock-on effect on staff, and the potential difficulties in obtaining special licences for events like major televised events, which could increase special licence application processes.

The Restaurant Association of New Zealand strongly disagreed with reducing trading hours for suburban on-licensed venues, stating that the risk of on-licensed venues, particularly restaurants and cafes, contributing to alcohol-related harm is significantly lower than that of off-licensed outlets. They noted that most on-licensed venues are not currently open until 4am, and reducing hours would have limited impact. They also commented that such a reduction creates a disadvantage for suburban businesses already struggling in the current economic climate. Additionally, they pointed out that on-licence venues typically close earlier than those in other countries, which can lead to disappointment for tourists expecting late-night options. They emphasised that servicing tourists should be considered when deciding on reducing the latest closing time for on-licensed venues, as this may negatively impact international visitors and the hospitality industry.

The Association also requested that if the Council includes this option in a draft policy, cafes and restaurants should be excluded due to the low risk they pose to alcohol-related harm. They stated that their membership comprises hospitality businesses where food is the "hero of their operations," with alcoholic beverages offered as a supplement to the culinary experience.

2. Temporary freeze on new off-licences in high deprivation areas

A large proportion of respondents agreed that Council should implement a temporary freeze on new licences in high deprivation areas (61%), compared with 25% of respondents who disagreed. When broken down by licence type, those who do not hold a liquor-licence agreed at a higher rate (62%) than off-licence holders (40%), club-licence holders (39%), and on-licence holders (33%). Respondents most commonly thought that the freeze should apply to new liquor stores (68%), followed by small grocery stores (52%) and specialty stores (47%).

What the community told us:

As shown in *Table 2.1*, the majority of respondents agreed that Council should implement a temporary freeze on new licenses in high deprivation areas (61%), 25% of respondents disagreed.

Table 2.1: How much do you agree or disagree that Council should include a temporary freeze on new licences in high deprivation areas?		
Total number of responses: 3,473		
Response	Count	%
Strongly agree	1,417	41%
Agree	703	20%
Neither agree nor disagree	416	12%
Disagree	335	10%
Strongly disagree	527	15%
Don't know	75	2%

Breaking the results down by licence type, *Table 2.2* shows that 62% of respondents who do not hold a liquor licence agree that Council should implement the temporary freeze, compared with 40% of off-licence holders, 39% of club-licence holders, and 33% of on-licence holders. 34

Table 2.2: How much do you agree or disagree that Council should include a temporary freeze on new licences in high deprivation areas?								
Total number of responses: 3,494*								
Ward	Agree		Neither agree nor disagree		Disagree		Don't know	
I hold an on-licence	26	33%	16	20%	35	44%	2	3%
I hold an off-licence	31	40%	18	23%	28	36%	1	1%
I hold a club licence	7	39%	6	33%	5	28%	0	0%

I do not hold a liquor licence	2,064	62%	383	12%	800	24%	72	2%
--------------------------------	-------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----	----

*Respondents may hold an on and an off licence

Respondents most commonly thought that the freeze should apply to bottle-stores (68%), followed by small grocery stores (52%), specialty stores (47%), and supermarkets (40%). Table 2.2 shows these breakdowns.

Table 2.3: If we did include a temporary freeze on new licences in high deprivation areas, which of the following venues and outlets do you think a temporary freeze should apply to?		
Total number of responses: 3,473		
Response	Count	%
Bottle Stores	2,371	68%
Supermarkets	1,399	40%
Small Grocery Stores	1,798	52%
Specialty Stores	1,643	47%
Nightclubs	1,401	40%
Pubs/Taverns	1,335	38%
Restaurants	612	18%
Cafes	822	24%
Sports Clubs	1,080	31%
Working Men's Clubs	1,035	30%
None of the above	626	18%
Don't know	216	6%

Is there anything else you would like to tell us about how a freeze should be applied?

959 respondents provided additional comments about how a freeze should be applied. An overview of the key themes and messages is provided below. Generally respondents had mixed opinions on which venues a temporary freeze should apply to, with many favouring off-licences due to higher concerns, while others highlighted the multifaceted roles of on-licence venues and the complexities surrounding supermarkets, emphasising the need for fairness, consistency, and consideration of potential impacts on local businesses and community dynamics.

Consideration of different types of venues

As shown in the table above and further iterated in the comments, respondents had mixed opinions on which venues and outlets a temporary freeze should apply to. Some respondents noted the differences in purposes and ways of operating between off and on-licences and therefore felt that a freeze should not apply to all.

In their comments, respondents tended to note that off-licences were of bigger concern and that any freezes should (only) apply to off-licences or bottle stores in particular. On the other hand, respondents felt that on-licence venues served more purposes than just selling alcohol, but provided entertainment, sold food, created a platform for socialising, could add a sense of vibrancy and life to the area, and also represented a more controlled environment where there were trained staff to monitor and restrict problematic behaviour, thus being of lower risk.

Based upon the comments, respondents seemed to feel that supermarkets were more of a grey and complicated area as while they do sell alcohol for off-premise use, they also serve the purpose of selling essential groceries. Some however noted other challenges with supermarkets (specifically chains) as they could make alcohol very accessible, could compete against local business in a different way, and should not be treated differently from other off-licence premises.

“Where food is provided and some oversight is a reasonable expectation, I'm more relaxed to see places open up. Places where people go to stock up, or to tank up, are less satisfactory”

Impacts on local businesses and local area

Beyond the type of venues possibly affected, some respondents were concerned that restricting growth would negatively affect the area by harming local businesses and the local area e.g. by either reducing ability to operate, reducing competition, increasing prices or limiting venues that could be valued by residents.

“Prioritise freezing off-licences. This makes it harder to bring alcohol home or to the streets. Freezing on-licences doesn't have this benefit and can stifle culture and local business.”

Fairness, Consistency and/or Reviewing Case-by-case

The aspects of fairness and consistency (regardless of what they considered ‘fair’) were important to many respondents who disagreed with a freeze based on deprivation areas. It was also important to some who agreed with the freeze. Some respondents believed a freeze based upon the deprivation index was unfair for multiple reasons (e.g. why target one particular group when alcohol harm could happen anywhere), and that it was another form of discrimination or could cause additional challenges or unintended consequences for businesses or community. Others just thought standards should be consistent and apply to all.

Some respondents thought that a freeze needed to be more nuanced rather than a blanket rules. For these respondents it was more important to make a decision case-by-case by reviewing each new licence application individually on its merits

“I don't think there should be an arbitrary blanket rule like a freeze, instead I think the council has a duty to consider each application on its merits.”

“I think the rules should be consistent across the City rather than changing suburb by suburb.”

“Apply freeze everywhere. It would be discriminatory to apply it only to "deprived" areas. Perhaps allow consideration of population changes.”

Effectiveness in reducing alcohol-related harm

Many of those who disagreed with the freeze questioned how effective it would be as people could go / drive elsewhere to fulfil their needs. In addition, some were concerned a freeze may even have unintended consequences of pushing people to drive under the influence or drink in less controlled and safe areas.

“With the majority of people having access to transport this would potentially just result in people travelling more or further.”

“If people don’t have a place to meet up then they will do it out on the street or park.”

Alternatives / additional suggestions:

Either in addition to the temporary freeze in high deprivation areas, or as an alternative, some respondents suggested additional/different ideas.

Capping the number of licences allowed: Several respondents raised the idea and notion that the number of licences allowed to exist in a given area should be reviewed, often feeling there were enough outlets already. The cap could either be based upon the number of existing outlets in general, as a ratio to population, based upon specific distances, dependent on the proximity to existing outlet, or as a goal to introduce a sinking lid.

Looking at the length of freeze: Some respondents offered different suggestions of the length that the freeze should be valid for and when it should be reviewed. Some even suggested ‘temporary’ should be replaced with ‘permanent’

Increasing the reach of the freeze: Some respondents felt that rather than just focusing on high deprivation areas, or specific indices or deciles that the reach should be increased to encompass more areas, or even the whole city.

Ensuring sensitive areas are protected: Some respondents pre-empted the next question and rather than just looking at deprivation, they wanted to look at the location of the outlets and what they were in proximity to (e.g. schools).

Looking at other methods for harm reduction: Some respondents thought other methods would be more effective, such as restricting the hours of trade, ensuring the enforcement of rules, managing those that do not comply with the rules, focusing on education and fixing the underlying causes of alcohol harm or deprivation.

“It would be useful to check the number of these venues in each area of the city and use the average number to determine if additional outlets are required.”

“Freeze on renewal of licenses where the licensee has had repeated breaches.”

“It should be for longer, say 5 years and not necessarily allow new owners to renew the license.”

Freedom of choice

Some respondents who disagreed with the freeze were of the opinion that it should not be up to the Council to control the sale and consumption of alcohol. Freedom of choice was deemed important by these people, either at the business level, the community's level, the host's / salesperson's level, or at the individual level.

“Let the customer decide how and where they choose to spend their money.”

Community Boards' feedback

The Waitai Coastal-Burwood-Linwood and Waipuna Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Boards supported a temporary freeze on new licences in high deprivation areas, agreeing that it should apply to bottle stores, supermarkets, small convenience stores, and nightclubs. The Waipuna Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board also suggested that the freeze should apply to sports clubs and working men's clubs, but not to new restaurants and cafes. They recommended that the Council consider including a 'sinking lid' policy for existing premises in these areas as well.

The Waipapa Papanui-Innes-Central Community Board neither agreed nor disagreed with the proposal but stated that if it were included, it should apply to bottle stores, supermarkets, small grocery stores, and specialty stores. They noted that further catchment analysis would be undertaken to determine the exact areas to be included and expressed support for this analysis if it showed that the option would reduce alcohol-related harm in vulnerable communities.

The Waihoru Spreydon-Cashmere-Heathcote Community Board expressed concern about the unintended consequences of applying a restriction, stating that defining 'deprived areas' could lead to new licences being placed just outside freeze zones, potentially undermining their effect. They recommended that the Council consider an alternative approach, such as creating 'alcohol-free' zones.

Mana Whenua feedback

Ngā Hau e Whā National Marae (Te Rūnanga o Nga Maata Waka) strongly supported the inclusion of a temporary freeze on new licences in high deprivation areas, stating that it should apply to bottle stores, supermarkets, specialty stores, nightclubs, and pubs/taverns.

Statutory Consultee feedback

New Zealand Police supported a temporary freeze on all new licences in high deprivation areas as proposed.

Te Whatu Ora (NPHS Te Waipounamu) also supported a temporary freeze on new licensed venues and outlets in high deprivation areas and recommended several ways to strengthen the proposed policy:

- a rebuttal presumption in this policy to ensure the intended effect to reduce alcohol availability in high deprivation areas continues beyond the duration of any temporary freeze as Auckland has implemented.

- including areas of medium-high deprivation (deciles 7 to 8) in addition to areas of high deprivation (deciles 9 to 10) in the temporary freeze.
- using crime, health, licence and demographic data, in addition to deprivation, to determine areas to implement a temporary freeze stating consideration of this data will highlight areas where alcohol harm currently has a cumulative impact.
- extending the duration of the temporary freeze to up to six years, noting a longer duration will allow more time to see whether the intended effects of this policy of reducing alcohol availability in high deprivation areas have been realised and that it aligns with requirements for a policy review timeframe.

The CCC Alcohol Licensing Team expressed strong support for including a freeze on bottle stores, nightclubs, and pubs/taverns only. They also recommended applying the freeze in areas of high deprivation with a level of eight or more.

Licensed industry representatives' feedback

Hospitality NZ were pleased the assurances provided regarding the freeze on new licences that existing venues and outlets could still be able to renew their licence and if they changed ownership, the new owner could still obtain a new licence.

Foodstuffs South Island stated they were unsure whether a policy should contain a temporary freeze on new licences in high deprivation areas commenting that restrictive rules for high deprivation areas may not achieve the purpose of Local Alcohol Policies and, in terms of grocery stores, 'cross border' purchasing occurs with stores that are geographically close suggesting it may be the same for other outlet types.

Superliquor Holdings Ltd strongly disagreed with placing a freeze on new licences in high deprivation areas stating that the approach is unreasonable as there may be valid reasons why a new off-licence could be permitted such as residential developments, population growth, or growth in commercial sectors. They also noted the District Licensing Committee should have the responsibility for determining any further applications for a new off-licence based on the information provided by an applicant and recognising that every application is unique to the particular site in question.

Restaurant Association of New Zealand were unsure whether a freeze should be included in a policy but, if it was, that it be applied only to certain licence types rather than all licences, noting in their view, that the risk of harm from cafes and restaurants is significantly lower than off-licensed outlets (or even other on-licences, such as night clubs) and did not want to see Council deter restaurants and cafes from investing in high deprivation communities.

3. Restrict new bottle stores, taverns, and nightclubs locating near sensitive sites

The majority of respondents (68%) agreed that the Council should consider restrictions on how close new licensed venues and outlets can be located to sensitive community facilities. Among respondents, those without a liquor licence agreed the most (69%), followed by club-licence holders (50%); those with on and off-licences disagreed the most.

The highest proportions of respondents identified addiction and rehabilitation facilities (80%), secondary schools (70%), primary schools (69%), and early learning centres (66%) as sensitive community facilities. A strong majority (83%) believed licensed venues should be 200 metres away from these sites. Among those who disagreed with placing restrictions, 47% preferred a 200m restriction if one was introduced, while 53% supported a restriction of less than 200m.

Respondents most commonly said that that bottle stores should be restricted near each sensitive site, including early learning centres (93%), primary schools (93%), secondary schools (95%), and addiction and rehabilitation facilities (96%).

What the community told us:

The majority of respondents (68%) agreed that the Council should consider placing restrictions on how close new licensed venues and outlets can be to sensitive community facilities, compared to 18% who disagreed, as seen in *Table 3.1*.

Table 3.1: How much do you agree or disagree that Council should consider including a restriction on how close new licenced venues and outlets can be located to community facilities considered sensitive?		
Total number of responses: 3,475		
Response	Count	%
Strongly agree	1,425	41%
Agree	929	27%
Neither agree nor disagree	419	12%
Disagree	265	8%
Strongly disagree	356	10%
Don't know	81	2%

The majority of those who do not hold a liquor licence (69%), and those with a club-licence (50%) agreed with this proposal. In contrast, respondents who hold an on-licence or off-licence agreed at lower rates (35%). Those on and off-licence holders also disagreed at higher rates, 39% and 44% respectively, compared with club-licence holders (22%), and those without a liquor-licence (17%). *Table 3.2* shows these differences.

Table 3.2: How much do you agree or disagree that Council should consider including a restriction on how close new licenced venues and outlets can be located to community facilities considered sensitive?

Total number of responses: 3,500

Ward	Agree		Neither agree nor disagree		Disagree		Don't know	
I hold an on-licence	28	35%	18	23%	31	39%	2	3%
I hold an off-licence	27	35%	16	21%	34	44%	1	1%
I hold a club licence	9	50%	4	22%	4	22%	1	6%
I do not hold a liquor licence	2,297	69%	387	12%	559	17%	77	2%

Most respondents told us that if we did introduce restrictions (*Table 3.3*), addiction and rehabilitation facilities (80%), secondary schools (70%), primary schools (69%), early learning centres (66%) and hospitals and medical centres (51%) should be considered sensitive.

Table 3.3: If we did restrict new licensed venues and outlets being located near community facilities, which of the following do you think should be considered sensitive?

Total number of responses: 3,478

Response	Count	%
Early Learning Centres	2,282	66%
Primary Schools	2,406	69%
Secondary Schools	2,423	70%
Hospitals and Medical Centres	1,759	51%
Addiction and Rehab Centres	2,792	80%
Marae	1,593	46%
Places of worship	1,350	39%
Other	179	5%
None of the above	381	11%
Don't know	110	3%

Respondents who agreed that the Council should put restrictions in place indicated a strong preference for a 200 metre restriction around sensitive community facilities. Only 17% of these respondents indicated a preference that is less than 200 metres, as seen in *Table 3.4*.

Table 3.4: How far away should a licensed venue or outlet be located from a community facility that is deemed a sensitive site?

(Respondents who strongly agree/agree restrictions should be considered)

Total number of responses: 2,354

Response	Count	%
50 metres	35	1%
100 metres	177	8%
150 metres	188	8%
200 metres	1,954	83%

Those who indicated that they would prefer that the Council did not put restrictions in place were still asked to provide feedback on their preferences if restrictions *were* introduced, as shown in Table 3.5. The majority of these respondents (53%) indicated a preference for a restriction less than 200 metres; 47% supported 200 metres.

Table 3.5: If we did restrict new licensed venues and outlets being located near community facilities, how far away should a licensed venue or outlet be located from community facility that is deemed a sensitive site?

(Respondents who strongly disagree/disagree restrictions should be considered)

Total number of responses: 898

Response	Count	%
50 metres	238	27%
100 metres	155	17%
150 metres	80	9%
200 metres	425	47%

Bottle stores received high support for being restricted near sensitive sites, with 93% to 96% of respondents agreeing for early learning centres, primary schools, secondary schools, and addiction and rehabilitation facilities. On-licensed venues like pubs and taverns also had strong support for restrictions, with 78% to 84% of respondents agreeing for these same sites, as shown in Table 3.6.

Table 3.6: Which of the following licenced venues and outlets do you think should be restricted from being close to...?

Total number of responses: 2,987

Response	Count	%
----------	-------	---

Early Learning Centres	Total number of responses: 2,279		
	Bottle Stores	2,119	93%
	Supermarkets	522	23%
	Small Grocery Stores	741	33%
	Specialty Stores	1,136	50%
	Nightclubs	1,806	79%
	Pubs/Taverns	1,858	82%
	Restaurants	355	16%
	Cafes	297	13%
	Sports Clubs	869	38%
	Working Men's Clubs	1,173	51%
	None of the above	24	1%
	Don't know	41	2%
Primary Schools	Total number of responses: 2,402		
	Bottle Stores	2,244	93%
	Supermarkets	570	24%
	Small Grocery Stores	824	34%
	Specialty Stores	1,260	52%
	Nightclubs	1,861	77%
	Pubs/Taverns	1,894	79%
	Restaurants	363	15%
	Cafes	304	13%
	Sports Clubs	897	37%
	Working Men's Clubs	1,212	50%
	None of the above	25	1%
	Don't know	44	2%
Secondary Schools	Total number of responses: 2,419		
	Bottle Stores	2,303	95%
	Supermarkets	667	28%
	Small Grocery Stores	926	38%
	Specialty Stores	1,353	56%
	Nightclubs	1,825	75%
	Pubs/Taverns	1,885	78%

	Restaurants	353	15%
	Cafes	318	13%
	Sports Clubs	847	35%
	Working Men's Clubs	1,189	49%
	None of the above	19	1%
	Don't know	42	2%
Hospitals and Medical Centres	Total number of responses: 1,756		
	Bottle Stores	1,607	92%
	Supermarkets	471	27%
	Small Grocery Stores	597	34%
	Specialty Stores	954	54%
	Nightclubs	1,410	80%
	Pubs/Taverns	1,356	77%
	Restaurants	338	19%
	Cafes	281	16%
	Sports Clubs	769	44%
	Working Men's Clubs	945	54%
	None of the above	42	2%
	Don't know	38	2%
Addiction and Rehabilitation Centres	Total number of responses: 2,789		
	Bottle Stores	2,673	96%
	Supermarkets	1,096	39%
	Small Grocery Stores	1,263	45%
	Specialty Stores	1,732	62%
	Nightclubs	2,206	79%
	Pubs/Taverns	2,332	84%
	Restaurants	731	26%
	Cafes	616	22%
	Sports Clubs	1,318	47%
	Working Men's Clubs	1,697	61%
	None of the above	24	1%
	Don't know	52	2%
Marae	Total number of responses: 1,590		

	Bottle Stores	1,446	91%
	Supermarkets	469	29%
	Small Grocery Stores	593	37%
	Specialty Stores	902	57%
	Nightclubs	1,206	76%
	Pubs/Taverns	1,234	78%
	Restaurants	314	20%
	Cafes	286	18%
	Sports Clubs	653	41%
	Working Men's Clubs	850	53%
	None of the above	23	1%
	Don't know	88	6%
Places of Worship	Total number of responses: 1,347		
	Bottle Stores	1,204	89%
	Supermarkets	408	30%
	Small Grocery Stores	488	36%
	Specialty Stores	738	55%
	Nightclubs	1,087	81%
	Pubs/Taverns	1,066	79%
	Restaurants	294	22%
	Cafes	264	20%
	Sports Clubs	625	46%
	Working Men's Clubs	778	58%
	None of the above	38	3%
	Don't know	58	4%
Other	Total number of responses: 177		
	Bottle Stores	155	88%
	Supermarkets	64	36%
	Small Grocery Stores	81	46%
	Specialty Stores	109	62%
	Nightclubs	141	80%
	Pubs/Taverns	145	82%
	Restaurants	42	24%

	Cafes	34	19%
	Sports Clubs	78	44%
	Working Men's Clubs	103	58%
	None of the above	9	5%
	Don't know	7	4%

Why do you think the facilities you selected should be considered 'sensitive'?

1,198 respondents provided feedback on why they thought the facilities they selected should be considered 'sensitive'. An overview of the key themes and messages is provided below. Although responses to this question were mixed, general themes included consideration of vulnerable groups, addiction, and the importance of distance/proximity.

Normalisation of alcohol consumption and impact of alcohol-related harm

Several respondents talked to the risk of licensed premises being located within proximity of sensitive sites, particularly those sites where children and young people frequent such as schools and early childcare centres. A number of these highlighted the importance of the proximity restriction to reduce the exposure young and vulnerable people had to the advertising and availability of alcohol.

Generally, concerns stemmed from the potential normalisation of alcohol due to exposure, advertising, availability and general socialisation with alcohol consumption and related behaviours. A number of respondents talked to the vulnerability of children and being of an impressionable age where they may be easily influenced. Their perceptions and concerns were that advertising and proliferation of alcohol could contribute to the normalisation of alcohol consumption and undermine safe environments.

Many respondents who supported distance restrictions also discussed the importance of maintaining safe environments and reducing anti-social behaviour around schools, addiction centres and other sensitive sites.

"Alcohol outlets near schools, playgrounds, and community spaces normalise drinking, undermine safe environments, and contribute to higher crime and anti-social behaviour."

"The problem for all these organisations is that being close to a licensed premise, especially an off-license, will expose them to dealing with alcohol-related anti-social behaviour. It's just inevitable. Any space that is predominantly for vulnerable people and young people should have a buffer around it."

Proposed distances

Many respondents commented on the need for the restriction to be further than the maximum option provided of 200m, and many suggested further distances such as 500M or 1KM or more. Some of these respondents expressed the concern that the proposed distances may not deter people from easily seeking out alcohol. However, there was also some who acknowledged that putting any distance-based restriction in place between licensed premises and sensitive sites would not necessarily deter some people from seeking out alcohol.

200m - the longest distance suggested - would still be within walking distance of someone parking their car and walking to the venue past the outlet so hardly likely to prevent the marketing impact.

Vulnerability of those who frequent the ‘sensitive’ community facilities

Overall, there was a strong theme across respondents that discussed the vulnerability of the users of sensitive community facilities. In particular, the vulnerability of children, young people, and individuals experiencing or recovering from addiction were commented on regularly in relation to schools and rehabilitation and addiction services.

Areas young people frequent: A key theme respondents brought up was the vulnerability of children and young people to be easily influenced by their surroundings, including advertising or exposure to alcohol consumption. Concerns were also expressed about licensed premises being in close proximity to schools and other facilities frequented by youth which might increase the risk of exposure to alcohol and subsequently the normalisation of alcohol consumption. Further, from a safety consideration some respondents note that the proximity could result in exposure to drunken and anti-social behaviour (e.g. street harassment).

Addiction services: There was a consistent theme related to the proximity of licensed premises to addiction services and rehabilitation centres due to concern that exposure to temptation and easy access to substances could negatively impact the recovery of those using those facilities. The proximity of licensed sites including access and advertising of alcohol may be considered triggering for individuals experiencing addiction or undermine recovery. Generally, these respondents felt a distance restriction would reduce access to alcohol by addiction service users.

Hospitals and Medical centres: There were mixed views about whether a distance restriction around a hospital was required or would have the desired effect. Those in support acknowledged the elderly, recovering, and disabled communities and that since hospitals and medical centres were providers of health/emergency care, patients or visitors were likely more stressed and vulnerable than usual. It was also noted that hospitals regularly encountered people under the influence of drugs or alcohol.

“They all have young and/or vulnerable people likely to be present in these places who should not be subject to the possible abuse of drunk people or the likelihood of encountering drunk or unruly people”

“Additionally, placing alcohol outlets near addiction treatment centres and social services can hinder recovery efforts and increase risks for vulnerable individuals”

“Hospitals are places that we all need to access and for many reasons on a 24hr basis, so not having drunken people to deal with around them is important”

Considerations of different types of venues and existing licenses

Respondents provided also some more general comments about the considerations and practicality of applying distance restrictions between licensed venues and sensitive facilities. Some respondents felt that any proximity restrictions needed to consider existing licenses and the potential impact on license renewals.

Further, there were some who mentioned that a review of licence applications should be done 'case-by-case', with consideration given to the type/nature of the licensed premise, the impact of proximity to a sensitive facility would have (as it would likely differ depending on the type of licensed premise) and how the operating hours coincided with the operations of the sensitive site. In addition, although many respondents talked about licensed venues in a general sense, some respondents delineated between on-licence and off-licence premises. These respondents focused particularly on off-licenses having proximity restrictions to sensitive sites.

"Proximity restrictions should be considered on a case by case basis, in particular taking into account: - The type of licence being applied for (e.g. a Class 3 Restaurant on-licence vs bottle store off-licence) - How long a business has been operating (e.g. if an ECE or school decides to open near a licensed venue, knowing they will be near a licensed venue, the licensee should not be penalised when they come to renewing their licence)."

Why do you think none of the facilities listed should be considered 'sensitive'?

185 respondents provided feedback on why they believed none of the listed facilities should be considered 'sensitive'. An overview of the key themes and messages is provided below. Although responses to this question were mixed, general themes include allowing freedom of choice, whether the restrictions would have the desired effect and the impact on businesses.

Effectiveness in reducing alcohol-related harm

A general theme among respondents who considered none of the sites to be sensitive was the opinion that a restriction was unlikely to achieve the desired impact either due to the distances being too small to make a noticeable difference, or because those seeking alcohol could and would still travel to make their purchase. Therefore, respondents were concerned restrictions would not have any impact on alcohol-related harm. Some also noted there was some misalignment in opening hours of the licensed premises and the sensitive sites, noting due to timing differences, the distance restriction may not have the desired effect.

A couple of respondents also commented on how education around alcohol and responsible drinking could be introduced to focus on addressing anti-social behaviour and alcohol-related problems. Some also indicated that the behaviour of the seller or the business (e.g. following laws and policies) was a more important focus rather than restricting proximity to sensitive sites.

"I don't see how ensuring a place that sells alcohol a minimum of 200m away from any of the above actually results in those people not buying it. Surely if you want it, and/or are reliant upon it, you would travel to attain it."

Freedom of choice and seller responsibility

Among respondents there was also a strong theme around people having the ability and the right to make personal decisions and therefore it should be a personal responsibility rather than a restriction. Comments indicated both the freedom of choice related to alcohol consumption, as well as general freedom of choice for adults. In addition, some also mentioned that business owners should have the ability to make the commercial decision of where to trade, and the onus/responsibility should remain on the seller to abide by laws when supplying and selling alcohol.

A number of respondents specifically noted their belief that it was not Council's role or responsibility to place restrictions on the location of licensed premises or the availability and sale of alcohol.

"I don't think that it should be the council's responsibility to restrict the sale of alcohol. Citizens should be free to make their own decisions on when and where they can purchase alcohol"

Impact on businesses and reviewing case-by-case

There was also a number of respondents who commented on the detrimental impact this restriction could have on existing businesses and license holders and the potential impact on vibrancy or establishment of community hubs. Some comments related to the difficulty of imposing a 'blanket' policy without consideration of the variability in sensitivity of sites, and the differences in on-licence and off-licence premises. There was also mention of the impact a blanket policy could have particularly on smaller communities.

Another consistent theme was the need to consider the impacts on existing premises and the renewal of licenses, with suggestions made to consider which premise (licensed venue or sensitive facility) was established first. Suggestions were also made for licenses to be considered on a case-by-case basis, with consideration given to the type of sensitive site, the type of license-holder, and the needs of the local community.

"I think each application needs to be considered on its own merits, and the sites nearby looked at to see whether an alcohol licence would have an impact on that community. There is a danger that there would be unintended consequences if a blanket ban was put in place. There is also a danger that existing licences could be affected if, for example, a childcare centre or a charity second hand shop such as Salvation Army, etc decided to open up next door. Existing businesses should be protected and have existing use rights if a restriction such as this was implemented."

Community Boards' feedback

The Waitai Coastal-Burwood-Linwood, Waipapa Papanui-Innes-Central, and Waipuna Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Boards supported restricting how close new licensed venues and outlets can be located from sensitive sites, suggesting distances up to 200 meters as appropriate. They stated that these restrictions should apply to early learning centres, primary and secondary schools, hospitals, medical centres, and addiction and rehabilitation centres.

Some boards also believed the restrictions should apply to marae, places of worship, parks, playgrounds, sports facilities, WINZ offices, the City Mission, pharmacies, and places providing youth and community services.

When asked which licence types the restrictions should apply to, the same three boards stated all licence types except restaurants and cafes. One board also thought the restrictions should apply to new sports clubs and Working Men's clubs.

The Waihoru Spreydon-Cashmere-Heathcote Community Board understood the intent of such a policy but noted the practical challenges of implementation, urging further investigation into how it might realistically be enforced.

Mana Whenua feedback

Ngā Hau e Whā National Marae (Te Rūnanga o Nga Maata Waka) strongly supported the Council's proposal to restrict how close some new licensed venues and outlets could be located to all listed community facilities. When asked which licensed outlets or venues should be restricted, they stated that bottle stores, nightclubs, and pubs/taverns should not be within 200 meters of any of the listed community facilities.

Statutory Consultee feedback

New Zealand Police strongly supported and saw value in this option, recommending that it be applied to schools and addiction/rehabilitation treatment services. They also recommended that the proposed restriction apply to many off-licence types. Additionally, they commented that concerns about the visibility of alcohol advertising to children could be addressed through existing licence conditions for on-licensed venues.

Te Whatu Ora (NPHS Te Waipounamu) supported restricting new licensed venues and outlets from being located within 100 meters of sensitive sites. They stated that sensitive sites should include early childhood centres, primary and secondary schools, addiction/rehabilitation facilities, hospitals, marae, and places of worship, and recommended that Kura Kaupapa and Kōhanga Reo be included in the definitions of early childhood centres and primary and secondary schools. They also recommended applying a restriction to recreation facilities, including community facilities, playgrounds, parks, and reserves, noting that the inclusion of parks as sensitive sites may also support alcohol control bylaws applied to these facilities.

The CCC Alcohol Licensing Team expressed strong support for restrictions on the proximity of new licensed bottle stores, nightclubs, pubs/taverns, and Working Men's clubs to all listed community facilities in the survey. They stated that 200 meters should be the minimum distance and noted that for some community facilities, 500 meters might be more appropriate.

Licensed industry representatives' feedback

Hospitality NZ stated that this option should not have been included in a draft policy, noting staff advised that it might have 'limited impact on reducing alcohol-related harm' in reporting. Furthermore, they were concerned that there were no explicit assurances made that this option would not have impacted existing outlets and venues' license renewals or venues and outlets that

changed ownership, as they were for the temporary freeze option. Hospitality NZ suggested 'grandfathering' existing licenses to ensure venues currently in place were not impacted and allowed those licenses to be transferred to the new owner of an existing venue.

The Restaurant Association of New Zealand stated that any proximity restrictions should be considered on a case-by-case basis, in particular taking into account the type of licence being applied for (e.g., a Class 3 Restaurant on-licence vs bottle store off-licence), and how long a business had been operating (e.g., if an ECE or school decide to open near a licensed venue, knowing they would be near a licensed venue, the licensee should not be penalised when they came to renew their licence).

Superliqour Holdings Ltd requested that to protect the goodwill of existing businesses, existing businesses holding licenses should be exempt from the proximity restriction, to ensure that if a business was sold or changed ownership with the same 'use', it is not deemed a new licence.

4. Introduce one-way door restrictions

Just over half of respondents (52%) agreed that the Council should implement a one-way door restriction across the city, compared with 39% who disagree. When broken down by liquor licence type, those who do not hold a license agreed the most (53%), compared with 24% of on-licence holders. Of the respondents who supported a one-way door restriction, (72%) considered 1am an appropriate time, followed by 2am (23%).

What the community told us:

The majority of respondents (52%) agreed that Council should implement a one-way door restriction across the city, compared with 39% who disagreed (*Table 4.1*).

Table 4.1: Do you think we should include a one-way door restriction across the city?		
Total number of responses: 3475		
Response	Count	%
Yes	1808	52%
No	1339	39%
Don't know	328	9%

Among different licence holders (*Table 4.2*), 24% of on-licence holders agreed with the restriction, while 66% disagreed and 10% were unsure. For off-licence holders, 33% supported the restriction, 47% opposed it, and 20% were undecided. Club licence holders showed 42% in favour, 32% against, and 26% uncertain. Non-licence holders had the highest agreement rate at 53%, with 38% disagreeing and 9% unsure.

Table 4.2: Do you think we should include a one-way door restriction across the city?						
Total number of responses: 3,500*						
Licence Type	Yes		No		Don't know	
I hold an on-licence	19	24%	53	66%	8	10%
I hold an off-licence	26	33%	37	47%	16	20%
I hold a club licence	8	42%	6	32%	5	26%
I do not hold a liquor licence	1,758	53%	1,254	38%	307	9%

*Respondents may hold an on and an off licence

Generally respondents indicated that they consider 1am is an appropriate time for a one-way door restriction to be in place (72%), while 23% of respondents thought that 2am would be appropriate.

Table 4.3: If a one-way door restriction was introduced, what time do you think it should be in place?

Total number of responses: 1,806

Response	Count	%
1am	1,303	72%
2am	416	23%
3am	73	4%
4am	14	1%

Feedback on time options

Feedback from respondents highlighted varying opinions on the best time for a one-way door policy to come into place. Many respondents suggested implementing the policy earlier than 1 AM, with some proposing times as early as 11 PM or midnight. They believed that earlier restrictions would help reduce street noise, control customer behaviour, and prevent drunk individuals from moving between venues. Some respondents also mentioned that earlier restrictions could help re-educate people towards lowering or stopping alcohol consumption.

As the results in *Table 4.3* shows, many respondents agreed with the 1 AM time, stating that it is a reasonable balance between allowing nightlife to continue and reducing harm. They noted that most trouble occurs after 1 AM, and by this time, patrons are usually already intoxicated. A few respondents felt that 1 AM might be too early and suggested applying the policy later, such as 2 AM, arguing that this would still allow for a vibrant nightlife while reducing the risks associated with late-night drinking. Overall, the consensus leaned towards implementing the one-way door policy at or before 1 AM to mitigate alcohol-related harm and disturbances.

Why do you/don't you think a one-way door restriction should be applied to on-licensed venues?

1,667 respondents provided feedback on why they support or oppose a one-way door restriction. An overview of the key themes and messages is provided below. Generally the feedback highlighted that respondents felt we need to take a balanced approach, consider safety and the reduction of alcohol-related harm and balance it with the impacts that such a policy would have on the nighttime economy.

Freedom of choice and personal responsibility

Many respondents were concerned that a one-way door restriction would limit freedom of choice and take away individuals' responsibility for their behaviour. These respondents tended to indicate that they see a one-way door restriction as being overly restrictive and controlling, and that individuals should have the right to move between venues.

"If you can be in one venue and served alcohol then why can you not go elsewhere to do that."

Impacts on business, nighttime economy and nightlife

Respondents who opposed a one-way door restriction highlighted concerns about the impact that it would have on the nighttime economy and nightlife in the city. They expressed concerns that it would harm the vibrancy of Christchurch at night and have significant negative effects on the nighttime economy. Business owners expressed concerns about revenue loss, highlighting that in some cases businesses would no longer be viable. They emphasised that Christchurch is a *city* and should have a vibrant nightlife that reflects this.

“Night clubs and pubs require people to come and go, it’s a part of the night culture”

“You potentially stopping those businesses from making a living as they can only have so many people enter. It’s up to them to decide if someone needs to leave.”

Case-by-case or consistency

There were concerns that applying a one-size-fits-all approach would not address the diverse needs and challenges of different establishments. Many viewed a blanket approach as harmful to business, particularly those that are already well managed, and could lead to reduced revenue, decreased patronage and in some cases the closure of venues, even when operators are already actively working to reduce alcohol-related harm in their venues. Some suggested that a more tailored approach would be appropriate, addressing specific issues with some venues, without imposing unnecessary restrictions across all venues.

“A one-way door restriction may help in certain high-risk areas but should not be applied across all on-licensed venues. Well-managed businesses that already enforce responsible service and security measures should not be penalized with blanket restrictions. Instead, a targeted approach—focusing on problem venues or entertainment districts with high alcohol-related harm—would be more effective. Case-by-case decisions allow flexibility while maintaining public safety.”

On the other hand, those who indicated support for a one-way door restriction were supportive of consistent rules for all venues, noting that if all venues have to follow the same rules, it is easier to enforce regulations and avoid confusion.

“A blanket one way door policy would be easier to administer if it was set at midnight for all establishments within the city. “

Supervised environments

Those who supported a one-way door restriction highlighted that less harm occurs in venues where intoxicated people are actively supervised and managed, and that a one-way door restriction would support this. They argued that it is easy to monitor consumption and behaviour when patrons are kept in a single venue. These respondents often linked addressing alcohol-related harm to a one-way door restriction, suggesting that it would help to reduce the violence that can occur when intoxicated people are not in controlled environments.

Overall, respondents who provided written feedback generally agreed that consuming alcohol in a controlled, supervised environment is preferable. However, opinions differed on whether a one-way door restriction would effectively achieve this.

“It allows staff (including security staff) to maintain a safer environment for patrons to enjoy themselves. After a certain hour it also reduces the likelihood of 'group' related trouble where alcohol is a factor, by reducing the number of people who can enter at one time. This policy allows for a maximum number of people in a venue at any one time with better crowd control.”

Effectiveness in reducing alcohol-related harm

Many of the comments from those who supported a one-way door restriction emphasised that the objective of an LAP is to reduce alcohol-related harm, and expressed a view that limiting movement between licensed venues and bar hopping late at night would likely lead to a decrease in alcohol-related harm. Many of these respondents told us that keeping people in one venue after a certain time, where their alcohol consumption is consistently monitored in a safe environment is to lead to a reduction of excessive drinking and associated risk such as accidents, violence, and other harmful behaviours. Some also felt that it could help to reduce some of the environmental impacts of bar hopping, including vandalism, litter, and noise disturbances. Some mentioned the need to reduce the burden alcohol-related harm currently puts on police, ambulance and hospital services, leaving them with more time and capacity to focus on other critical incidents and issues.

“At the time of night being proposed, intake levels of alcohol can be pretty high, and potential for alcohol-related harm and damage is high. Good to at least try to supervise and limit additional alcohol intake.”

“Also easier for door staff who don’t have to deal with drunk abusive people that they decline entry.”

On the other hand, many of those who indicated that they do not support one-way door restrictions questioned their effectiveness and highlighted that there is mixed or little evidence that they reduce alcohol-related harm. Some respondents also told us that one-way door restrictions could have the opposite effect and lead to more harm. These respondents expressed concerns that a one-way door restriction may push intoxicated individuals into the streets and public spaces, where they are unsupervised and more vulnerable to harm. Others expressed concerns about groups of friends getting separated, leading to safety concerns, especially for vulnerable individuals such as women. There were some suggestions that implementing a one-way door restriction may lead to unintended consequences, including frustrated patrons, increased public disorder, large groups of intoxicated people congregating on the streets and in other public spaces, and more street fights.

“Because then if you limit the patrons to a certain club/pub, others will either take up the excess and everyone will still be drinking anyway or large crowds will be put out on the street and this could create fighting and or violence. Which is way worse.”

Community boards’ feedback

The Waitai Coastal-Burwood-Linwood Community Board did not support a one-way door restriction at on-licensed venues stating that evidence of effectiveness is inconsistent and that the focus should be on off-licenses to reduce pre, post and side loading.

The Waipapa Papanui-Innes-Central and Waipuna Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Boards were unsure stating they would like to understand if it would make a real difference in reducing

alcohol-related harm and that there may be reasons to visit or revisit venues within a single night that are not related to purchasing alcohol, for example for groups of people who have separated over the course of a night to meet at a single venue to travel home together.

The Waihoru Spreydon-Cashmere-Heathcote Community Board also queried whether there would be unintended consequences such as loitering outside venues or overcrowding encouraging Council to consider further how to mitigate unintended effects.

The Waipuna Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board also suggested considering a cut off period for alcohol sales at on-licensed venues prior to closing time instead.

Mana Whenua feedback

Ngā Hau e Whā National Marae (Te Rūnanga o Nga Maata Waka) supported the introduction of a one way door policy from 2am.

Statutory Consultee feedback

New Zealand Police stated they did not seek a one-way door policy to be included in a Local Alcohol Policy. Police commented that the majority of people loitering outside bars in public spaces late at night was a result of being refused entry to licensed venues. They did not view a one-way door policy as helping to reduce these occurrences.

However, Police wanted to ensure any Council decision to not include one-way-door restrictions in a LAP did not 'wipe out' existing one-way-door restrictions in force, and was not interpreted as a direction to the District Licensing Committee (DLC) to no longer impose any further one-way-door restrictions in the district (which the DLC could do, and do, on a case-by-case basis already).

Te Whatu Ora (NPHS Te Waipounamu) supported the introduction of a one-way door restriction, citing that it could help prevent a large number of people coming out of licensed premises at the same time and the potential for intoxicated patrons migrating between venues or interacting with others with an increased likelihood of disorder and crime. They also noted that it might help reduce the burden on Police, ambulance, and hospital services.

Te Whatu Ora (NPHS Te Waipounamu) also suggested Council consider reducing trading hours for on-licensed venues in addition to a one-way door restriction, as a reduction of hours could lead to fewer physical harms, including assaults, injuries, and vehicle crashes. They also noted there was more evidence that a reduction of hours for on-licensed venues was effective in comparison to one-way door restrictions.

The CCC Alcohol Licensing Team indicated support for including a one-way door restriction at 2am. They stated putting a restriction in place one to two hours before a venue closed would help reduce alcohol-related incidents occurring, and help licensed premises control and manage people within their venues.

Licensed industry representatives' feedback

Hospitality NZ noted that one-way door policies had been repeatedly attempted in overseas jurisdictions and in New Zealand over the previous 15 years, viewing them as largely rejected because they did not work and had been found to increase behavioural problems, particularly through separating groups and resulting in congregating of crowds outside closing venues rather

than natural dispersion. They viewed one-way door policies as a hamper to Christchurch's vision to be a 'vibrant city' rather than helping to bolster that vision.

The Restaurant Association of New Zealand did not support the inclusion of a one-way door policy, stating that there was no conclusive evidence that the use of one-way door policies worked to reduce harm.

5. Other mechanisms

Respondents were given the opportunity to provide alternative suggestions to the five possible options for conditions and rules that a LAP could consider.

Are there any other mechanisms you think Council should consider developing instead of or in addition to a LAP to help reduce alcohol related harm?

1,408 respondents provided feedback on other mechanisms Council should consider developing instead of or in addition to a LAP to help reduce alcohol-related harm. An overview of the key themes and messages is provided below.

Increased enforcement of existing regulations

Many respondents felt that current laws, rules and regulations relating to alcohol sales and consumption were sufficient but were not being adequately enforced by those responsible for doing so, including the Police and the Council. Some respondents wanted to see greater Police visibility and presence around places where people are drinking, particularly during times of increased activity.

“There are already plenty of regulations to control how alcohol is purchased and consumed. Start enforcing them.”

Consequences for individuals and businesses contributing to harm

Harsher penalties and fines for public intoxication and/or antisocial and criminal behaviour related to alcohol were wanted by many respondents. Some suggested such behaviour could result in bans from certain premises or referrals to social agencies for treatment. Others wanted harsher penalties for irresponsible businesses breaking the law and/or breaching conditions of their alcohol licence, with some suggesting temporary or permanent closure when this occurred.

“Greater penalties more quickly enacted for venues, premises or outlets who break the rules. Maybe three strikes & your no longer considered a fit person to retail alcohol in any form from any site.”

Lobbying government

Some respondents thought that Council’s role in reducing alcohol harm should focus on lobbying central government to effect change on alcohol-related issues relating to pricing, licensing, advertising, accessibility (including online purchases and delivery services), policing and justice, funding for education and support, and/or increasing the legal drinking age.

“What is really needed is nation-wide mechanisms, and I would suggest Council use such influence as it has to lobby for higher excise duties on alcohol and harsher penalties for public drunkenness.”

Licensing conditions

Some respondents felt that alcohol harm could be addressed through the licensing process. Suggestions included imposing specific conditions in certain instances, additional training requirements for licence holders, improved vetting of licence holders and applicants, and making it more onerous to renew a licence.

“Better scrutiny on license holders that are dubious somehow.”

“But, granting new or renewed licenses could be made more difficult (it appears to be almost automatic to grant) and pay more attention to what health/medical experts and Police, as well as member of the community say.”

Increasing the price of alcohol

Increasing the price of alcohol was frequently mentioned as a potential regulatory tool to deter people from harmful drinking and/or to raise additional taxes so help offset the societal costs of alcohol harm. Some respondents felt that alcohol was generally too cheap and that there was often a discrepancy in price between alcohol purchased from an off-licence premise compared to an on-licence premise, which encouraged unhealthy consumption patterns. Respondents generally wanted alcohol to be more expensive at off-licences or cheaper at on-licences.

“Put a small tax on alcohol and use the money to pay for social programmes and effective rehab/therapy for people who need it.”

“Drinking at bars and restaurants responsibly should be encouraged and be continued to be accessible and not out priced with taxes and restrictions. Bulk consumption at home needs addressing with regard to access and price.”

Zoning and alcohol-free areas

Some respondents thought that Council zoning, planning rules and bylaws could address alcohol harm by defining where alcohol-related activities could be permitted in the city.

“Consider some restriction on the placement and density of licensed premises in future consenting and town planning. It is much easier to prevent harmful situations from developing in the first place than to deal with harmful venues after they have been built.”

There was a desire by some respondents for more alcohol ban areas, particularly in suburban areas, although a smaller number of respondents did not think the current ban areas were effective in reducing alcohol-related harm and were not well enforced. Some respondents also wanted Council to support more alcohol-free events.

“I live within an alcohol free zone, it is not enforced and frequently experience very drunk students drinking while walking in public causing disturbances and litter. There is no signage on any street near me despite being well within the zone.”

Limiting advertising

Widespread alcohol advertising was seen as problematic by some respondents. Restricting or even banning the advertising of alcohol products was suggested as a way of reducing harm. This ranged from a total ban on alcohol advertising, to restricting advertising to certain locations, events and/or audiences. Billboards were commonly mentioned as a form of advertising that could be limited or banned, and excessive signage and branding schemes related to off-licences was viewed as harmful.

“Limit the advertising of alcohol on Tv, sports activities and venues, billboards, etc. maybe add more tax to it.”

“Let's campaign and work together to oppose the marketing and acceptance of alcohol consumption. Sounds a bit radical perhaps, but it clearly caused damage in my own life.”

Some respondents would also like to see restrictions around sponsorship and promotions involving alcohol products, particularly in relation to sporting events.

Restricting the number of new alcohol outlets

Some respondents would like to see a reduction in licence numbers throughout the city that goes further than the two proposed options of a temporary freeze in areas of high deprivation and restricting new outlets close to sensitive community facilities. Some would like reductions to be applied city-wide, and others would like to see a sinking lid policy introduced, where the number of places that people could buy alcohol from would gradually reduce. This was generally mentioned in relation to bottle stores or off-licences in general. Others thought that numbers could be capped in relation to population size or suburb.

“Reduce the number of off licenses. There are far too many of them everywhere across the city.”

“When approving licenses to sell alcohol to bottle stores first consider how many others are within the 1 km radius before issuing. We have 2 bottle stores, 1 supermarket and two pubs all within a 1 km radius in Belfast and that is already too much.”

Improved host responsibility

Alcohol consumption at on-licence venues was generally thought to be a safer and more controlled drinking environment than consumption in private locations, although many respondents made suggestions for how on-licences could manage alcohol harm more effectively.

There was a sense that too many premises were getting away with allowing intoxicated or underage drinkers in, with respondents saying greater penalties were needed to deter this.

Many respondents thought that there should be a greater onus on venues to provide safe drinking spaces with cheaper non-alcoholic drinks or food options. They felt both security staff and bar staff should be better trained and more vigilant about recognising and dealing with signs of intoxication.

“venues actually taking more responsibility for intoxication, & not only noticing once someone is already intoxicated but identifying warning signs earlier on & taking action to prevent high levels of intoxication. some venues don't seem to follow the rules, there focus is on making money not on the wellbeing of their customers. More inspectors doing random visits to venues would be worthwhile.”

While some respondents thought that intoxicated customers should be removed from the premises, others thought that the venues had a duty to care for them by providing food, water and/or helping them get home safely.

“Venues to take responsibility for over intoxicated persons on their premises, i.e. sitting them down with water rather than making them leave.”

Some respondents thought that the use of breathalysers should be encouraged in bars either before entry or to assess patrons who are suspected of being intoxicated, citing examples of use in other cities.

“Implement breath testers as a norm in all licenced establishments as a mandatory for clientele suspected of being intoxicated. A lot of places here in Adelaide already do this and it works flawlessly.”

Type of alcohol available for consumption

The type and strength of alcohol was commonly mentioned as contributing to alcohol-related harm, and some respondents would like to see some restrictions around the types of beverages available, their alcohol content and/or the serve size. Views ranged from a total ban on certain types of alcohol products (such as RTDs or single serve) to only zero or low percent alcohol being sold at certain times or places. A few respondents were concerned about some types of alcohol being sold in glass bottles at off-licences and in glassware at on-licences due to litter in the streets and ‘glassing’ injuries respectively, and suggested alternative types of materials.

“Limit the alcoholic strength of beverages after a certain hour.”

“Consider the material alcohol is sold in, i.e. glass bottles versus cans etc. Glass bottles are used as weapons. Glass bottles get deliberately smashed on cycleways and roads, causing damage to bicycle tyres and tubes.”

Additionally, some respondents were concerned about the widespread availability and normalisation of alcohol in supermarkets and would like to see such sales banned completely, as is the case in much of Australia.

“Currently you can pick up a bottle of alcohol to pop into your shopping trolley as easy as you can a pick up a pack of chewing gum. There isn't any need for that.”

Culture change and more education and support

Many respondents mentioned the role of alcohol in society and how normalised it has become, reminding us that alcohol is a widely available drug. They argued that we must change our attitudes to drinking and address the causes of harmful drinking. Some respondents would like to see more education and support programmes offered to address this, with Council potentially playing a role through funding or running them. Others would like more support available for mental health services and/or addiction and rehabilitation centres.

“I think it is worth the council considering more about developing education programs and tools about alcohol harm.”

“better education in the schools. more help for hopeless cases of alcoholism. better funding of organisations helping addicted people.”

Greater collaboration with communities

Some respondents wanted us to work more closely with affected communities, giving them more opportunities to voice how they are or might be impacted by alcohol harm. In particular, they wanted greater weighting to be given to community opposition in relation to new licence applications.

“Look at ways of assisting the community to make excessive drinking less socially acceptable. Deal with the problem rather than the symptom this way. Look at who is most likely to drink excessively

and who are their influencers. Can their influencers be convinced excessive drinking is an issue and should be discouraged?”

“The licencing committee listening more to the pleas of local organisations and schools of the harm that alcohol does in their community.”

No restrictions

Respondents opposed to a LAP or the introduction of any new restrictions felt that the majority of people drink responsibly and that they should not be penalised or inconvenienced due to other people's harmful drinking. Some told us that people will still find a way to access alcohol regardless of Council interventions.

“The majority of people do the right thing and their choice to buy alcohol later in the evening should not be taken away because of a minority group.”

“Restricting access to the 'deprived' wont 'cure' the issue. You will just make them travel further.”

Some felt that Council should not be introducing restrictions relating to operating times and/or location. Others thought that Council should be focussing on other city-wide priorities rather than addressing alcohol harm. Some respondents were concerned about the potential impact of restrictions on the city's nightlife, live music scene, vibrancy and economy.

“The council should stay out of people's lives, we have laws, the country needs to go back to personal responsibility with harsh penalties.”

“I'm finding it difficult to believe that in 2025 you are trying to implement a policy restricting something that is legal to save people from themselves. Yes alcohol causes harm, but people need to take responsibility for their own actions. I don't drink nor do I smoke because they are harmful. But I am extremely concerned that a blanket LAP that includes Lyttelton will destroy our vibrant, after hours community.”

“Yes I think the CCC need to stop with the interference and meddling ... These types of policies are always written to appeal to everyone and seem reasonable until you consider how they will work, how will they be enforced and interpreted, and the real life impacts of a seemingly reasonable policy which wants to stop bottle stores adjacent to a preschool.”

Feedback from Community Boards

The Waitai Coastal-Burwood-Linwood Community Board suggested considering;

- an alcohol ban around Eastgate,
- a targeted rate on off-licences to pay full cost of enforcement and monitoring,
- District Plan restrictions on external advertising of alcoholic products.

Feedback from Statutory Consultees and licensed industry representatives

Te Whatu Ora (NPHS Te Waipounamu) support the Christchurch Alcohol Harm Partnership group and see them as playing a role in supporting initiatives that fall outside of a Local Alcohol Policy.

CCC Alcohol Licensing Team representative recommended Council also consider use of Alcohol Accords around specific areas such as the inner city or areas where there is a high concentration of licensed premises.

Hospitality NZ would like to see a holistic approach taken to support safer drinking in New Zealand and see well-managed on-premise environments as part of the solution. They stated Council have a number of mechanisms that could be continually supported or created noting;

- National settings under the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act.
- District Licensing Committees and their discretion around approving licenses, and the ability to issue infringement notices and license suspensions for noncompliance.
- Accords and stakeholder agreements to drive inner city safety improvements.
- Host responsibility and Sexual Harm Prevention training: eg Responsible Service of Alcohol (HNZ), Servewise (HPA), Don't Guess the Yes (RespectED).
- Inner city safety initiatives including design, lighting, public transport, cameras and safe zones for vulnerable people.
- Updating the expired Alcohol Action Plan 2021 before any LAP is drafted.

Restaurant Association of New Zealand suggested that Council consider adopting a third-party accreditation programme such as HospoCred to streamline application and renewal processes for hospitality businesses. They state it could be utilised in conjunction with current council processes: by checking whether any complaints or infringements have been recorded against an applicant in the Council's own database, and then utilise the comprehensive vetting and benchmarking offered by the HospoCred accreditation programme, Council could streamline workflows, reduce costs, and build stronger partnerships with the hospitality industry.

Feedback on other conditions or restrictions that could be considered

Some Community Boards and Statutory Consultees recommended the following policies be considered for inclusion in a draft policy.

Waipapa Papanui-Innes-Central Community Board;

- A limit and/or restriction on alcohol advertisements and signage. Noting excessive alcohol-related signage and bright colours outside licensed premises expose all members of the community to an unacceptable level of advertising for alcohol, and thus to alcohol-related harm.

New Zealand Police

- Additional provision under reduced trading hours for off-licenses that specifically restricts the same day delivery of alcohol after 7pm (unless they are endorsed under Section 40) to mitigate the ambiguity around the ability to deliver alcohol from off licences outside of trading hours. Many off-licence bottle store operators believe that, because they offer a delivery service they can be viewed as remote sellers – and therefore continue to trade after their licensed hours have ended solely for delivery sales. The Police view is that it is not the case as the off-licence bottle store operators do not have the relevant endorsement under Section 40 as 'remote sellers'.

- Blanket restriction on the sale and supply of alcohol after 3am for all on-licenses in the Central City to mitigate how to define nightclubs/ entertainment venues. The provision for “Entertainment Venues” in the Sale of Liquor Act 1989 did not transfer to the Sale & Supply of Alcohol Act 2012, so has become a grey area as the Act does not specifically address how ‘Entertainment venues’ should be categorised. Providing a blanket maximum trading hour restriction of 3am would mean entertainment premises could still remain open after that time, but not sell alcohol and ensure a ‘level playing field’ for all Central City on-licensees.
- Discretionary condition requirement for licensed outlets and venues to provide CCTV footage (filmed at the premise) to Police on request in order to help with investigations,
- Condition with maximum drink serve limits of two drinks per serve per person for special licensed events such as those held at Hagley Park audiences of 5,000 or more.

Te Whatu Ora (NPHS Te Waipounamu);

- Prevention of new licensed premises being located in close proximity of other licensed premises. The stated that setting a distance rule would address the harm with clustering of premises. As example, this measure could prevent off-licensed premises from being established within 50 or 100 metres of an existing off-licensed premises.
- Restrict alcohol advertising and signage at licensed premises. Sighting research has found there is a causal relationship between alcohol marketing and drinking among young people and their exposure to alcohol advertising is associated with earlier uptake of drinking and heavy drinking among adolescents who already drink.
- Prohibit the use of ‘buy now, pay later’ (BNPL) services at licensed premises. Noting these services increase the economic accessibility of alcohol and may lead to increased alcohol use and harm, as well as financial hardship for vulnerable populations.
- A condition with maximum drink serve limits of two drinks per serve per person for special licensed events. Stating control of the number of serves per person at an event is an effective tool in controlling the risk of intoxication at events.

CCC Alcohol Licensing Team

- Set a specific delay requirement between an online order being received and delivery of the order at 2hours preventing people from quickly topping up alcohol supplies.
- That off-licensed outlets who cater for remote sales must stop filling remote sales orders at the time their premise closes (street front doors) for example at 9pm. Remote sales and off licenses are the biggest area of concern for the Alcohol Licensing Team and should be a focus of a draft policy.
- That no new bottle stores can be established within 1km of another bottle store.

Superliquor Holdings Ltd

- Request that a Local Alcohol Policy **does not** contain any discretionary conditions so to avoid risk of creating an unlevel playing field.

Restaurant Association of New Zealand

- Request that a Local Alcohol Policy **does not** include a discretionary condition whereby the District Licencing Committee and ARLA are recommended to consider imposing conditions

that specify a minimum number of certified managers be present onsite, if appropriate for large capacity premises at peak times as other councils have/are considering. Noting that the condition fails to recognise the current cost and administrative burden associated with becoming a licensed manager, with those barriers often imposed by the District Licensing Committee and ARLA themselves. They view that a reform of restrictions around who can hold a manager's license would need occur first so that an appropriately certified workforce would become available.

Waipuna Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board

- Uniform ending time for alcohol sales for all similar types of licensed venue and outlets within the same area,
- Investigating setting a minimum price per alcohol unit,
- A 'sinking lid' approach to existing off-licensed outlets in high deprivation areas.

6. Other feedback

Respondents were given an opportunity to give further open-ended feedback about the development of a LAP.

Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the development of a Local Alcohol Policy?

960 respondents provided further feedback on aspects about the development of a Local Alcohol Policy. Much of this reiterated some of the key themes already mentioned throughout this report.

Mixed support for the options

Some respondents wholeheartedly agreed the proposed options and the overall intent behind them. Some respondents expressed agreement with some options but not all of them. Supporters generally felt that the proposed options would help to reduce alcohol-related harm in the city.

"Many, many thanks for considering this plan. I am very grateful. It shows responsible governance."

"I work in the drug and addiction space. The number 1 addiction is alcohol because it is accessible and acceptable. This would address some of the accessibility issues. Good on you for taking this step to shape a healthier environment for all."

Other respondents were vehemently opposed to all or some of the options proposed and told us that there could be unintended consequences of restrictions, restrictions would not be effective in reducing alcohol harm, or they would impede on individuals' choices around accessing alcohol.

"Don't bother. A waste of money. Spend it elsewhere on positive education and save ratepayers having to pay for unnecessary hearings etc. Current system seems to be satisfactory for the silent majority."

"Rules should be more relaxed not stricter. Alcohol is legal and the council changing these rules is a bad idea."

Regardless of their position, many indicated that they were happy to have had the opportunity to provide feedback and help shape the development of a draft LAP.

Finding a balance

Striking a balance between addressing alcohol related harm and having a city that is vibrant and lively was a strong theme amongst respondents. Some warned about unintended consequences of any blanket restrictions, particularly in relating to earlier closing times, fearing that the city would become boring or businesses would be economically impacted. Some feared for the ongoing viability of the live music scene if closing times were too early.

“You need to strike a balance between a vibrant and fun city vs alcohol harm.”

“It should balance the needs of business owners and residents/visitors against the select few patrons who contribute to alcohol harm and violence.”

Tensions between community and business interests

Many respondents implored us not to prioritise those in the alcohol industry ahead of community wellbeing and safety. These people were concerned about protecting communities and vulnerable members of society (including children) from alcohol harm. Some told us that they felt the previous LAP development process (paused in 2017) was derailed by industry influence and well-resourced legal challenges and did not want to see this happen again. Others told us that we should be working with licence holders to reduce alcohol harm.

“The principle must be that the policy protect community well-being. If vendors complain, point out to them risks are a normal part of being in business. They should absorb the risk associated with selling a product known to cause harm; not the community bear risks associated with increased alcohol availability.”

“Don't be swayed by the alcohol sellers like last time this came up.”

Across the board vs case-by-case

There were mixed feelings about how some of the proposed options should be implemented throughout the city. Some respondents felt that any LAP conditions should be applied consistently across the city so that all operators and licence holders were equally affected, while others thought that a blanket approach was not feasible and restrictions should apply on a case-by-case basis. Some respondents wanted to see approaches that were based on research and evidence.

“As a licensee, I am in favour of an LAP which offers a fair and level playing field for everyone. If all off premise licences are treated the same, then we have a level and fair playing field and restricting hours would be OK. We do need to be mindful that pulling back hours too much does have an impact of jobs of staff who work until 10 or 11pm though.”

“no doubt there will be some special cases rather than one size fits all.”

“This needs to be evidence-based and focus on creating policy that is not morally motivated.”

Central City

Respondents had mixed views about how the central city should be treated. Some thought that the central city should not be subject to further restrictions as these could curb the vitality and

vibrancy of the city's main hospitality precinct and harm the local economy. They also felt that issues in the central city were different to issues elsewhere in the city. Others reminded us that there were residential areas in close proximity to hospitality hotspots within the central city, including the stadium, and that these residents should be considered in the development of a LAP.

"The inner city cannot have 1 blanket LAP as some areas, such as near Victoria Street, are residential dominated so need to be treated quite differently from the areas such as Oxford Terrace etc."

"I think it is silly closing the central city all at the same time, let people slowly leave town and not have them leaving at the same time."

"I think this questionnaire has lumped Christchurch's central city nightlife in with community harm. You have some valid points around tightening availability in vulnerable communities, but will kill night life in Christchurch if you can't untangle these two (very different) conversations."

Protecting vulnerable members of society

Respondents were keen for us to hear about the damaging effects of alcohol in society, particularly the impacts on children, families and other victims of alcohol misuse. They supported measures to restrict access to alcohol, especially in relation to off-licence purchases and consumption in private settings.

"I was raised by an alcoholic, and I have seen many friends grow up under similar circumstances, witnessing firsthand the harm alcoholism inflicts on families and communities. Now, as these individuals age, I am also seeing the severe health impacts of alcoholism."

"I enjoy a drink now and then but as a teacher I see first hand the effects of excessive alcohol consumption, both in terms of family violence and harm, and health. When I have to deal with educating a child who has foetal alcohol syndrome, I assure you my heart breaks."

Others noted that alcohol was often one contributing factor to societal harm in communities, and should not be viewed in isolation from other 'environmental bads' such as vape and tobacco retailers, gambling outlets, and fast food outlets. There was a sense by some respondents that some communities were more exposed to multiple risk factors than others, and that Council should be doing more to help these communities and work towards healthier environments.

"A good LAP needs to take a number of other factors into account. In some areas, the availability of alcohol is also linked to fast food outlets and vape shops. These policies need to align and not be fragmented, otherwise families are still bombarded with an excess of these in combination i.e. Linwood/Eastgate intersection."

"Alcohol abuse is also observed linked to drug and tobacco addictions. There is no place for addictions to harmful substances in our communities. Unfortunately with poor policy, families and vulnerable people are affected. Less talk and more action please!!!!"

Education and support

Changing our attitudes towards drinking and reassessing our tolerance for alcohol-related harm in the community were seen as important steps to reducing alcohol-related harm. Some respondents would like to see more funding and support given to education programmes and campaigns

highlighting the risks involved with alcohol use. Others would like more funding and support given to addiction and rehabilitation services.

“The issue is people noticing why they reach for alcohol. Increasing education around managing life stresses in a healthy way without alcohol and then drinking responsibly are two additional ways we can address alcohol related harm.”

“Fortunately attitudes appear to be changing from the recent drinking culture but every effort should be made to restrict sales and to educate about its potentially harmful consequences. Limiting availability is but one step.”

“...funding mental health and rehabilitation programs should be the priority.”

Other regulatory measures that central government and/or Council could address

Respondents reiterated that alcohol harm could be reduced through legislative or regulatory means. Key suggestions included: restricting or banning alcohol advertising, marketing and sponsorship; increasing the drinking age; increasing the price of alcohol; restricting or banning certain types of alcoholic beverages; restricting or banning alcohol sales at supermarkets; restricting or banning remote/online purchases and deliveries; making changes to the alcohol licensing process; increasing enforcement of licensee obligations, with greater penalties for breaches; and increasing policing of businesses and intoxicated individuals.

“Concentrate on reducing the supply of cheap alcohol from bottle stores / supermarkets etc as this is what causes most harm.”

“Most effective mechanisms seem to be raising minimum age and surcharge to make alcohol more expensive, but realise Council has no authority over that. But, granting new or renewed licenses could be made more difficult (it appears to be almost automatic to grant) and pay more attention to what health/medical experts and Police, as well as member of the community say.”

Examples in other cities and countries

Some respondents wanted us to be aware of and/or follow what other cities and countries are doing to address alcohol related harm, including Auckland Council's recent LAP. Some highlighted different cultural attitudes to drinking, some pointed out the success of more restrictive approaches, while others noted that overly restrictive approaches can have adverse effects.

“Having travelled internationally and seeing how other countries treat drinking and alcohol availability, it's become apparent New Zealand's methods are incredibly heavy-handed and often exacerbate the very problems they're aimed at fixing.”

“Do you know why Melbourne is one of the coolest cities on the planet? Because they made it really easy and cheap for small venues to obtain liquor licenses, leading to a thriving hospitality economy and vibrant nightlife. What kind of a city do you want to live in? One that's dead by 9pm? Mission accomplished, Council.”

“In Sydney, some have observed that rigid restrictions have led to a less lively and diverse night-time scene.”

LAP Pre Engagement

Q1.1 The Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act allows councils to develop local alcohol policies that set out rules and conditions about how alcohol is sold and supplied in their districts. If a council has a Local Alcohol Policy (LAP), licensing bodies must consider it when making decisions about alcohol licensing applications.

The purpose of a LAP is to help ensure that the sale, supply and consumption of alcohol is undertaken safely and responsibly, and to minimise alcohol-related harm. A LAP can set policies that restrict the number, location, and opening hours of licensed premises, such as bars, cafes and restaurants, supermarkets and bottle stores. The policies in a LAP can apply across either the whole city and district or only in identified local areas.

We're testing some ideas that could be included in a draft Local Alcohol Policy for Christchurch and Banks Peninsula. Give us your feedback here by 11pm Sunday 9 March 2025, or find out more about the project.

Q1.2 We welcome constructive feedback, but abuse is not OK. Our communities and your opinions are important to us. So is the welfare of our staff. Please treat everyone with respect.

Q1.3 We require your contact details as part of your feedback – it also means we can keep you updated throughout the process. Please only provide your feedback once. We are able to identify where an individual has provided feedback multiple times and will remove these from the analysis.

Q1.4 Your details

☐ First Name *(Required)* _____

☐ Last Name _____

☐ Email Address *(Required)* _____

Q1.5 Are you submitting on behalf of a recognised organisation?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Q1.6 Please tell us about the organisation that you are submitting on behalf of.

☐ Organisation Name *(Required)*

☐ Postal Address or Web Address *(Required)*

☐ Your role in the organisation

☐ Approximately how many people or businesses does your organisation represent?

Q1.7 Where do you live?

☐ I live in Christchurch (including Banks Peninsula)

☐ I live elsewhere in Canterbury (e.g. Rolleston, Lincoln, Rangiora, Kaiapoi)

☐ I don't live in Christchurch or Canterbury, I live in...

Q1.8 Where do you live in Christchurch?

Q1.9 Other (please specify)

Q1.10 Where do you live elsewhere in Canterbury?

Q1.11 Do you currently hold any of the following (select all that apply);

- ☐ On-licence
- ☐ Club licence
- ☐ Off licence
- ☐ I do not hold a liquor licence

Q2.1 **Reduce Trading Hours**

Off licences are provided to an outlet which sells alcohol that is taken away from the outlet and consumed, such as supermarkets, bottle stores, wineries and small convenience stores. A Local Alcohol Policy (LAP) can set conditions for maximum trading hours for all or some off-licences. Our research tells us the most alcohol harm occurs at night and early hours of the morning. Reducing hours of operation could help reduce this.

Q2.2 How much do you agree or disagree that Council should reduce trading hours for **off licenced outlets** across the city and Banks Peninsula?

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

Q2.3 If we did reduce hours in the evening, what time do you think **off-licences** should stop selling alcohol each day? Please select a time for each type of outlet.

	6pm	7pm	8pm	9pm	10pm	11pm	Don't know
Bottle store	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supermarket	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Small grocery stores	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Working men's clubs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Wineries	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Specialty stores	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q2.4 Why did you choose those times? (Optional)

Q2.5 On-licences and club licences allow venues to sell alcohol that is consumed on site such as cafés, restaurants, pubs, working men's clubs, sports clubs and night clubs. Currently the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act allows trading until 4am and a LAP can set conditions for maximum trading hours for all or some on-licences. Our research tells us there is alcohol related harm in locations where on-licensed venues are located. We have also identified in our district plan that we want to encourage a vibrant central city, so we are considering setting a reduced latest closing time for on-licensed venues in suburban areas.

Q2.6 How much do you agree or disagree that Council should reduce the latest closing time for **on-licensed venues** in suburban areas?

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

Q2.7 If we did reduce the latest closing time for **on-licensed venues** in suburban areas, what time do you think they should stop selling alcohol? Please select a time for each type of venue.

	11pm	12am	1am	2am	3am	4am	Don't know
Nightclubs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pub/ tavern	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Restaurants	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cafes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sports Clubs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Working men's Clubs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q2.8 Why did you choose those times? (Optional)

Q3.1 Freeze New License Applications

A LAP can include a policy on whether licences can be issued at all, such as placing a freeze on new licences. It could be for a period of time for any or all types of licence or, in all or only some areas.

What would a freeze mean? A freeze would mean that licences could not be issued for a period of time for any or all types of licence or, in all or only some areas.

Our research indicates availability of alcohol in areas of high deprivation is a concern for our communities, and residents in these areas are more likely to experience alcohol related harm. We are considering a temporary freeze on new licence applications for new venues and outlets in high deprivation areas for three years. Existing venues and outlets could still renew their licence and if they changed ownership, the new owner could still obtain a new licence.

What is a high deprivation area? High deprivation areas are generally considered to be locations that have a score of 9 or 10 on the New Zealand deprivation index. The index considers a range of factors for example, numbers of people not living in their own home, unemployment numbers, households with no access to internet at home, numbers living in unhealthy homes, etc.)

Q3.2 How much do you agree or disagree that Council should include a temporary freeze on new licences in high deprivation areas?

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

Q3.3 If we did include a temporary freeze on new licences in high deprivation areas, which of the following venues and outlets do you think a temporary freeze should apply to? Select all that apply.

- ☐ Bottle store
- ☐ Supermarket
- ☐ Small grocery stores
- ☐ Specialty stores
- ☐ Nightclubs
- ☐ Pub/ tavern
- ☐ Restaurants
- ☐ Cafes
- ☐ Sports Clubs
- ☐ Working men's Clubs
- ☐ None of the above
- ☐ Don't know

Q3.4 Is there anything else you would like to tell us about a how a freeze could be applied?
(Optional)

Q4.1 Proximity to Sensitive Community Facilities

Over 70% of survey respondents in the 2024 Life in Christchurch survey told us they think restrictions should apply on how close a licenced venue or outlet is located to community facilities they consider sensitive.

A LAP can put conditions on how close a licenced venue or outlet can be located to these places.

Q4.2 How much do you agree or disagree that Council should consider including a restriction on how close new licenced venues and outlets can be located to community facilities considered sensitive?

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

Q4.3 If we did restrict new licensed venues and outlets being located near community facilities, which of the following do you think should be considered sensitive? Select all that apply.

- ☐ Early Learning Centres
- ☐ Primary Schools
- ☐ Secondary Schools
- ☐ Hospitals and medical centres
- ☐ Addiction and rehabilitation centres
- ☐ Marae
- ☐ Places of worship (for example Churches, Mosques, Synagogues)
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____
- ☐ None of the above
- ☐ Don't know

If strongly agree or agree

Q4.4 How far away should a licensed venue or outlet be located from a community facility that is deemed a sensitive site?

- ☐ 50 metres
- ☐ 100 metres
- ☐ 150 metres
- ☐ 200 metres

If neither agree nor disagree, disagree, strongly disagree or don't know

Q4.5 If we did restrict new licensed venues and outlets being located near community facilities, how far away should a licensed venue or outlet be located from community facility that is deemed a sensitive site?

☐ 50 metres

☐ 100 metres

☐ 150 metres

☐ 200 metres

Q4.6 Why do you think none of the facilities listed should be considered 'sensitive'? (Optional)

Q4.7 Why do you think the facilities you selected should be considered sensitive? (Optional)

Q4.8 Which of the following licenced venues and outlets do you think should be restricted from being close to **early learning centres**? Select all that apply.

- ☐ Bottle store
- ☐ Supermarket
- ☐ Small grocery stores
- ☐ Specialty stores
- ☐ Nightclubs
- ☐ Pub/ tavern
- ☐ Restaurants
- ☐ Cafes
- ☐ Sports Clubs
- ☐ Working men's Clubs
- ☐ None of the above
- ☐ I don't know

Q4.9 Which of the following licenced venues and outlets do you think should be restricted from being close to **primary schools**? Select all that apply.

- ☐ Bottle store
- ☐ Supermarket
- ☐ Small grocery stores
- ☐ Specialty stores
- ☐ Nightclubs
- ☐ Pub/ tavern
- ☐ Restaurants
- ☐ Cafes
- ☐ Sports Clubs
- ☐ Working men's Clubs
- ☐ None of the above
- ☐ I don't know

Q4.10 Which of the following licenced venues and outlets do you think should be restricted from being close to **secondary schools**? Select all that apply.

- ☐ Bottle store
- ☐ Supermarket
- ☐ Small grocery stores
- ☐ Specialty stores
- ☐ Nightclubs
- ☐ Pub/ tavern
- ☐ Restaurants
- ☐ Cafes
- ☐ Sports Clubs
- ☐ Working men's Clubs
- ☐ None of the above
- ☐ I don't know

Q4.11 Which of the following licenced venues and outlets do you think should be restricted from being close to **hospitals and medical centres**? Select all that apply.

- ☐ Bottle store
- ☐ Supermarket
- ☐ Small grocery stores
- ☐ Specialty stores
- ☐ Nightclubs
- ☐ Pub/ tavern
- ☐ Restaurants
- ☐ Cafes
- ☐ Sports Clubs
- ☐ Working men's Clubs
- ☐ None of the above
- ☐ I don't know

Q4.12 Which of the following licenced venues and outlets do you think should be restricted from being close to **addiction and rehabilitation centres**? Select all that apply.

- ☐ Bottle store
- ☐ Supermarket
- ☐ Small grocery stores
- ☐ Specialty stores
- ☐ Nightclubs
- ☐ Pub/ tavern
- ☐ Restaurants
- ☐ Cafes
- ☐ Sports Clubs
- ☐ Working men's Clubs
- ☐ None of the above
- ☐ I don't know

Q4.13 Which of the following licenced venues and outlets do you think should be restricted from being close to **marae**? Select all that apply.

- ☐ Bottle store
- ☐ Supermarket
- ☐ Small grocery stores
- ☐ Specialty stores
- ☐ Nightclubs
- ☐ Pub/ tavern
- ☐ Restaurants
- ☐ Cafes
- ☐ Sports Clubs
- ☐ Working men's Clubs
- ☐ None of the above
- ☐ I don't know

Q4.14 Which of the following licenced venues and outlets do you think should be restricted from being close to **places of worship** (e.g. churches, mosques, synagogues)? Select all that apply.

- ☐ Bottle store
- ☐ Supermarket
- ☐ Small grocery stores
- ☐ Specialty stores
- ☐ Nightclubs
- ☐ Pub/ tavern
- ☐ Restaurants
- ☐ Cafes
- ☐ Sports Clubs
- ☐ Working men's Clubs
- ☐ None of the above
- ☐ I don't know

Q4.15 Which of the following licenced venues and outlets do you think should be restricted from being close to **#{Q4.3/ChoiceTextEntryValue/8}**? Select all that apply.

- ☐ Bottle store
- ☐ Supermarket
- ☐ Small grocery stores
- ☐ Specialty stores
- ☐ Nightclubs
- ☐ Pub/ tavern
- ☐ Restaurants
- ☐ Cafes
- ☐ Sports Clubs
- ☐ Working men's Clubs
- ☐ None of the above
- ☐ I don't know

Q5.1 One-way door restrictions

A 'one-way door' restriction means that people must be inside a venue, such as bar or nightclub, by a specific time, and that people cannot enter or re-enter any venue after that time. A LAP can apply a one-way door policy to on-licensed venues at a specific time during their operating hours.

A one-way door restriction aims to address alcohol related harm by encouraging alcohol consumption to take place in supervised venues and by reducing the risk of harm that can occur from people moving between venues after consuming alcohol for a long period of time.

One-way door restrictions can already be applied to on-licensed venues on a case-by-case basis however, we could consider whether a LAP should apply a one-way door restriction for all on-licensed venues.

Q5.2 Do you think we should include a one-way door restriction across the city?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don't know

Q5.3 If a one-way door restriction was introduced, what time do you think it should be in place?

- ☐ 1am
- ☐ 2am
- ☐ 3am
- ☐ 4am

Q5.4 Why do you think a one-way door restriction should be applied to **on-licensed venues**?
(Optional)

Q5.5 Why do you not agree with or are unsure about including a one-way door restriction across the city? (Optional)

Q6.1 Other mechanisms

Q6.2 Are there any other mechanisms you think Council should consider developing instead of or in addition to a LAP to help reduce alcohol related harm? (Optional)

Q7.1 Is there anything else you would like to tell us about development of a Local Alcohol Policy. (Optional)

Q7.2 Finally we just have some questions about you. Your answers to these help us better understand who we have heard from.

Q7.3 How old are you?

- ☐ Under 18 years
- ☐ 18 - 24 years
- ☐ 25 - 34 years
- ☐ 35 - 49 years
- ☐ 50 - 64 years
- ☐ 65 - 79 years
- ☐ 80 years and over

Q7.4 How do you identify your gender?

- ☐ As a man
- ☐ As a woman
- ☐ Non-binary / another gender

Q7.5 Ethnicity is a measure of cultural affiliation, not a measure of race, ancestry, nationality, or citizenship.

Ethnicity is self perceived and people can belong to more than one ethnic group.

An ethnic group is made up of people who have some or all of the following characteristics: one or more elements of common culture, for example religion, customs, or language

unique community of interests, feelings, and actions, and
a shared sense of common origins or ancestry

Q7.6 Which ethnic group(s) do you identify with?

(You may identify with more than one, please select all of the groups that you identify with)

- ☐ NZ European
- ☐ Maori
- ☐ British & Irish
- ☐ Other European
- ☐ Samoan
- ☐ Cook Islands Maori
- ☐ Tongan
- ☐ Niuean
- ☐ Tokelauan
- ☐ Fijian
- ☐ Southeast Asian
- ☐ Chinese
- ☐ Indian
- ☐ Japanese
- ☐ Korean
- ☐ Other Asian

- ☐ Middle Eastern
- ☐ Latin American
- ☐ African
- ☐ Other (Please specify) _____
-

Q7.7 Please upload any additional attachments here. Please make sure you have included as much detail as possible in the questions provided before uploading any additional or supporting attachments. *Please note that you can **only upload one attachment of up to 100MB.***

To upload multiple files they will need to be compressed into a ZIP file before uploading. If your attachment is bigger than 100MB, please email it to us.