


## Environment: Alcohol licences

Downloaded from <https://www.canterburywellbeing.org.nz/our-wellbeing/environment/alcohol-licences/> on 27/04/2024 2:09 PM

New Zealand and international research [8-10] highlights a clear relationship between the density of alcohol outlets (and the proximity of outlets to residential areas, and areas of higher social deprivation) and measures of alcohol-related harm, although the relationships are complex [11]. Broadly, a greater availability of alcohol leads to increased consumption, which in turn leads to more social harms (including antisocial behaviour, dishonesty offences, property damage, and violent offences) [11]. However, the level of social harm is also influenced by local factors such as population demographics including deprivation, differences in access to transport networks, and differences in the amenity or character of an area [11].


This indicator presents alcohol licence density per 10,000 population aged 15 years and over, by licence type, for greater Christchurch, Christchurch City, Selwyn District, Waimakariri District, and New Zealand, for 2016 and 2019 (currently, the 2019 New Zealand comparator is only available for total licence density). The licence types are: off-licence — such as supermarket, and liquor store; on- licence — bar, restaurant; and club-licence — an on-licence that allows a club to sell alcohol to club members and certain guests and visitors.

The alcohol licence density in greater Christchurch, 2016, is lower than for New Zealand as a whole across the three main licence types: on-licence (15.5 outlets and 17.6 outlets per 10,000 population), off-licence (5.1 outlets and 7.2 outlets per 10,000 population) and club licences (3.5 outlets and 4.9 outlets per 10,000 population), respectively.




The figure shows a general increase in total alcohol licence density in greater Christchurch between 2016 and 2019 (total of on-licence, off-licence, and club licence densities: 24.1/10,000 population and 26.8/10,000 population, respectively). In 2016, the total alcohol licence density in greater Christchurch was lower than for New Zealand as a whole (24.1 outlets and 29.6 outlets per 10,000 population, respectively). The figure also shows that the total alcohol licence densities differ across the three Territorial Authorities in greater Christchurch (In 2019 Christchurch City 29.4/10,000; Selwyn District 20/10,000; Waimakariri District 17.8/10,000). Waimakariri District had the lowest alcohol licence density in the greater Christchurch area in 2019.

Figure 3.1b: Alcohol on-license density (per 10,000 population aged 15 years and over), by Territorial Authority and for Greater Christchurch and New Zealand, 2016 and 2019




The figure shows that the on-licence alcohol licence densities differed across the three Territorial Authorities in greater Christchurch in both 2016 and 2019. In 2019, Christchurch City had the highest on-licence density at 20.5/10,000 in 2019; followed by Waimakariri District 11/10,000 in 2019, and Selwyn District 9.2/10,000 in 2019.

Figure 3.1c: Alcohol off-license density (per 10,000 population aged 15 years and over), by Territorial Authority and for Greater Christchurch and New Zealand, 2016 and 2019



The figure shows that the off-licence alcohol licence densities differed across the three Territorial Authorities in greater Christchurch in both 2016 and 2019. In 2019, the off-licence density was highest in Selwyn District at 6/10,000, followed by Christchurch City 5.3/10,000 and Waimakariri District 4.3/10,000. There is currently no New Zealand comparator available for 2019, however, in 2016 the off-licence alcohol licence density in greater Christchurch was lower than for New Zealand as a whole (5.1 off-licences/10,000 population and 7.2 off-licences/10,000 population, respectively).

Figure 3.1d: Alcohol club-license density (per 10,000 population aged 15 years and over), by Territorial Authority and for Greater Christchurch and New Zealand, 2016 and 2019



The figure shows that the club-licence alcohol licence densities differed across the three Territorial Authorities in greater Christchurch in both 2016 and 2019. In 2019, the club-licence density was highest in Selwyn District (4.8/10,000), followed by Christchurch City at 3.5/10,000 and Waimakariri District at 2.5/10,000. There is currently no New Zealand comparator available for 2019, however, in 2016 the club-licence alcohol licence density in greater Christchurch was lower than New Zealand as a whole (3.5 club-licences/10,000 population and 4.9 club-licences/10,000 population, respectively).

#### Data Sources

**Source:** Environmental Health Indicators Programme, Massey University.

**Survey/data set:** Administrative data to 2019. Custom data request for 2019. Access publicly available alcohol licence density data from the Massey University website [www.healthspace.ac.nz/resources-datasets-metadata-links](http://www.healthspace.ac.nz/resources-datasets-metadata-links)

**Source data frequency:** No update currently scheduled.

Metadata for this indicator is available at <https://www.canterburywellbeing.org.nz/our-wellbeing/index-data>

## REFERENCES

---

This is the full reference list for **Environment**.

- 1 Handy SL, Boarnet MG, Ewing R, Killingsworth RE (2002) How the built environment affects physical activity. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 23: 64-73.
- 2 Perdue WC, Stone LA, Gostin LO (2003) The built environment and its relationship to the public's health: The legal framework. *American Journal of Public Health* 93: 1390-1394.
- 3 Sallis JF, Spoon C, Cavill N, Engelberg JK, Gebel K, et al. (2015) Co-benefits of designing communities for active living: An exploration of literature. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity* 12: 30.
- 4 Björk J, Albin M, Grahn P, Jacobsson H, Ardö J, et al. (2008) Recreational values of the natural environment in relation to neighbourhood satisfaction, physical activity, obesity and wellbeing. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 62: e2.
- 5 Blaschke P (2013) Health and wellbeing benefits of conservation in New Zealand. *Science for Conservation* 321.
- 6 de Dios Ortúzar J, Willumsen LG (2011) *Modelling Transport*. New York: Wiley.
- 7 Bennett H, Jones R, Keating G, Woodward A, Hales S, et al. (2014) Health and equity impacts of climate change in Aotearoa-New Zealand, and health gains from climate action. *New Zealand Medical Journal* 127.
- 8 Royal Society Te Apārangi (2017) *Human Health Impacts of Climate Change for New Zealand: Evidence Summary* Wellington.
- 9 Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (2012) *CERA Wellbeing Survey 2012 Report, prepared by AC Nielsen for the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority*. AC Nielsen and the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority.
- 10 Cameron MP, Cochrane W, McNeill K, Melbourne P, Morrison SL, et al. (2012) Alcohol outlet density is related to police events and motor vehicle accidents in Manukau City, New Zealand. *Aust N Z J Public Health* 36: 537-542.
- 11 Livingston M, Chikritzhs T, Room R (2007) Changing the density of alcohol outlets to reduce alcohol-related problems. *Drug and Alcohol Review* 26: 557-566.
- 12 Popova S, Giesbrecht N, Bekmuradov D, Patra J (2009) Hours and days of sale and density of alcohol outlets: Impacts on alcohol consumption and damage: A systematic review. *Alcohol and Alcoholism* 44: 500-516.
- 13 Cameron MP, Cochrane W, Gordon C, Livingston M (2013) *The locally-specific impacts of alcohol outlet density in the North Island of New Zealand, 2006-2011. Research report commissioned by the Health Promotion Agency*. Wellington: Health Promotion Agency.
- 14 Browne M, Bellringer M, Greer N, Kolandai-Matchett K, Langham E, et al. (2017) *Measuring the burden of gambling harm in New Zealand*: Central Queensland University and Auckland University of Technology.
- 15 Abbott M, Bellringer M, Garrett N (2018) *New Zealand National Gambling Study: Wave 4 (2015). Report number 6*. Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland University of Technology, Gambling & Addictions Research Centre.
- 16 Rook H, Rippon R, Pauls R, Doust E, Prince J (2018) *Gambling harm reduction needs assessment*. Wellington, New Zealand: Sapere Research Group.
- 17 Kristiansen S, Trabjerg Camilla M (2016) Legal gambling availability and youth gambling behaviour: A qualitative longitudinal study. *International Journal of Social Welfare* 26: 218-229.
- 18 Welte JW, Barnes GM, Tidwell M-CO, Hoffman JH (2009) Legal gambling availability and problem gambling among adolescents and young adults. *International Gambling Studies* 9: 89-99.
- 19 Pearce J, Mason K, Hiscock R, Day P (2008) A national study of neighbourhood access to gambling opportunities and individual gambling behaviour. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 62: 862-868.
- 20 Binde P (2013) Why people gamble: A model with five motivational dimensions. *International Gambling Studies* 13: 81-97.
- 21 Wardle H, Keily R, Astbury G, Reith G (2014) 'Risky places?': Mapping gambling machine density and socio-economic deprivation. *J Gambl Stud* 30: 201-212.
- 22 Beckert J, Lutter M (2009) The inequality of fair play: Lottery gambling and social stratification in Germany. *European Sociological Review* 25: 475-488.
- 23 Orford J, Wardle H, Griffiths M, Sproston K, Erens B (2010) The role of social factors in gambling: Evidence from the 2007 British Gambling Prevalence Survey. *Community, Work & Family* 13: 257-271.

- 24 Abbott M, Binde P, Hodgins D, Korn D, Pereira A, et al. (2013) *Conceptual Framework of Harmful Gambling: An International Collaboration*. Guelph, Ontario: Problem Gambling Research Centre (OPGRC).
- 25 Easton B (2002) Gambling in New Zealand: An economic overview. In: Curtis, B, editor. *Gambling in New Zealand*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press. pp. 45-58.
- 26 Department of Internal Affairs Gambling in Pubs and Clubs (Class 4). Wellington: The Department of Internal Affairs.
- 27 Canterbury DHB (2019) *Canterbury Wellbeing Survey, June 2019: Report prepared by Nielsen for the Canterbury District Health Board and partnering agencies*. Christchurch: Canterbury District Health Board.
- 28 Environment Canterbury Regional Council (2018) *Air Quality in the Canterbury Region- Winter 2018 Update: Environment Canterbury Environmental Snapshot Report*. Christchurch: Environment Canterbury Regional Council.
- 29 World Health Organization (2013) *Health effects of particulate matter*. Copenhagen: World Health Organization.
- 30 World Health Organization (2005) *WHO Air quality guidelines for particulate matter, ozone, nitrogen dioxide and sulfur dioxide: Global update 2005, Summary of risk assessment*.
- 31 McNamara KE, Buggy L (2017) Community-based climate change adaptation: a review of academic literature. *Local Environment* 22: 443-460.
- 32 Ebi KL, Semenza JC (2008) Community-based adaptation to the health impacts of climate change. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 35: 501-507.