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Abstract

This thesis is a case study of local community involvement in the liquor licencing process. Alcohol is a widely available commodity with the potential for harm to communities through short and long term health impacts, violence and crime. There is often tension between meeting community needs and those of the business, entertainment and recreation sectors. A large body of evidence links the reduced availability of alcohol with reduced harm. Liquor store placement is an aspect of alcohol availability that has generated strong public interest in New Zealand. The New Zealand Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012 allows communities to object to liquor licences in their neighbourhood if they have concerns, and provides increased opportunities for community voices to be heard in the liquor licensing process.

This case study covers the process around the licence for the liquor store in Fantame Street, Cannons Creek East, Porirua, New Zealand, during 2011 to 2013. In 2011 and before, members of the local community were concerned about harm resulting from the location and long trading hours of the liquor store in their vulnerable residential neighbourhood. Between 2011 and 2013 they objected to two liquor licence applications, with Liquor Licensing Authority hearings resulting in drastically reduced liquor store trading hours, and subsequent licence refusal. The aim of this study was to better understand the role of local community action in progressing population health issues, particularly alcohol issues. Key informant interview data, document analysis, and informal conversations formed the basis of data collection.

Community action refers to ‘collective action driven by a community to influence factors in the environment which determine a community’s health’. In this case study, community action was enhanced by a strong local consensus regarding a visible problem. Opportunities for action arose through the liquor licensing process and the timing of law changes, which gave community voices more weight. A major key to successful action was a passionate and dedicated community leader, supported by church and school groups, as well as by the media and interested professionals. The community experienced the liquor licensing procedure as unfriendly, frustrating and difficult to engage in, due to it being a legal process. Multiple agencies provided the local community with information, legal support, and statistics to support their campaign. This enabled them to participate more effectively.
In this study, community action was influential in the judge’s decisions to shorten the liquor store hours and the later refusal to grant a liquor licence. These decisions reduced alcohol-related harm and increased community safety in the local area. They may also assist other communities through setting a precedent for residential liquor licensing in other vulnerable communities. In this community, working together, and getting their concerns heard, strengthened bonds and led to a greater sense of community spirit.

The results of this study suggest that communities can, in some circumstances, be supported to take collective action. This can occur by the creation of more supportive environments for participation and action (e.g., law that better privileges community wishes) and by help in participating in the liquor licensing process. Supportive environments can be fostered by central and local government taking a global approach to alcohol harm, creating policies that consider the impact on health and inequalities of health, reducing the affordability and availability of alcohol, as well as fostering collaborative societies and local participation in decision making.

In conclusion, facilitating community action is an essential part of broader efforts to tackle alcohol-related harm. It also has the potential to contribute to wider positive health outcomes, through increasing social capital and the capacity within the community to tackle further health concerns.
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Chapter One: Introduction and Background

1.1 Overview

This work is a case study of community initiated action by members of the Cannons Creek East community in Porirua, New Zealand. They were concerned about the late trading hours, excessive promotion and subsequent harm caused by the location and activities of a liquor store in their suburban area. They twice objected to the stores’ liquor licence, resulting in reduced store hours and the eventual closure of the store (Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority, 2013b; New Zealand Liquor Licensing Authority, 2012).

This introductory chapter first details a brief history of liquor licensing legislation in New Zealand as a means for reducing alcohol-related harm (s. 1.2). The roles of three key stakeholders in New Zealand alcohol policy namely temperance groups, the alcohol industry and Māori are then briefly outlined (s. 1.2.3). Liquor licensing regulations under the Sale of Liquor Act 1989 (SOLA1989) and Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012 (SASA2012) are then detailed as they are relevant to this case study (s. 1.2.4 - 1.2.5). The second half of the chapter details some of the background to Cannons Creek, the setting of the case study, and gives a brief account of the Fantame Liquor Store (s. 1.3). The chapter concludes with the specific study aims and objectives (s. 1.4).

1.2 Background to liquor licensing in New Zealand

1.2.1 A brief history of liquor licensing in New Zealand

Requiring a licence to sell alcohol has been a part of alcohol regulation in New Zealand since 1842 (Christoffel, 2013) with the administration of, and criteria attached to, a licence varying over time. Legislation introduced in the 1880s made it very difficult for new licences to be obtained, and it remained difficult to get a licence for nearly 100 years (Christoffel, 2006). Thus for the majority of New Zealand liquor licensing history there have been strong controls on the availability of alcohol and also some provision for resident input on the number of licences in their local area.
In the 1860s, liquor licences were administrated provincially, with most areas allowing residents to petition against the granting of new licences or for existing licences to be cancelled (McLintock, 1966). From 1893, legislation enabled communities to vote every three years to reduce the number of liquor licences in their electoral area, or to prohibit alcohol completely, known as going ‘dry’ (Shoebridge, 2012). This resulted in 12 out of 76 areas voting to ban alcohol between 1894 and 1908, and 484 establishments losing their liquor licence. Though no areas went dry after 1908 the provision for a referendum lasted over 70 years, and some areas remained dry until the 1980s (Christoffel, 2013).

Liquor law changes in the 1940s were precipitated by unpleasant drinking conditions occurring in the large drinking establishments or ‘booze barns’. These conditions came about due to the laws that made it difficult to get a liquor licence, banned barmaids, entertainment or the provision of food and required bars to finish serving alcohol to the public at 6pm (Christoffel, 2013). The changes resulted in the formation of the Licensing Control Commission (LCC) aimed at redistributing licences and improving drinking conditions (Alcohol Advisory Council of New Zealand, n.d.-b). However, the commission was hampered by lack of funding, legal problems and a clause that allowed communities to block new bars by forcing a local poll (Alcohol Advisory Council of New Zealand, n.d.-b; Christoffel, 2013). Many areas were also able to vote for whether licensed premises were to be run by community trusts (Alcohol Advisory Council of New Zealand, n.d.-b).

1.2.2 Liberalisation of liquor licensing

The 1960s and 1970s saw further major liquor changes which enabled the issue of licences to a wider range of premises, gave the LCC greater powers as well as ending 6pm closing and the ban on barmaids (Christoffel, 2013; McEwan, Campbell, & Swain, 2010; Phillips, 2013). These changes resulted in thousands of new licences, large taverns being erected in suburban areas and greater availability of alcohol (Christoffel, 2013; McEwan et al., 2010). The introduction of the Sale of Liquor Act 1989 also saw an overhaul of liquor licensing, with licences issued on the basis of applicant suitability instead of the previous criteria of need. This was due to a perceived lack of evidence between the number of outlets and levels alcohol consumption (Law Commission, 2010).

Licensing committees and local objection polls were done away with. Decisions were made by local governments, through District Licensing Agencies as part of the local council, and by
a national Liquor Licensing Authority (LLA). Later changes allowed longer trading hours, lowered the drinking age and permitted wine and beer to be sold in supermarkets and grocery stores (Huckle, Pledger, & Casswell, 2012; McEwan et al., 2010). These changes resulted in liquor licences being easier to get and a substantial increase in the number of liquor licences. One unintended consequence of the legislation was the proliferation of liquor stores in suburban areas, which caused community concern regarding the availability of alcohol and harm (McEwan et al., 2010). The recently introduced Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012, aims to give communities more input into licensing in their area (Ministry of Justice, 2013).

1.2.3 Influences on liquor licensing laws

Alcohol confers many benefits and harms to individuals, communities and society, making alcohol policy formulation complex (Wilson, Gunasekara, & Thomson, 2011). Thus many factors have influenced the liquor licensing laws in New Zealand over the last 160 years. Powerful, well-resourced stakeholders have had a strong influence on shaping politicians’ impressions of the problems and preferable solutions. Policies also reflected prevailing ideologies or values of the time (Babor et al., 2010; Casswell & Thamarangsi, 2009). For example, free market ideologies contributed to the radical liberalisation of liquor laws in the 1980s, with previous legislation thought to be restricting competition and trade (Christoffel, 2013). Three key stakeholder groups that have had an impact on alcohol policy in New Zealand include temperance and community groups, the alcohol industry and Māori. The impact of these groups is detailed below.

1.2.3.1 Temperance movement and community groups

One major influence on New Zealand alcohol laws from 1880-1980 were temperance groups concerned with the impact of alcohol on society (McLintock, 1966; Shoebridge, 2012). Comprising mainly of Christian groups, they were influential in helping to establish the 1893 Act which allowed communities to vote on banning alcohol or reducing the number of liquor outlets in their area (Christoffel, 2013; Shoebridge, 2012). They also petitioned parliament to allow voting for national alcohol prohibition, with the resulting vote being extremely close on several occasions (Shoebridge, 2012).

Temperance groups were well-resourced, with local leagues often headed by Methodist or Presbyterian ministers, and funded by church congregations. They spread their message through public demonstrations, the dissemination of information through pamphlets, radio and
newspaper advertisements, and even produced their own newspaper. Prohibitionists encouraged their members only to vote for Members of Parliament (MPs) that had a history of supporting prohibition and worked with temperance friendly MPs to gain the support of other senior MPs (Shoebridge, 2012). The influence of the temperance movement was one factor that ensured that 6pm bar closing times remained in place for so many years (Christoffel, 2006). Support for prohibition declined after the 1920s, due to the apparent lack of success of prohibition in the United States of America (Shoebridge, 2012).

Other community groups have also been influential in impacting liquor law. Members of the West Coast Trades Council (WCTC), comprised mostly of unionised workers, were successful in preventing a rise in beer prices in their area in 1947. These prices were set by the national price control authority. WCTC members called a public meeting in which there was strong support for boycotting drinking establishments that put the price up or so called ‘seven penny pubs’. Beer boycotters made life very hard for anyone who drank in the seven penny pubs. Some went on mass strikes, refusing to work with people who had been seen drinking at the seven penny pubs. The seven penny pubs lost business and the publicans relented after four months, reducing the price back to a sixpence. Many of the key supporters of the beer boycott expanded their efforts for community control by setting up working men’s clubs (Ministry for Culture and Heritage, 2012).

1.2.3.2 Alcohol industry: a powerful international stakeholder

The alcohol industry is a stakeholder which has had a considerable impact on shaping the drinking culture and alcohol policy both in New Zealand and overseas through marketing, involvement in research, supporting ineffective policies and espousing values of individual responsibility (Anderson, 2009; Babor et al., 2010; Casswell & Thamarangsi, 2009; Casswell, 2013; Stenius & Babor, 2010). Some alcohol restrictions, such as 6pm closing and difficulties in obtaining new licences, benefited many members of the liquor industry through reduced competition. Thus the alcohol industry posed little resistance to these strict measures (Christoffel, 2006, 2008).

Prohibition was a huge threat that united the alcohol industry into marketing alcohol as being integral to New Zealand culture, by associating it with family, good times and ‘real kiwi men’. At the same time the industry discredited the harms of alcohol and portrayed prohibitionists as ‘wowsers’ who were boring and wanted to suck all of the fun out of life.
The alcohol industry funded a ‘continuance party’ (Ministry for Culture and Heritage, n.d.) and delivered long lists of anomalies in the prohibition voting. Christoffel argues that the strength of the alcohol industry presence and the comparative lack of pro-prohibition advertising was what prevented prohibition in 1919 by 0.3% of votes (Christoffel, 2008).

### 1.2.3.3 Māori and alcohol policy in New Zealand

Māori are stakeholders in New Zealand alcohol policy regulation whose experiences of and opinions on the best way to manage alcohol are varied (M. Cook, 2013). Prior to the introduction of alcohol by European settlers, Māori did not consume alcohol and as such did not have experience regulating it (Hutt, 2003). Initially many Māori did not consume alcohol, however consumption increased during the time when European settlers were taking ownership of Māori land. Māori were encouraged to create large bills at local drinking establishments for which they could pay off with land (Stuart, 2009). Māori were concerned about the impact of alcohol and there were many petitions to parliament. In 1884 Ngāti Maniapoto was successful in petitioning for the King Country to become the largest dry area in New Zealand. However, many Māori were opposed to government regulation as they believed they should manage the problems themselves (M. Cook, 2013). Over time there have been many policies aimed at reducing the harm of alcohol to Māori but at the same time discriminating against them (Alcohol Advisory Council of New Zealand, n.d.-b).

### 1.2.4 Liquor licensing under the Sale of Liquor Act 1989

The two most recent pieces of liquor licensing legislation in New Zealand are the SOL1989 and SASA2012. This case study involves community objections to licences under both, thus they will be explained in more detail below.

Under SOLA1989 liquor licensing was controlled by a local level District Licensing Authority (DLA), which was part of the local council (Hill & Stewart, 1998; Hill, 2004; Porirua City Council, 2013b). The process involved applying to the DLA for a licence, which could be an on-licence, off-licence, club or special licence. This case study deals with applications for off-licences, which are licences for alcohol which is not consumed on the premises it was bought, as is the case in supermarkets and liquor stores (New Zealand Parliament, 2013b). Applications could be opposed by the DLA appointed inspector, Police or the Medical Officer of Health (MOH) (New Zealand Parliament, 2013b; Porirua City Council,
The MOH role is to consider the public health implications of granting a licence (Law Commission, 2010). However, under the SOLA1989 they were not required to report on off-licence (where the alcohol is not consumed at the premises it was bought) applications (Hill, 2005; New Zealand Parliament, 2013b). If there were no objections, the DLA would grant a licence. However, if objections arose the licence application was passed over to the national LLA (New Zealand Parliament, 2013b; Porirua City Council, 2013b; Wellington City Council, n.d.).

Applications had to be advertised in the local paper and objections could be filed by the above parties or people with a greater interest than the public in general; this was usually local community members who lived or worked in the area (New Zealand Parliament, 2013b; Wellington City Council, n.d.). Objections had to be filed within ten days of the public notice and had to address specific criteria for objections as set out in the SOLA1989 (Wellington City Council, n.d.).

Under the SOLA1989, licences were issued or renewed based on the suitability of the licensee (Alcohol Healthwatch, 2009; Hill, 2004; New Zealand Parliament, 2013b). As such, the liquor licensing authorities considered specific past evidence of bad management when processing applications, and were unable to consider future risk or community concern (The Evening Post, 1998). Having limited power to consider the views of communities was a source of frustration for the liquor licensing authorities (Hill & Stewart, 1998; Hill, 2005).

Research into the workings of the SOLA1989 has found large variation in the way that the Act was enforced across different regions of New Zealand (Hill, 2005; Law Commission, 2010; L Stewart, Casswell, & Thomson, 1997). Research into the SOLA1989 and liquor licensing process found the process was most successful when members of the Police, public health officials and the relevant council worked together as a local team, had well defined roles and a commitment to common goals (Hill & Stewart, 1996; Hill, 2005; New Zealand Police, n.d.).

### 1.2.5 Changes to licensing under the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012

Under the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act (SASA2012) applications are processed by a District Licensing Committee (DLC), which can include elected community members as well as local government officials, but cannot include the District Licensing Inspector. The role of the DLC is consistent across territorial authorities. The DLC hears both contested and
uncontested applications, thus facilitating both more consistency in decisions regionally and
nationwide (Local Government New Zealand, 2013). However, during the first 12 months
after this legislation was introduced, opposed applications were heard by the Alcohol
Regulatory and Licensing Authority (ARLA) which replaced the LLA, as happened in this
case study (Ministry of Justice, 2012).

An important change to liquor licensing under the SASA2012, was the consideration of the
impact on the community and surrounding neighbourhood and whether the licence would
increase alcohol-related harm (Health Promotion Agency, 2012a; Ministry of Justice, 2012).
This change appeared to be partly in response to strong community concern about liquor
licence placement that was expressed in the alcohol law reform review process preceding the
2012 law changes (Law Commission, 2010).

Reflecting this change in focus from applicant suitability towards community and harm
minimisation, the MOH is, at the time of writing, required to report on all off-licence
applications. In addition, objectors have 15 days as opposed to 10 days from the public notice
to submit objections (New Zealand Parliament, 2013a, 2013b). Another relevant change under
the new legislation is the opportunity for territorial authorities to develop local alcohol
policies (LAPs). These can, among other things, determine licensed premises trading hours,
influence the density of premises, and impose conditions on licences (Ministry of Justice,
2012). At the time this thesis was submitted in May 2014, most areas were still in the process
of developing their LAPs.

1.3 Case study background

This case study was located in Cannons Creek East, Porirua, where residents utilised the
liquor licensing process to voice their concerns about a liquor store in their local
neighbourhood. Section 1.3 provides a brief background to the Cannons Creek area and the
liquor store at the heart of the case study. A statement of the study aims and objectives
concludes this introduction (s. 1.4).

1.3.1 Life in Cannons Creek

Cannons Creek East is a community of approximately 3594 situated in Eastern Porirua,
Wellington, New Zealand (Profile. ID, 2013a). The landscape of Eastern Porirua was
predominantly rolling hills until the 1950s, when the introduction of earthmoving equipment facilitated development. In 1965, 80% of the housing was built by the government and many migrant families flooded in (Porirua City Council, 2014). The Cannons Creek East population is more ethnically diverse than New Zealand as a whole, with more Māori (17% vs. 14%) and Pacific people (65% vs. 7%) and less residents identifying as New Zealand European or Asian ethnicities (Profile. ID, 2013f). There are also more citizens with Christian (64% vs 43%) or religious (68% vs 45%) affiliations (Profile. ID, 2013b).

The residents of Cannons Creek East and surrounding suburbs are some of the poorest in New Zealand, with an average deprivation score of 10 (Community Response Forums, 2012; Profile. ID, 2013g; P. White, Gunston, Salmond, Atkinson, & Crampton, 2008). Compared with the New Zealand average, Cannons Creek East has a higher rate of unemployment (20% vs 7%) and a significantly larger proportion of residents living in social housing (42% vs 4%) (Profile. ID, 2013c, 2013e). There is also a higher proportion of the population aged 15 and over with no educational qualifications (29% vs 19%) (Profile. ID, 2013c). Porirua community members’ top concerns include a high rate of local drug and alcohol problems, crime, vandalism and graffiti (Dudding & Hastings, 2013; James & Southwick, 2011). See Figure 1 below for an aerial map of Cannons Creek.

![Figure 1. Aerial map of Cannons Creek (denoted by the white line) in Porirua. Sourced from (Google maps, 2014b)](image-url)
1.3.2 History of Fantame Liquor Store

The liquor store at the heart of this case study was located 21 Fantame Street, Cannons Creek, Porirua. It was part of a small set of shops, including an adjoining food-market, diary and takeaway shop (Google maps, 2014a). The shops are nestled in a residential area and 40m from Russell School (Foley, 2012; Russell School Board of Trustees, 2011). See Figure 2 and Figure 3 below. Russell School has 140 students between years one to six. It has a high proportion of students identifying as Pacific (89%) or Māori (11%) (FindTheBest.co.nz, 2014), as well as students from low socio-economic communities (Ministry of Education, 2014) [RS principal interview].

![Figure 2. Aerial view of Fantame Liquor Store (denoted by a yellow dot), nestled in a residential area. Russell School is located directly across the road. Sourced from (Google maps, 2014d)](image1)

![Figure 3. Street view of Fantame Liquor Store in relation to Russell School. Sourced from (Google maps, 2014e)](image2)
1.3.2.1 Initial opposition to a liquor store in Fantame Street

Bhanumati and Umesh Patel directors of Nischay’s Enterprises Ltd first opened the liquor store in 1999 (B Patel, 2013). Prior to 1999, they had a licence to sell beer and wine from their adjoining food-market (Foley, 2012)[Police interview]. At the time of the liquor licence application in 1999, there was strong opposition from the community, citing fears that a liquor store would increase crime, vandalism and youth binge drinking in an already troubled area (O’Connor, 1998).

The Police, the local Salvation Army church, local Pacific Island church council and Russell School objected to the application, with 278 parents of Russell School signing a petition. Russell School principal, and then local counsellor, David Stanley (Maxwell, 1999) expressed his fears for student safety and increased vandalism at the school (The Evening Post, 1998). At a LLA hearing regarding the licence application, current Porirua city counsellor Litea Ah Hoi spoke as a witness for Russell School. She was concerned the proposed store would sell liquor to underage patrons as her 14 year old daughter was sold cigarettes by Bhanumati Patel. The Police also cited seven concerns about the proposed store. However, lawyers for the Patel’s noted that only concerns about underage drinking were relevant to the judge’s decision (O’Connor, 1998). A liquor licence was subsequently granted (The Evening Post, 1998).

1.3.2.2 Business as usual

Nischay’s Enterprises Ltd ran the liquor store from 1999 until 2003. Between 2004 and 2013 they leased the liquor store and adjoining food-market to Chiman Patel (B Patel, 2013). The liquor store initially traded under the name ‘Fantame Liquor Store’ and then became part of the ‘Thirsty Liquor’ franchise in 2012 (New Zealand Liquor Licensing Authority, 2012). When Chiman Patel took over the liquor store in 2004, the trading hours were 9am-9pm daily. On 23 December 2005, the hours were extended until midnight, following an unopposed liquor licence renewal application (Sargent, 2013). A further unopposed renewal application with midnight trading was processed on 16 September 2008 (Gibbs, 2012).
1.3.2.3 Fantame Liquor Store

In February 2013 the directors of Nischay’s Enterprises Ltd did not renew Chiman Patel’s tenancy at 21 Fantame Street, intending to run the liquor store themselves. They applied for a liquor license under Nischay’s Enterprises Ltd which was declined (refer to s. 4.2.10- 4.2.14 for further information). For ease of understanding, the liquor store at 21 Fantame Street will be referred to as ‘Fantame Liquor Store’ under the management of Chiman Patel. The proposed liquor store at the same location by Nischay’s Enterprises Ltd (Nischay’s) will be referred to as ‘Nischay’s’. When referring to liquor licensing at 21 Fantame Street across the case study period the term ‘Fantame Street’ liquor licensing or ‘Fantame Street’ liquor store will be used.

1.4 Aims and Objectives

The aim of this research was to better understand the role of community action in progressing population health issues, particularly alcohol issues. To explore this issue, a case study methodology was used to evaluate the processes, nature and role of stakeholders involved in the community objections to the Fantame Liquor Store’s liquor licence. Specific objectives included: detailing the nature of involvement by the community and other parties, an exploration of the barriers and enablers of community action in liquor licencing, and an examination of the outcomes and the implications of the outcomes of the community involvement in the Fantame Liquor Store liquor licencing hearings.
Chapter Two: Literature review

2.1 Introduction

The previous chapter gave a brief background on liquor licensing in New Zealand, as well as on the Cannons Creek community and liquor store at the centre of this case study. The aim of this chapter is to present the findings of a literature review, which was undertaken to provide background context to alcohol regulation in New Zealand, as well as background to community action.

To complete this literature review, searches were performed using Medline, Psychinfo, Embase, Web of Knowledge and Google Scholar databases. Community action searches included the term ‘community’ and synonyms such as ‘citizen’, and ‘local’ with or without ‘action’, ‘mobilis’*, ‘organising’, ‘development’, ‘led’, ‘driven’, ‘participation’ and ‘grassroots’. A separate search was undertaken using the terms ‘alcohol’, ‘alcohol drinking’, combined with either or ‘harm’, ‘policies’ (health policy or public policy). Elements of both searches were also combined to look at community action on alcohol issues. Various searches were repeated with limits such as New Zealand or Zealand, effectiveness or evidence.

The Factiva database and stuff.co.nz were used to find media articles relating to community involvement in New Zealand local alcohol issues. There was a particular focus on the Porirua area and articles from 2008 to 2013. The search terms bottle shop, liquor store, liquor licence, alcohol, liquor, local, community, residents, Cannons Creek, and Porirua were used. Grey literature was obtained using searches with the Google search engine, and utilising relevant government and University thesis websites.

This literature review firstly describes the burden of alcohol-related harm in New Zealand, highlighting the rationale for alcohol regulation (s. 2.2) and effective polices to reduce alcohol-related harm (s. 2.3). The second part of the literature review explores community action and participation as a health promotion tool, and highlights the rationale for the study (s. 2.4).
2.2 The burden of alcohol-related harm in New Zealand

2.2.1 Alcohol harms health

Alcohol is a common, legal, widely available drug consumed by 80% of New Zealand adults in 2012 (Ministry of Health, 2013). It is strongly interwoven into the culture and history of New Zealand (Alcohol Advisory Council of New Zealand, n.d.-a). However, there is a significant body of evidence detailing the many deleterious health and social impacts of alcohol on individuals and society (Babor et al., 2010; Casswell & Thamarangsi, 2009; Law Commission, 2010; Wilson et al., 2011). Both in New Zealand and globally, alcohol causes 4% of annual deaths and is the third highest risk factor for disease and disability, behind only childhood underweight and unsafe sex (Jennie Connor, Broad, Rehm, Hoorn, & Jackson, 2005; World Health Organization, 2011). Alcohol use is considered necessary for the development of 30 diseases and contributes to the development of many more (Jennie Connor, Broad, Jackson, Hoorn, & Rehm, 2004; Rehm, 2011; World Health Organization, 2011).

2.2.2 Alcohol harms society

Alcohol also impacts society, causing family dysfunction, violence and crime with 40% of New Zealand arrestees in 2011 consuming alcohol prior to arrest (Wilkins et al., 2012). A recent analysis of New Zealand datasets concluded that New Zealanders experienced more harm from other peoples’ drinking than from their own. This was mostly due to injuries resulting from aggression, crime, fires or traffic accidents (Jennie Connor & Casswell, 2012). Alcohol also contributes to lost productivity, public disorder, domestic violence, assaults and homicides with wide reaching impacts on the economy, police, businesses, communities and families (Babor et al., 2010; Jennie Connor & Casswell, 2012; Law Commission, 2010; Wilson et al., 2011).

2.2.3 Drinking patterns in New Zealand

The risk of harm from drinking alcohol is related to the frequency and quantity of alcohol consumed (Babor et al., 2010; Jennie Connor et al., 2004; World Health Organization, 2011). Alcohol can cause harm through: (i) its toxic effects and role in chronic disease, (ii) impairment of functioning that can lead to injury, or (iii) via dependence which contributes to
excessive patterns of consumption (Babor et al., 2010). In 2011, one in five New Zealand drinkers, or 15% of all New Zealand adults had a drinking pattern considered hazardous. This was defined as a drinking pattern that posed a high-risk to the physical or mental health of the drinker or others (Ministry of Health, 2013). New Zealand has developed a drinking culture whereby drinking to intoxication is common, intended and considered acceptable, particularly by young people (Alcohol Advisory Council of New Zealand, n.d.-a, 2005, 2012; Ministry of Health, 2013).

2.2.4 Intoxication is a risky business

Drinking to intoxication poses a high-risk of harm with strong evidence for the links between intoxication and violence, traffic offences and injuries (Babor et al., 2010; Jennie Connor & Casswell, 2012). Of the 1000 alcohol-related deaths in New Zealand each year, half can be attributed to injuries and a quarter due to cancers (Jennie Connor et al., 2005). Research shows each additional drink significantly increase the risk of injury, with the risk being higher for those who drink infrequently (Law Commission, 2010; NHMRC, 2009). Thus irregular heavy drinking carries the highest risk of harm (J. L. Connor, Broad, Jackson, Hoorn, & Rehm, 2005).

2.2.5 Inequalities in alcohol-related harm

The burden of harm is unequally distributed, with people living in lower socioeconomic areas and Māori experiencing higher levels of harm (Casswell & Thamarangsi, 2009; Jennie Connor et al., 2005; Jatrana, Carter, McKenzie, & Wilson, 2011; Law Commission, 2010; Wilson et al., 2011). Recent surveys estimate that although Māori drink alcohol less frequently than non-Māori, the volume of alcohol consumed per drinking occasion is 40% higher resulting in a higher risk of harm (Ministry of Health, 2013). It has also been noted that alcohol often exacerbates the problems people are trying to escape from, contributing to further inequalities in health (Law Commission, 2010).

2.2.6 Alcohol as no ordinary commodity

Thus there is much to be gained by reducing the harm caused by alcohol. However, the present wide availability of alcohol in supermarkets, liquor stores, cafes and restaurants helps to normalise the consumption of alcohol and present it as an ordinary commodity. With the weight of evidence above, public health experts have argued alcohol is ‘no ordinary
commodity’ and as such needs public policy in place to help regulate it (Babor et al., 2010; Casswell & Thamarangsi, 2009).

2.3 Regulating alcohol-related harm

2.3.1 Introduction

Public policy for alcohol includes any action by government that affects the consumption of alcohol and its consequences (Alcohol and Public Policy Group, 2010; Anderson, Chisholm, & Fuhr, 2009). Although alcohol policies have been longstanding, they have only recently begun to be scientifically investigated (Babor et al., 2010). Governments are argued to have an obligation to provide and enforce effective policies to provide optimum conditions for the health of their people, reducing inequalities in health which ultimately increases productivity and wellbeing (Anderson et al., 2009).

Alcohol policies can reduce harm by influencing drinking patterns, drinking environments and health services (Babor et al., 2010). Effective policies allow for civil society voices, or public influence to counteract vested trade interests (Anderson et al., 2009). Section 2.3 briefly covers the evidence for a range of policies, with an emphasis on those that can be influenced at a local level. The strongest evidence is for policies which affect alcohol price (s. 2.3.2) or availability (s. 2.3.3) thus these options are discussed first. There is a particular focus on the local availability of alcohol, due to this case study’s research questions. Other promising policy options are then discussed. These include policies which restrict alcohol marketing (s. 2.3.4), target at risk drinkers (s. 2.3.5) or influence drink-driving (s. 2.3.6). Finally, the limited evidence that alcohol education reduces alcohol harm is touched on (s. 2.3.7).

2.3.2 Increasing the ‘real’ price of alcohol reduces harm

Research has shown increasing taxation on alcohol to be one of the most cost effective policy interventions for reducing alcohol-related harm (Anderson et al., 2009; Babor et al., 2010; Casswell & Thamarangsi, 2009). Changes in price are more effective over the long term (Anderson et al., 2009). To be beneficial, minimum pricing should be implemented and tax should be graduated according to alcohol content and adjusted for inflation to ensure affordability is affected (Casswell & Thamarangsi, 2009; Wall & Casswell, 2013). Taxes also
have the added benefit of increasing government revenue, have the greatest influence on heaviest drinkers, with only a small financial cost to lighter drinkers, and are easy to implement (Anderson et al., 2009; Anderson, 2009; Casswell & Thamarangsi, 2009).

2.3.3 Restricting alcohol availability reduces harm

Best practise prescribes regulations on who can purchase alcohol, when and where. Specific policies include a legal minimum purchase age, restrictions on the density of outlets, hours and days of sale, in addition to differing availability of alcohol by strength (Anderson et al., 2009; Babor et al., 2010; Casswell & Thamarangsi, 2009). To be effective these policies must be fully enforced (Anderson et al., 2009; Babor et al., 2010). Below aspects of availability are examined.

2.3.3.1 Outlet density and consumption: a mixed bag

The association between the density of alcohol outlets and alcohol-related harm is one aspect of availability that has been widely researched and has strong New Zealand public interest (Babor et al., 2010; Cameron et al., 2012c; Cameron, Cochrane, Gordon, & Livingston, 2013; Law Commission, 2010; Livingston, Chikritzhs, & Room, 2007). The theory underpinning most availability research is that the easier alcohol is to obtain, the more will be consumed (both on average and by heavier drinkers), resulting in greater harm (Babor et al., 2010). However, reviews examining the evidence for a relationship between density of alcohol outlets and consumption have produced mixed results (Babor et al., 2010; Cameron et al., 2012c, 2013; Livingston et al., 2007; Popova, Giesbrecht, Bekmuradov, & Patra, 2009). Livingston et al. (2007) note that increased harm can result without an increase in overall consumption. They suggest that outlet density can affect consumption though both ease of access to alcohol and the effect of the outlets on the surrounding area (Cameron et al., 2012c).

2.3.3.2 Outlet density and harm: a context specific relationship

Reviews examining the spatial relationship between outlet density and harms such as violence, injury, and traffic accidents have similarly produced inconsistent findings (Babor et al., 2010; Cameron et al., 2012c, 2013; Campbell et al., 2009; Law Commission, 2010; Livingston et al., 2007; Popova et al., 2009). As most of the research is ecological in nature, it cannot examine cause and effect relationships, just assess associations (Popova et al., 2009).
Thus results could be influenced by confounding variables such as the size of the outlet and total volume of alcohol sold (Cameron et al., 2012c). The strongest evidence appears to be for the association between density of outlets with violence and injuries (Babor et al., 2010; Campbell et al., 2009; Livingston, 2011; Popova et al., 2009). This could be explained by certain outlets or outlet areas attracting violence prone patrons or simply by higher densities of outlets bringing together more people that could be potential perpetrators and victims of violence (Babor et al., 2010; J Connor, Kypri, Bell, & Cousins, 2011; Law Commission, 2010; Livingston, 2011; Popova et al., 2009). Overall, findings vary over time, between contexts and between type of outlet. They are also likely to be influenced by further factors in the community (Cameron et al., 2012c, 2013).

2.3.3.3 New Zealand outlet research: location specific

Outlet density research specific to the New Zealand context has similarly found results to be location and outlet specific (Cameron et al., 2012d, 2013). A nationwide study using police data from 2005-2007 found an association between increased incidence of serious violent offending in areas with decreased distance to licenced premises (Day, Breetzke, Kingham, & Campbell, 2012). Similarly, proximity to multiple licensed premises within 1km from home was a factor that predicted university student binge drinking in a survey of students from six university's (Kypri, Bell, Hay, & Baxter, 2008). Outlet density was also a factor that predicted teenage binge drinking in Auckland (Huckle, Huakau, Sweetsur, Huisman, & Casswell, 2008). A further large nationwide survey found there was a 4% increase in the odds of binge drinking and a 2.3% increase in alcohol-related harm score with each extra off-licence within 1km from home independent of individual and neighbourhood socioeconomic position (J Connor et al., 2011). However, this relationship only held true in urban areas and the response rate of the survey was only 49% so the results need to be interpreted with caution. Similarly, recent studies in Manukau that were repeated for the whole of the North Island found the relationships between outlet densities and harm such as violence, police events and motor vehicle accidents varied in urban and rural areas and by outlet type (Cameron et al., 2012b, 2013). For example, in central Wellington city, the addition of an extra off-licence resulted in decreased reported violent offences, whereas the addition of an off-licence outlet in other areas such as Porirua resulted in an increase in reported violent offences (Cameron et al., 2013). This suggests that other factors in the community and locality are likely to be important.
2.3.3.4 Increased deprivation = increased harm

The relationship between deprivation, outlet density and harm is one factor of interest that may explain such varied effects of outlets. New Zealand studies have found residents of highly deprived areas have shorter distances to travel to purchase alcohol at an off-licence (Cameron et al., 2012a; Hay, Whigham, Kypri, & Langley, 2009; Health Promotion Agency, 2012b; Pearce, Day, & Witten, 2008), whereas restaurants are more common in low deprivation areas (Pearce et al., 2008). As restaurants have been promoted to reduce public disorder, there is concern that alcohol outlet type and placement could be contributing to increasing inequalities of health (Cameron et al., 2012a; Health Promotion Agency, 2012b; Huckle et al., 2008). Furthermore, it has been noted that the clustering off-licences promotes competition, excessive advertising and late opening hours (Babor et al., 2010; Cameron et al., 2012a; Health Promotion Agency, 2012b). Consistent with other international studies, the implication appears to be that the impact of extra off-licences in deprived areas with a high number of existing off-licences will lead to greater risk of harm. However, policies should be informed by local research, as different policies may be required for central city and suburban areas (Cameron et al., 2013).

2.3.3.5 Other aspects of alcohol availability

Other aspects of availability include restrictions on days and hours of trade, minimum purchasing age and differing availability of alcohol by strength (Casswell & Thamarangsi, 2009). There is New Zealand public support for reducing opening hours of premises (Law Commission, 2010; McNeil et al., 2012) backed up by evidence suggesting that increasing or reducing hours of trade can impact both on the amount of alcohol consumed and a range of harms, particularly violence, alcohol-related ED admissions and drink driving (Babor et al., 2010; Popova et al., 2009). However, it has been suggested that the evidence for an impact on harm with changes of two hours or less is less conclusive (Hahn et al., 2010). Increasing the minimum purchasing age is the most important intervention to reduce teenage drinking, however enforcement is important for success (Babor et al., 2010). The social availability of alcohol, (the social context of alcohol availability, including the supply through friends and family) (Health Promotion Agency, 2012b) is also an important contributor to teenage drinking (Babor et al., 2010; Law Commission, 2010).
2.3.4 Alcohol marketing increases alcohol harm

There is evidence that alcohol marketing contributes to pro-drinking attitudes (Babor et al., 2010). However, methodological difficulties make quantifying the effect of alcohol marketing on alcohol harm challenging (Anderson et al., 2009; Huckle et al., 2012). Cross sectional studies are unable to establish causality and it is difficult to construct a model that accurately reflects the complex social process of marketing. Many studies use advertising expenditure as a proxy for marketing, which fails to take into account advertising effectiveness or other forms of marketing, such as sponsorship (Anderson & Baumberg, 2006; Bruijn, 2012).

Nevertheless, there is an association between countries with stronger regulations on alcohol marketing and lower levels of alcohol-related problems (Babor et al., 2010). Longitudinal data also show associations between alcohol advertising, particularly through the media, movies and merchandise, with increased alcohol uptake and riskier youth drinking (Anderson et al., 2009; Casswell & Thamarangsi, 2009; Huckle et al., 2012). These findings have been replicated in experimental studies. Exposure to advertising appears to be cumulative, with increasing advertising exposure for youth leading to increased drinking throughout their 20s (Anderson et al., 2009). Thus evidence supports regulations on alcohol marketing (Babor et al., 2010), however voluntary industry accords have not proven to be efficacious (Anderson et al., 2009; Casswell & Thamarangsi, 2009). For marketing regulation to be most successful it must be an international effort, as significant marketing is done on a global scale via the internet and satellite television (Casswell & Thamarangsi, 2009).

2.3.5 Brief interventions and treatment reduce alcohol harm

Research shows that exposing people with hazardous drinking behaviours to any form of treatment reduces harm from alcohol (Babor et al., 2010). Although these interventions do not have a wide reach, they are effective and can be considered a form of prevention (Alcohol and Public Policy Group, 2010; Casswell & Thamarangsi, 2009) For individuals with hazardous drinking but not severe dependence, brief interventions in primary care settings reduce volumes of alcohol consumed and subsequent harm. For individuals with alcohol dependence there is also evidence for effectiveness of behavioural interventions, glutamate inhibitors or opiate antagonists, however the evidence for Alcoholics Anonymous or 12 step programmes is unclear (Anderson et al., 2009; Anderson, 2009).
### 2.3.6 Targeted drink driving measures reduce harm

There is strong evidence for interventions specifically targeted towards reducing harm from drink driving. Meta-analysis studies consistently find legal minimum blood alcohol concentrations, random breath testing and sobriety checkpoints all contribute to significant reductions in road traffic injuries and fatalities (Anderson et al., 2009; Babor et al., 2010; Casswell & Thamarangsi, 2009). To be most effective, these policies need to be highly visible, sustained and well enforced (Alcohol and Public Policy Group, 2010; Casswell & Thamarangsi, 2009). There is also some evidence for licence suspension or mandatory treatment for repeat drink drivers, and graduated licensing systems and or zero blood alcohol concentrations for young or learner drivers (Anderson et al., 2009; Casswell & Thamarangsi, 2009).

### 2.3.7 Education is largely ineffective at reducing alcohol harm

In contrast to the other policies discussed, there is little evidence for the effectiveness of alcohol education in school or other settings to reduce alcohol harm (Alcohol and Public Policy Group, 2010; Anderson et al., 2009; Anderson, 2009). There is also evidence that when these interventions are undertaken by the alcohol industry it can result in increased positive regard towards the industry, thus increasing harm (Anderson et al., 2009). Although most education does not lead to behaviour change, it can still be beneficial in affecting attitudes and social views of alcohol, and positioning alcohol on the political agenda (Anderson et al., 2009; Anderson, 2009).

### 2.4 Community Action

#### 2.4.1 Introduction

This case study involved community members collectively participating in the liquor licensing process in order to express their concerns about the location and activities of the Fantame Liquor Store in their local neighbourhood. Therefore, the literature examined has a strong participation focus. This section begins by reviewing the idea of ‘community’ (s. 2.4.2) then moves to describing the different ways communities can participate to further their health (s. 2.4.3). Community action is then defined (s. 2.4.4), and the role of community action in population health explained (s.2.4.5). The benefits of community participation are discussed.
(s. 2.4.6), followed by the tensions between community driven and externally driven approaches (s. 2.4.7). Facilitators and barriers to action and participation are delineated (s. 2.4.8- 2.4.9) and the Community Capitals framework explained as a way to understand community action (s. 2.4.10). Finally, previous research on community action is described and the rationale for the study explained (s. 2.4.11).

2.4.2 Who or what is ‘the community’

The term ‘community’ has been widely discussed in social science literature (DiClemente, Ralph, Crosby, & Kegler, 2009) with older reviews on the term emphasizing social interaction, common ties and shared geographic location. Indeed, historically geographically defined communities were the mainstay of communication and sharing of ideas. However globalization, with increased geographic mobility for many people, and greater access to technology has facilitated communication, bonds and the sharing of ideas between people from all over the world (Castles, 2002).

Nowadays, communities are not necessarily limited by geographic location and can also be conceptualized as being about shared values, needs and a commitment to meeting those needs, shared symbol systems, reciprocal influence and a sense of membership (DiClemente, Ralph et al., 2009). Communities can be thought of as being bound by something in common and limited by the boundaries of their commonality (Jewkes & Murcott, 1996; Mannarini & Fedi, 2009). In summary, communities can be conceptualized as being groups of people who share common interests or characteristics, such as teachers or farmers, or who share common locations, such as neighbourhoods, churches or schools (Agrawal & Gibson, 1999; Bach, Doran, Gibb, & Settle, 2010; Kerstetter, 2012; Selman, 2004).

There are many difficulties associated with defining communities for a particular purpose (Painter, Orton, Macleod, Dominelli, & Pande, 2011; Thom, Herring, Bayley, Waller, & Berridge, 2011). For example, the way the community organises itself socially may differ to the geographic boundaries prescribed by local government (Bach et al., 2010). Experiences of a ‘community’ often differ both within and across communities (MacQueen et al., 2001), and between community workers and community members (Jewkes & Murcott, 1996). Communities contain complex patterns of interrelationships, with much of the activity obscured from public view (Painter et al., 2011). Thus in defining ‘community’ it is important to analyse how that community works (Bach et al., 2010), and to examine the diverse interests...
and roles of the various actors, in addition to influences on decision making (Agrawal & Gibson, 1999). It is also important to acknowledge that the idea and reality of ‘community’ happens within the broader political and social context (Agrawal & Gibson, 1999; DiClemente, Ralph et al., 2009).

### 2.4.3 Community participation in health: a broad field

Research describing community involvement to influence community health is a wide-ranging field. It covers broad and specific initiatives that are either community driven or externally driven (Clark, 2007; Greenaway & Witten, 2006; Laverack, 2012; Milligan et al., 2008; Tenbensel, 2010). On one end of the spectrum there is community-initiated grassroots activism, which uses communication to change people’s view of social reality and shift power for social change (Shragge, 2013; Zoller, 2005). Activism usually focuses on a specific issue utilising participation, legal action and protest as strategies to give voice to the problem (Barnett & Barnett, 2003).

The other end of the spectrum includes efforts led by others outside the community to mobilize existing community resources. Examples include the fields of community mobilizing, development, empowerment and organizing (Alcohol Advisory Council of New Zealand, n.d.-a; Fawcett et al., 2011; Pilisuk, McAllister, & Rothman, 2010; Tones & Green, 2004; Treno & Holder, 1997). Each of these areas are slightly different, but they all aim to help empower and strengthen a communities ability to solve problems, making collective action on specific issues more likely (Alcohol Advisory Council of New Zealand, n.d.-a; Greenaway & Witten, 2006).

### 2.4.4 What is ‘community action’

The literature regarding community action on alcohol or health is also varied, including both community and externally led initiatives (Alcohol Advisory Council of New Zealand, n.d.-a; Casswell, 2000; Greenaway & Witten, 2006). For the purposes of this research, community action is defined as ‘collective action driven by a community to influence factors in the environment which determine a community’s health’. This case study describes community action which involves participation in the liquor licensing legal process. As there is a lack of research examining specifically community driven action (Conway, Greenaway, Casswell, Liggins, & Broughton, 2007; Shoebridge, 2012; Tenbensel, 2010), the literature also
incorporates references from externally led action, as well as other closely related fields such as community development and mobilization.

2.4.5 Community action as a public health strategy

Community action and mobilization have become increasingly important in response to the complex and sometimes unpredictable threats brought about by societal changes such as globalization, climate change and terrorism (Bach et al., 2010). These threats to communities include neoliberal alcohol laws which result in less regulation of alcohol (Huckle, Pledger, & Casswell, 2006). There is debate about the relative effects of action at global or local levels. Communities are more able to give their voice to a local issue, however it is also argued that a broader focus can be more important, with globalization resulting in global actors holding increasing power. The government has an important role in mediating these power relations (Gaventa, 2005).

The importance of community action or participation in social policy is increasingly recognised by governments and public health professionals (Casswell, 2001; DeFilippis, Fisher, & Shragge, 2010; Innes & Booher, 2004; Larner & Craig, 2005; Wallis & Dollery, 2002). Public health or population health as a discipline acknowledges health is a holistic concept; encompassing physical, social and spiritual aspects (World Health Organization, 1986). Health is influenced by range of factors, including the broader social and physical environment (Alcohol Advisory Council of New Zealand, n.d.-a; Braunack-Mayer & Louise, 2008; Martin, 2002; Tones & Green, 2004). The Ottawa Charter for Health Promotion specifies multiple avenues for population health to help enable people to ‘increase control over and improve their health’. This includes building health public policy, reorienting health services, creating supportive environments, building personal skills and strengthening community action (World Health Organization, 1986).

The ethical principles underlying this approach include striving for equity and social justice, respect for autonomy of individuals and groups in addition to collaborative and consultative ways of working (Morgaine & Moore, 2007; World Health Organization, 1986). Striving for equity, and fostering partnerships and participation in health, is especially important in New Zealand. This is because of the obligations to the Māori population under the Treaty of Waitangi (Alcohol Advisory Council of New Zealand, n.d.-a; Larner & Craig, 2005; Martin, 2002; Morgaine & Moore, 2007).
2.4.6 Community participation in decision making: why is it important?

Governments have also recognised the importance of facilitating community participation in decision making (Painter et al., 2011). Fostering community participation can:

a) Provide legitimacy to the democratic process as well as advance fairness and justice as minority needs are heard (Casswell, 2001; Innes & Booher, 2004; Pilisuk et al., 2010; Tenbensel, 2010; Uslaner, 2013),

b) Define values and understand the national mood for agenda setting (B. Maclennan, Kypri, Langley, & Room, 2011; B. Maclennan, Kypri, Room, & Langley, 2013; Tenbensel, 2010),

c) Address local communities’ needs (Casswell, 2001; Greenaway & Witten, 2006) with local knowledge leading to improved decision making (Innes & Booher, 2004; Ohio State University, n.d.) and

d) Grow social capital and thus foster sustainable development (Larner & Craig, 2005; Wallis & Dollery, 2002).

One theory about why participation is beneficial to communities is because it enhances community empowerment (empowerment theory), with studies showing a strong correlation between participation and empowerment. Empowerment is not well defined in the literature, with debate over whether it is an individual or collective process. However it can be conceived as the ability to mobilise resources, create change and result in a degree of control over the environment. There is a correlation between social capital, or the bonds between people, and levels of empowerment in a community (Painter et al., 2011). One theory is that empowerment is generated through the utilization and production of social capital, by allowing opportunities for dialogues and relationships, generating trust, shared understandings, building networks and building capacity (Innes & Booher, 2004). Thus empowerment is also understood to be both a process and outcome (Painter et al., 2011).

However, there are criticisms of the ‘participation as empowerment’ model, the most common being that it ignores inequalities of power, information and resources (Abbott, 2010; Gaventa, 2005; Innes & Booher, 2004; Painter et al., 2011). Opportunities for participation are in a predefined form, with those creating the space also shaping the rules of the space, and prescribing what knowledge and information is valid (Painter et al., 2011; Ransome, 2014).
Therefore, participation is not on an even playing field and the chances to create real shifts in power are limited.

There are also concerns about representation, both in terms of disadvantaged groups not being adequately represented, and in who legitimately speaks for whom (Gaventa, 2005; Painter et al., 2011). It is argued that ‘tick box’ participation can take attention away from remediating inequalities. Such superficial ‘participation’ can drain community resources without any real change, and this can leave communities feeling overburdened and disillusioned (Painter et al., 2011). Thus as the quality of participation is important to successful empowerment (Gaventa, 2005) citizen participation in local government is most successful when participation is more than a tokenistic response. Participation needs to be pursued by multiple levels of government, with opportunities for real shifts in power and with structures in place to support this devolution of power (Painter et al., 2011).

### 2.4.7 Community action: tensions between a top down and bottom up approach

> Everybody has the power to act in favour of the common good, but the temptation to impose a resource where it is not needed or cleverness where it is not wanted is ever present [Pat Snedden] (Inspiring Communities, 2013)

Although there is agreement on the benefits of community action, there is a tension between community driven and expert driven approaches to health promotion, in both theory and practise (Greenaway & Witten, 2006; Laverack & Labonte, 2000; Painter et al., 2011). Externally driven, or top down approaches involve experts outside the community defining problems and solutions to help a community take action (Laverack & Labonte, 2000). Top down approaches are likely to be resourced and evidence based. However they have been criticised as being paternalistic and failing to address broader determinants of health such as powerlessness and social capital (Braunack-Mayer & Louise, 2008; Treno & Holder, 1997) instead portraying people as negative or deficient (McKinnon, 2007). Furthermore, they may fail to achieve the goals if they do not reflect communities’ true concerns and are not supported or taken up by the community (DiClemente, Ralph et al., 2009; Treno & Holder, 1997).

In contrast, community driven or bottom up grassroots approaches can address broader determinants of health by empowering communities, and are more likely to have community
support (Bach et al., 2010; DiClemente, Ralph et al., 2009; Laverack & Labonte, 2000; Treno & Holder, 1997). However, with increasing specialisation of knowledge, there is an increased need to cooperate and rely on other specialists for ‘expert’ advice in a particular area (Ransome, 2014). Bottom up approaches may suffer from a lack of resources, political leverage and evidence base, providing ethical dilemmas for health promotion practitioners trying to maximise health and scarce resources (Braunack-Mayer & Louise, 2008; Laverack, 2012; Treno & Holder, 1997). Furthermore, disempowered communities may lack the ability to make truly autonomous choices and the knowledge to make informed decisions around specific factors influencing health (Braunack-Mayer & Louise, 2008).

Consequently, it is argued that elements of both externally driven and community driven approaches are ethically advisable for successful community action (Braunack-Mayer & Louise, 2008; Morgaine & Moore, 2007). New Zealand research has found that in the social services contracting environment, community activists and leaders have been employed as brokers between the community and local authorities, arguably helping strengthen partnerships and movement towards a more participatory governance (Larner & Craig, 2005). In addition, support from specialists in particular areas can help communities actualise their priorities, with public participation and priority setting an important first step (Bach et al., 2010; Conway, 2002).

There is comparatively less research regarding bottom up approaches, which also suffer from difficulties in quantifying and measuring the outcome (Israel, Schulz, Parker, & Becker, 1998; Laverack & Labonte, 2000). Thus features from both top down and bottom up approaches form an integral part of an emerging area that combines research (or at least reflection) with community action (W. K. Cook, 2008; Williams, Labonte, & Brien, 2003; Wynn, Taylor-Jones, Johnson, Bostick, & Fouad, 2011). This area has various forms, but the basic tenet is that partnerships between researchers and communities will produce research that will benefit the community under study by also making some change (Israel et al., 1998; Williams et al., 2003). The action research is a cyclical practise with continued action and reflection with each phase informing the next. This approach promises to generate both results for the community under study and generate useful insights for health promotion practise (Williams et al., 2003).

The literature discusses the relative merits of having a researcher from within or outside the community. An outside researcher may come with a more neutral perspective, however they also may not ever be able to fully understand and be accepted by the community (Kerstetter,
The boundaries between an insider and outsider are murky and whether or not someone is accepted relates more to perceived similarities or differences in power, education, age, ethnicity, gender, religion, values and culture (Kerstetter, 2012; Merriam & Johnson-Bailey, 2001).

### 2.4.8 Community action: what facilitates this

Community action and empowerment research has suggested numerous factors that are important for successful community led action or externally led community action. This section highlights factors relevant to both, with a particular focus on community led action. These supporting factors include strong leadership, acknowledgment of the local context and creating a supportive environment for action (Inspiring Communities, 2013). Sections 2.4.8.1 – 2.4.8.3 discuss the above factors. Section 2.4.8.4 touches on the role of the media in community action.

#### 2.4.8.1 Leadership: a commitment to creating change

Effective community action usually requires a passionate, organized leader with a vision of success (Barnett & Barnett, 2003; Boehm & Staples, 2005; Greenaway & Witten, 2006; Larner & Craig, 2005; Laverack, 2012; Pigg, Gasteyer, Martin, Keating, & Apaliyah, 2013; Pilisuk et al., 2010; Wallin, 2007). A leader is more likely to be successful if they are viewed as credible (Ohio State University, n.d.) and having the ability to lead and create change (Pigg et al., 2013). A key leadership attribute is the ability to communicate and network, building relationships of trust which enable the sharing of resources (Barnett & Barnett, 2003; Greenaway & Witten, 2006; Larner & Craig, 2005; Laverack & Whipple, 2010; Laverack, 2012; Treno & Holder, 1997). It has also been recognised that successful grassroots leaders attend to both accomplishing tasks and ensuring positive relations within the group (Boehm & Staples, 2005). Thus a key step to supporting community action is to develop the capacity of community leaders (Inspiring Communities, 2013; Painter et al., 2011).

#### 2.4.8.2 Working with the local context

Successful community action requires an understanding of the local context, such as the political environment, community culture, history, values, knowledge, strengths and constraints (Barnett & Barnett, 2003; Fawcett et al., 2011; Gaventa, 2005; Graham & Chandler-Coutts, 2000; Holder & Moore, 2000; Inspiring Communities, 2013; Midford, 2007;
The extent of community participation and involvement in decision making throughout the process is also a key to success (Barnett & Barnett, 2003; Conway, 2002; Fawcett et al., 2011; Greenaway & Witten, 2006; Holder & Moore, 2000; Inspiring Communities, 2013; Treno & Holder, 1997). Small scale, local projects work best for community based prevention drug and alcohol problems, as they are easier to fund and can be more responsive to community needs (Midford, 2007). Communities with more resources are more likely to participate. Resources include time, income, education, social connections, organization and communication skills (Uslaner, 2013).

Religion can help mobilize communities, including deprived communities, through opportunities to develop civic skills and foster connections, building community trust. Furthermore, religious leaders can encourage their congregation to support initiatives because of their faith (Uslaner, 2013). In general, people like expressing their values and beliefs (Ransome, 2014) so people are more likely to get involved in community matters if the issue conflicts with their values and is ethically, religiously, economically or morally unacceptable to them (Ohio State University, n.d.; Wallin, 2007). Furthermore, research into environmental action finds people are more likely to take action if they have direct experience of the problem, or it is affecting their quality of life (Kollmuss & Agyeman, 2002). The degree to which the solution can be observed and the complexity of the action are also factors. Thus community readiness to tackle an issue is an important consideration (Wallin, 2007).

Knowledge of the issue and time to discuss it and evaluate how it fits in with their values is also important. Education is often a prized value, so action relating to schools is common. Community members are more likely to take part if they are asked by someone they know (Ohio State University, n.d.). However, this likelihood suffers from a selection bias, in that the people who were asked would be most likely to participate anyway (Uslaner, 2013).

Acknowledging the local context, community action is enhanced by an ability of community leaders and others to be flexible in the timing, content and timescales (Conway, 2002; Graham & Chandler-Coutts, 2000; Holder & Moore, 2000; Inspiring Communities, 2013). This is facilitated by reflective practices. These practices examine approaches and progress whilst challenging existing way of working (Greenaway & Witten, 2006; Inspiring Communities, 2013).
### 2.4.8.3 Creating a supportive environment

Community action is also supported by factors in the social environment, including the broader political climate, the extent of structural opportunities for action, the availability of local resources and any support from professionals. Action is more likely to take place if the broader political and national environment fosters participation and provides spaces for action (Boots & Midford, 2007; Selman, 2004). Structural opportunities include formal channels, organizational structures and democratic frameworks which allow community input into decisions which affect their lives (Ohio State University, n.d.; Painter et al., 2011). Communities can be supported by elites, activist public agencies and private sector organizations through creating supportive conditions which facilitate action (Painter et al., 2011; Uslaner, 2013).

Health promotion often occurs in particular community settings, as health determinants are present in situations of daily life where people live, work and play (World Health Organization, 1986). The environments and neighbourhoods that people inhabit impact on their health, and can be utilised to create positive health change. For example, the New Zealand ‘Inspiring Communities’ projects recognize that community hubs, such as schools, provide a space for people to connect and share ideas and resources, becoming ‘their space’ (Inspiring Communities, 2013).

Community coalitions bring diverse individuals together to work towards common goals. Research into these coalitions suggest that partnerships with experts in certain areas can help build the capacity of communities and community leaders, through the provision of resources, incentives and education (Chavis, 1995; Conway, 2002). This process can be costly to both sides in terms of time and energy. Support includes providing information, referrals, training, research and evaluation, and assistance in fundraising, communicating, setting goals and developing social relationships (Chavis, 1995). This support can help communities navigate bureaucratic processes (Barnett & Barnett, 2003; Graham & Chandler-Coutts, 2000; Holder & Moore, 2000; Laverack, 2012) which in turn can aid in the legitimacy and credibility of the project (Laverack & Whipple, 2010; Pilisuk et al., 2010). For these relationships to work, an acknowledgment by powerful parties of the power dynamics within these relationships has been noted as helping facilitate community action efficacy (Greenaway & Witten, 2006; Tenbensel, 2010). For example, officials need to be proactive in being aware of and
identifying barriers to collaboration such as difficulties attending meetings outside of their local community due to lack of transport or childcare.

2.4.8.4 Working with the media

The media transmits information to the general public and can also play a role in community action, by framing, informing, educating and creating interest in public issues, and influencing decision makers (Anderson et al., 2009; Liz Stewart & Casswell, 1993; Uslaner, 2013; Whitman, 2013). For communities to achieve the promotion of a message, short sound bites are often used, utilizing symbols perceived positively by the general public such as fairness, hard work, family, health, education, freedom, security and churches (Whitman, 2013). Reading local newspapers that have a focus on local issues and civic journalism can help increase civic engagement, however, the relationships between media viewing and civic action are complex, varying among type of media and type of civic action, and require further investigation (Uslaner, 2013). In terms of utilizing the media to enlist support for community action, the ‘diffusion of innovations’ theory suggests that mass media is an important influence in the beginning of actions by raising awareness of the issue. However, peers may be the biggest influence for the majority of people, with them taking part in community action due to being asked by someone they know (Wallin, 2007).

2.4.9 Barriers to action and participation

There are also multiple barriers to action, including a lack of leadership (Barnett & Barnett, 2003; Greenaway & Witten, 2006; Larner & Craig, 2005; Laverack, 2012; Pigg et al., 2013; Pilisuk et al., 2010; Wallin, 2007) or appreciation of the local context (Barnett & Barnett, 2003; Fawcett et al., 2011; Gaventa, 2005; Graham & Chandler-Cou tts, 2000; Holder & Moore, 2000; Midford, 2007; Tenbensel, 2010; Wallis & Dollery, 2002), and a lack of opportunities or resources, including collaborative skills and time (Innes & Booher, 2004). Inequalities in access to power, information and resources can hinder meaningful participation (Painter et al., 2011). Furthermore, as people often take part due to someone they know asking them, many people will never participate simply because they were never asked (Uslaner, 2013).
2.4.9.1 Deprivation as a potential barrier to participation

One of the ideas of empowerment theory (s. 2.4.6 above), is that social capital and trust between people must be present for participation to occur (Painter et al., 2011). Preconditions for trust include transparency, reciprocity and interaction (Bach et al., 2010). Thus, in areas of high diversity, action may be less likely to occur due to weak community ties resulting from a fear of the unfamiliar (Ohio State University, n.d.).

Similarly, highly deprived communities are often less likely to take part in participatory action, due to repeated experiences of a lack of control over their environment, leading to a lower sense of control or belief that they can make a difference (Abbott, 2010; Gaventa, 2005; Kollmuss & Agyeman, 2002; Uslaner, 2013). Therefore, deprived communities with fewer resources are less likely to participate in community action, perceiving the benefits or chance of success as low and not outweighing the costs of time, resources, and potential loss of prestige (Kollmuss & Agyeman, 2002; Ohio State University, n.d.; Uslaner, 2013; Wallin, 2007). However, failing to direct resources towards deprived communities, due to low perceived capacity and likelihood of the community participating can increase inequalities of health (DiClemente, Ralph et al., 2009).

2.4.9.2 Institutional arrangements can stifle participation

Another barrier to participation comes from differential access to power, information and resources making meaningful participation difficult (Painter et al., 2011). Meaningful participation involves opportunities for shifts in power (Gaventa, 2005; Painter et al., 2011). However, spaces for participation are not neutral, with those creating the space, also creating the rules of the space in terms of whose voices are heard, and determining what information is considered relevant (Gaventa, 2005; Innes & Booher, 2004). There are many barriers to organisations and institutions having participatory approaches, including a lack of time, money, collaborative skills and opportunities for discussions between competing stakeholders. In addition, officials may also fear loss of power, and struggle to adapt to new ways of working (Innes & Booher, 2004).

2.4.10 A framework for community development and action

A community can be conceptualized by the assets and resources it contains (Centre for Sustainable Community Development, 2012) with certain capacities needed to prevent and
overcome social problems (Chavis, 1995). The Community Capitals framework (CCF) highlights these resources (Centre for Sustainable Community Development, 2012; Flora & Flora, 2008) and provides a framework for understanding the process of community development (Pigg et al., 2013). These resources include the seven constructs of natural, cultural, human, social, political, financial and built capital that can be built on and enriched to facilitate community change (Flora & Flora, 2008; Pigg et al., 2013). The different capital is explained in further detail below.

(1) Natural capital includes the natural resources and amenities present in a location such as such as the weather and natural beauty. One aspect important for community action is the physical distance between residences and the sites of political decisions making. For instance, being able to walk to the local council office can help.

(2) Cultural capital is about how people understand and relate to the world and is reflected in what heritages are valued and voices listened to. The extent to which people work hard and collaborate across races and generations can be a reflection of cultural capital.

(3) Human capital encapsulates the skills and resources in the community, and the community’s ability to access outside resources. An important feature of human capital is leadership, with successful leaders focusing on strengths, able to ‘lead across difference’ and foster inclusive participation (Emery & Flora, 2006; Flora & Flora, 2008).

(4) Social capital represents the bonds between people that facilitate collaboration. This includes both bonding social capital or the strong ties between people who know each other well and bridging social capital or looser ties between different groups or individuals within a community (Emery & Flora, 2006; Painter et al., 2011). Churches, schools or other community groups can be a source of social capital.

(5) Political capital refers to access to power and power brokers and the ability to influence rules and norms. This may include contacts such as professional and church contacts, and the support of local politicians.

(6) The financial resources available to be invested in a community forms the sixth type, financial capital.
Finally, built capital refers to the infrastructure present to support the community in its activities (Emery & Flora, 2006; Flora & Flora, 2008). This can include school buildings, parks and other meeting places.

Research into relationship among the types of community capital proposes that the capital can be built on so as to support community change (Conway, 2002; Pigg et al., 2013). Emery and Flora proposed that fostering social capital was the first step in generating an increase in other community capital, by turning a downward spiral of loss into an upward spiral of hope, a process they termed spiralling up (Emery & Flora, 2006; Pigg et al., 2013). However, more recent research examining the use of the CCF in various communities suggests that the relationship is more complicated. Leaders deployed multiple capitals which interacted with each other in a mutually reinforcing way. Although they did not have explicit knowledge of the CCF, leaders seemed to understand how communities worked and were selective in the capitals that they utilized. Capitals often clustered, with social, political and human capital often mobilized together and financial, built and natural capital leveraged together (Pigg et al., 2013).

However, the main factors which predict successful development include the way the leaders and community members view themselves, their neighbours, and the efficacy of the community and leader. That is, the leader is willing to get involved, and they and the community believe they can be successful (Pigg et al., 2013). These factors were found to be important in other studies as discussed above (Ohio State University, n.d.; Uslaner, 2013).
2.4.11 Community action on alcohol: dearth of research

2.4.11.1 New Zealand communities are interested in alcohol policy

New Zealand communities have taken an active interest in alcohol policy and liquor licensing from the time of the temperance movement through to the present (Law Commission, 2010; Shoebridge, 2012). Early in the 20th century voting in licensing polls was comparable to that of the general elections with media coverage of prohibition polling even greater than the coverage of the general elections (Christoffel, 2008; Shoebridge, 2012). More recently, the New Zealand Law Commission review into alcohol in New Zealand drew a record number of submissions for a social policy issue. Liquor licensing was one of the concerns which drew the most comment (Law Commission, 2010). There also appears to have been strong media coverage of alcohol issues. For example, alcohol law stories numbered 13% of the New Zealand Herald newspaper’s social issues front page stories in 2012, and the word drink featured as one of the top 30 words in headlines (Wendelborn, 2013).

2.4.11.2 Interest does not equal research

Despite enduring community interest in alcohol issues, there is a dearth of research into New Zealand community driven action on alcohol issues except for one case study covered below (Conway et al., 2007; Shoebridge, 2012; Tenbensel, 2010). Most of the research on communities and alcohol-related harm, both in New Zealand and overseas, focusses on the community as a setting and on outcomes, as opposed to processes (Anderson et al., 2009; Babor et al., 2010). Most researched community action is driven by professionals from outside the community (Babor et al., 2010; Casswell, 2000; Graham & Chandler-Coutts, 2000). Many projects included community action as part of a broad range of policy strategies, making the community action component difficult to analyse separately (Babor et al., 2010; d’Abbs & Togni, 2000). Greenaway and Witten’s (2006) analysis of community action in New Zealand struggled to find well documented projects. As such, there is a lack of knowledge about community driven collective action success factors which are important for improving health promotion practice (Tenbensel, 2010).
2.4.11.1.3 Thinking about alcohol policy

There is however some New Zealand survey data examining community sentiment towards alcohol policy. A 2007 survey entitled ‘Community views on drinking and alcohol-related problems’ targeted 2337 people from the electoral roll and had a 60% response rate (B. A. Maclennan, 2010). It concluded that alcohol was a community concern that warranted tougher government regulation, including reducing the opening hours of off-licenced premises. There was also some support for reducing the number of outlets, however this varied by location (B. A. Maclennan, 2010; B. Maclennan, Kypri, Langley, & Room, 2012). Although 40% of respondents had taken action on some type of local issue, and 18% had considered taking action on alcohol, only 4% had done so. Twelve percent of respondents thought they could influence the number of outlets, and 24% of respondents were confident they could influence the location of outlets in their community. Thus the authors of this study suggested that either residents did not know how to use the power they had to participate in official licensing processes or did not rate their chance of success in those processes as being very high (Kypri & Maclennan, 2014). Other New Zealand survey data noted an association between perceived neighbourhood cohesiveness and less risky patterns of drinking (Lin, Witten, Casswell, & You, 2012).

2.4.11.1.4 Case studies of community driven action

Two pertinent case studies were found highlighting community driven action on alcohol issues. One was set in Australia and one in New Zealand (Conway, 2002; Lockwood, 1989). The Australian study describes a long community action battle against an on-licence premises which was causing disruption due to noise, vandalism and parking problems in a residential suburb. It details multiple strategies used by residents to further their cause including: written documentation of problems, fundraising activities, letters and petitions to appropriate authorities, public meetings, letter drops, newspaper advertisements and presentations at local government meetings. However, despite residents winning 14 out of 15 cases of legal action relating to licensing between 1980-1988 they did not see much change mostly due to legal technicalities. The long battle took a toll on the residents, many of whom were tired, emotionally drained and upset at being labelled wowsers (Lockwood, 1989).

The second article describes efforts initiated by local residents in the Piha community in New Zealand to reduce the harm from alcohol at Piha beach during holiday season. Concerned
residents pressured the council and police to initiate alcohol bans. The council delegated responsibility to the local community board, who brought stakeholders together including police, council staff and community groups to form a coalition. Following strategy meetings they initiated an alcohol ban, backed up by police presence. Although local government policy did not allow a 24/7 ban, the promotion implied this was the case. This was a key to success, with the ban resulting in fewer police attendance events and fewer injuries compared with previously. Other keys to success were community ownership, a shared vision, and the role of the local council in facilitating, funding and promoting the ban. The coalition was beneficial to all involved. Strategy meetings helped facilitate relationships, networks and communication regarding other community health issues. The ban reduced harm and the coalition increased community capacity to tackle other issues. The community was proud of the achievement, having resolved many longstanding problems (Conway, 2002).

2.4.12 Literature review conclusions

This literature review has highlighted the high burden of alcohol-related harm in New Zealand, along with evidence for successful policies to mitigate alcohol harm. It has discussed the role of community action and participation in progressing population health, and highlighted a lack of research into community initiated collective action. There were no previous studies found that detailed community driven action within the New Zealand liquor licensing process. This case study aims to help fill that gap and identify some keys to successful community action and participation in the liquor licensing process in New Zealand.
Chapter Three: Methods

3.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the methods used in this thesis and the rationale underpinning their use. The thesis aim was to better understand the role of community action in progressing population health issues, particularly alcohol issues. To explore this question, a qualitative case study was undertaken, examining community involvement in the liquor licencing process the liquor store in Fantame Street, Cannons Creek, Porirua, New Zealand, between 2011 to October 2013.

The epistemological approach adopted for the research was constructionism. Other possible epistemologies for the research included positivism, where there is one objective truth, and subjectivism, where objects and phenomena have no intrinsic meaning but are ascribed meaning by people which is independent of the phenomena. Constructionism however acknowledges that understandings are formed through the relationships between objects and phenomena and the way they are experienced, and as such there can be multiple realities (Center for Qualitative Psychology, 2011; Israel et al., 1998). As a qualitative case study, this approach was chosen to better capture and understand the rich details of people’s experiences and to explore the nature of the relationships involved (Simons, 2009).

The research questions for this case study were formulated in November 2012 and ethics obtained from the Otago University Wellington Public Health Department (reference D13/D17). The initial scope of the research included events from 2011 up until the end of 2012. The research began in March 2013, and in August 2013 the case study period was extended to the end of October 2013. This decision was made because subsequent events relating to the Fantame Street liquor store were happening around the time of the interviews, were important to stakeholders and were relevant to the case under study. In addition, as the research progressed it became clear that events occurring from 2008 were important to the case study. These events are also touched on.
This methods chapter firstly describes the data collection procedures including document analysis, key informant interviews as well as informal observations and conversations (s. 3.2). This is followed by the data analysis process (s. 3.3).

3.2 Primary data collection

3.2.1 Document analysis

Document assembly and analysis provided the starting point for this case study’s data collection. Initial background documents of interest were provided by staff at RPH. Further documents were obtained from Google searches, using terms including Fantame Liquor Store, Russell School, and Thirsty Liquor Porirua. This search uncovered media reporting on the events, official reports of ARLA and LLA hearings and links to the Fantame Liquor Objections (FLOF) Facebook page (See 3.2.1.1 below for further information regarding Facebook).

The document search was an iterative process, with some documents providing avenues for further document searching. Documents were also obtained from the files of RPH employees and the Porirua DLA in November 2013, following an official information request. These requests resulted in copies of briefs of evidence, regulatory agency reports, and other information presented at the 2011 and 2012 Fantame Liquor Store, and 2013 Nischay’s hearings. Community objections from the 2013 hearing were also obtained. During attendance at the August 2013 Nischay’s hearing for a liquor licence at 21 Fantame Street, the researcher collected all of the publically available documents presented at the hearing including submissions, reports, exhibits and statements of evidence (Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority, 2013b). In February 2014 the researcher obtained an electronic file from Matt Crawshaw containing all his correspondence relating to the liquor store objections and associated events. This included emails, event posters and planning documents as well as other official documents. However, due to this information being obtained so late into the thesis, not all of it was able to be utilised.

Prospective documents were skim read to ascertain their relevance for this study. Documents were considered relevant to the extent that they helped answer the study aims and objectives. That is, if they explained something about what happened during the Fantame Street liquor licensing process, the roles played by various actors, or provided background information
about the process or the local community. Relevant sections of the documents were highlighted, with much of the relevant information used to help make a working ‘timeline of events’ which formed the backbone of the results. Other information informed the interview questions or avenues for further research.

3.2.1.1 Facebook as a source of primary documents

In addition to mainstream media, the most popular social media site in New Zealand, Facebook, was utilised as a source of primary documents (Facebook New Zealand, 2011; Social Bakers, 2013; G. White, 2012). ‘Fantame Liquor Objections’ (FLOF) page was the primary source of Facebook information alongside other relevant Facebook pages (Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook page, 2011a; Kapi-Mana News Facebook page, 2013; Thirsty Liquor Porirua Facebook page, 2012b).

Facebook has various privacy settings. On the FLOF page, some content was posted publically so that any registered Facebook user who searched the page could view, comment or show appreciation for the content by clicking ‘like’ button. Other content was posted to ‘friends’ of the page. Users can become ‘friends’ by requesting to connect with the person or page.

In this instance the researcher’s request to become ‘friends’ with FLOF was accepted which allowed her access to all of the content posted both publicly and to friends. This included posters, invitations to and messages about upcoming events, updates, links to media articles about group action and other correspondence. Most of the content on the FLOF page was utilised in the thesis, either as part of the timeline of events, or to understand how the community action events were organised.

3.2.2 Interviews

3.2.2.1 Participant recruitment

The main data source for this case study was eight in-depth face to face interviews with key stakeholders. Study participants were selected from those involved in the Fantame Street liquor licence process between 2011 and 2013. Stakeholders were specifically chosen to provide an in-depth view of the process from their position of involvement as a community member, employee of public health agency or official employed to regulate or enforce local liquor licensing. With a maximum of eight participants due to time constraints, this meant one
or two participants per organisation or situation, to provide a variety of perspectives. The selection of individuals within the community or organisation of interest was on the basis of the extent of their involvement in the community and regulatory processes, and their ability to articulate their experience (Boots & Midford, 2007).

Identification of and contact with relevant participants was initially facilitated by Andrea Boston, Public Health Advisor, RPH who had had extensive contact with a range of relevant regulatory and community stakeholders (Kawulich, 2005). Seven participants were approached by Andrea and asked if they were happy to be contacted regarding the research. One further community member was identified and initially approached by community participant Matt Crawshaw. The researcher phoned all participants, explained the research, emailed an information sheet and consent form then arranged interview times. See Appendix A for a copy of the study information sheet and consent form. Where appropriate, permission to interview employees was sought from relevant senior managers. In most cases this involved asking potential participants to check with their employee, however in the case of the local council a letter was sent from RPH to the council Chief Executive Officer.

3.2.2.2 Interview process

Immediately prior to the interview, participants were reminded about the particulars of the study and signed the consent form. They were interviewed for approximately one hour. See Appendix B for a copy of the immediate pre-interview study introduction. Interviews were undertaken during September and October 2013, at public places convenient to the interviewee such as place of employment or local school. Following an uncomfortable interview undertaken at a previously unsighted room at Russell School, an amendment to the original ethics approval was obtained from the Otago University Academic Committee in September 2013. This allowed for interviews to be undertaken in participant’s homes. Interviews were audio recorded with the participant’s consent. Participants were offered a $20 grocery or petrol voucher to thank them for their time.

The interviews used a semi-structured protocol and questions were sufficiently broad to allow for emerging themes (Varvasovszky & Brugha, 2000). Multiple questioning techniques were also used to explore experiences and perceptions of the Fantame Street liquor licence process and outcome. See Appendix C for the base interview schedules. These were adapted for each interviewee, and were modified as the research process uncovered further areas that needed to
be addressed. In the case of Matt Crawshaw, a 45 minute follow up telephone interview was undertaken in March 2014.

3.2.3 Informal observations and conversations

Data was also gathered via informal observations when the researcher attended a two day ARLA hearing in August 2013. During this hearing she observed proceedings and informally chatted to people present at the hearing. The researcher also attended the community celebration day in October 2013, helping in the kitchen beforehand and with the clean up afterwards. She observed the proceedings, and during the mealtime was invited to sit at the VIP table with lawyer Alastair Sherriff, community members and RPH employees. During this event she chatted informally with people at the VIP table, and to various other people present. Other informal conversations and discussions with RPH employees experienced in alcohol harm reduction and community engagement also occurred approximately monthly between November 2012 and April 2014. These observations and conversations provided context for understanding of the interview and documentary evidence. In addition, the conversations were used to gain specific pieces of information that were missing from the interview transcripts.

3.3 Data analysis

Interview data provided the bulk of the information for analysis. Immediately following each interview, a one page summary was written to retain an overall feel of the information and ideas gained. The interviews were transcribed by the researcher. The audio for each interview was listened to once to complete a transcript, and then heard again to check the transcript for accuracy. The exception to this was the telephone follow up interview undertaken with Matt Crawshaw. Handwritten notes were taken during that interview, then a summary of those notes typed up afterwards. These notes were then sent to Crawshaw to check for accuracy. Transcripts were sent to all interviewees who requested them.

Participants were assigned codes for the results with either their name or their title used within the liquor licensing process. The following codes were used [in brackets] to refer to information generated by the interviews: (a) Community members: (i) Matt Crawshaw [Crawshaw interview], (ii) Paula MacEwan [MacEwan interview], (b) Porirua Alcohol and Drug Cluster representative [PADC interview], (c) Russell School principal [RS principal
interview], (d) Regional Public Health representative [RPH interview], (e) Medical Officer of Health [MOH interview], (f) District licensing inspector [Inspector interview], (g) Liquor licensing Police Sargent [Police interview]. Note, for ease of reading, the information gained from both the face-to-face and telephone interview with Matt Crawshaw was coded as Crawshaw, and not differentiated.

To facilitate reflexivity a research diary was kept throughout the research. At the time of the thesis submission this numbered 44 pages long. This diary noted research considerations, future directions, and notes about the way in which the researcher could see how as the research instrument she was impacting on the research. Some research diary notes stemmed from reflections following academic reading or discussions with colleagues about this case study or case study research in general (Simons, 2009). Other entries were generated following interviews, presentations about the research or whenever the researcher became stuck about how to proceed at a particular point of the research. The research diary facilitated reflection about the research as well as noting ideas, questions and action points to follow up on. Thus the research diary assisted the researcher to solve research problems as well as maintain motivation, focus and direction.

3.3.1 Making meaning

Following transcription, the researcher read the transcripts multiple times to become immersed in the data (Simons, 2009). Excerpts from transcripts were coded if they provided an answer to one of the study aims or interview questions or appeared interesting. Codes were also generated for excerpts that agreed or disagreed with (a) previous findings in the literature, (b) documents or (c) something that another interviewee said. This process firstly involved the researcher highlighting sections of the transcripts. These sections were then grouped under relevant headings, with the headings or codes refined as the process progressed. A time line of events was constructed with the researcher bringing together data from the interviews, observations and documentary analysis to make sense of the story (Flick, 2004). The timeline was an essential foundation for understanding the process of community action.

Following the completion of the timeline, it was sent to Crawshaw to check for accuracy of the event sequencing. This resulted in only minor revisions. The information utilised from the interview with the licensing inspector was also sent to the DLA for comment on their request. They did not seek any modifications.
Note, as the researcher did not have access to the documentation presented at the first two LLA hearings she utilised the documentation she collected from the 2013 hearing to describe in detail the concerns the residents expressed about the liquor store. It is likely that this would be an accurate reflection of the concerns residents expressed in previous years as it aligns with the newspaper reporting and the documentation from the LLA decisions. One of the interviewees also mentioned that most of the objectors presented similar testimonies at all hearings [MacEwan interview].

However, the 2012 LLA decision noted that much of the evidence presented by the objectors was considered irrelevant to proceedings. Thus with legal representation in 2013, it is assumed that the residents took a more focussed approach to their evidence. As a result, some of the concerns that did not align with evidence that was considered appropriate for a LLA may have been missed. The second part of the data analysis consisted of constructing key themes with supporting quotes. Themes grew of out clusters of similar codes, with information cross referenced among interviews, documents and the literature review. The clusters of codes were then condensed to key ideas or themes.

Whilst undertaking data analysis it became clear that community action was a messy process with an ill-defined beginning and ending. As a result, community action was difficult to conceptualise, explain and understand. Whilst summarising the research for a presentation, the researcher noted parallels between the community action in this study and the process of setting up a community garden. For example, both require a space in which to act, vision, leadership, groups of people working communally, determination and hard work. Other similarities include a lack of control over external factors affecting the outcome and a long latency period for things to come to fruition. Finally both have benefits and costs for those taking part, with benefits arising from both the process and the outcome.

Thus to make the community action process easier to conceptualise it was decided to structure the results using the metaphor of a community garden. Metaphors can help people to transform an abstract concept into a memorable visual image (Duit, 1991; Grubbs, 2001). Indeed, Dr Camara Jones famously used a gardening metaphor, with two sets of flowers in different soils, to describe the relationships between three levels of racism and highlight potential ways to address these (Jones, 2000). In the present study, the use of the metaphor makes the results more memorable. The metaphor was decided after the majority of the
analysis was undertaken, minimising the risk of the results being misinterpreted to fit into the metaphor structure.
Chapter Four: Results

4.1 Introduction

The key overarching aim of this work was to better understand the community action process, using the 2011-2013 Fantame Street liquor licensing events as a case study. This chapter presents the results of this case study, utilizing information from interviews, primary documents and informal observation. Information attributed to the interviewees is presented by the code of the interviewee followed by ‘interview’ in square brackets. For example [MOH interview]. Please refer to the methods section 3.3 for a list of interviewees and codes.

The results begin with a description of events (s. 4.2), which is followed by a discussion of the role of community (s. 4.3) as well as the facilitators (s. 4.4) and barriers to community action that were found (s. 4.5). The impact of the community action events is then discussed (s. 4.6).

4.2 Description of events

4.2.1 In the beginning: surveying the scene (2008)

The seeds of these community action events can be traced back to 2008 or before. (Objections to the liquor licence in 1999 are covered in s. 1.3.2). In 2008, Crawshaw moved to Cannons Creek, with his family and other members of the Urban Vision church. Their intention was to set up a five-household Urban Vision community in Cannons Creek [Crawshaw interview]. Urban Vision seeks to make a difference in marginalised communities by becoming credible members of those communities, forming quality relationships with their neighbours and protesting against injustices (Urban Vision NZ, 2013).

Crawshaw studied Politics and International relations at University. He initially worked for Porirua City Council undertaking strategic planning, and has subsequently worked for a government organisation and done other consulting work. In 2013 Crawshaw was employed by Wesley Community Action in Cannons Creek, helping to support the financial wellbeing of the community (Wesley Community Action, n.d.)(Crawshaw interview).
Crawshaw recognised that the primary school (Russell School) and the local shops around the corner from his home were community hubs, and hence could be locations for positive change. Initially he wanted to do something about the graffiti at the local Fantame Street shops, as a stepping stone project to the bigger issue of addressing problems associated with the liquor store next door. However the graffiti was addressed through a project by others, so he set his mind to doing something about the Fantame Liquor Store, as the shopping area was a core community meeting place, and challenge to positive change [Crawshaw interview]. More details about the problems with the location and actions of the liquor store are illustrated in section 4.2.9.

4.2.2 Conversations about the lie of the land: learning the language of liquor licensing (2009-2011)

Conversations were the key first step Crawshaw used to learn about alcohol, liquor stores and what could be done. Initial advice came from Alfred Ngaro a current National Party MP, [Crawshaw interview] and recognised leader in community development to improve education, health and social issues both in New Zealand and overseas. Ngaro also has experience on local and national governance boards and advisory committees (New Zealand National Party, 2014). Crawshaw’s employment at Wesley Community Action resulted in him meeting Ngaro, whose advice to Crawshaw was to begin now, and start having conversations in his community to scope out the possibilities for what could be done about the Fantame Liquor Store [Crawshaw interview, 2013].

Crawshaw spoke to officials involved in the liquor licensing process, such as the local Police Sergeant in charge of liquor licensing, and officials from the local council. He also made contact with alcohol advocacy groups interested in alcohol harm reduction, such as The New Zealand Drug Foundation (NZDF) and the Porirua Alcohol and Drug Cluster (PADC), and subsequently attended PADC meetings ‘every now and then’ [Crawshaw interview].

Founded in 2008, PADC is a group of over 40 individuals and organisations which meets to coordinate a local response to the alcohol-related harm (Porirua Alcohol and Drug Cluster, 2011; Porirua City Council, n.d.). The group was initially called CAPP (Community action against ‘P’ [Methamphetamine] in Porirua). However, alcohol emerged as the problem most concerning the community, and the name changed to reflect a change in focus [PADC interview]. In 2011 PADC active members included: Porirua Healthy Safer City Trust,

PADC aims to facilitate collaboration between alcohol and drug service providers, advocate for better services and promote social responsibility in the Porirua community (Porirua Alcohol and Drug Cluster, 2011). With respect to liquor licences, they monitor liquor licence applications, provide support to communities interested in opposing licences, and are a community voice on the local Liquor Liaison Group [PADC interview]. The Porirua Liquor Liaison group includes representatives from PADC (Porirua Healthy Safer Cities Trust employee), Police, RPH, Health promotion agency ((HPA), previously ALAC), Accident Compensation Corporation, liquor licencing inspectors and other local council employees, as well as the hospitality industry. The group meets to discuss ways to collectively address identified or potential local alcohol-related issues [Inspector interview; PADC interview; Police interview].

4.2.2.1 Looking around at what else is happening

Crawshaw became aware of other community activity going on in the broader local area, such as opposition to a proposed liquor store across the road from Cannons Creek School, which is the next school west of Russell School (Calman, 2008). See Figure 4 below for a map of Russell School in relation to Cannons Creek School. Crawshaw and his daughter attended the protest march opposing that liquor store in December 2008 but Crawshaw did not have an active role in organising the community activities (Dando, 2011a) [Crawshaw interview]. In this instance, the LLA stated that ‘to grant the application would undermine the efforts being made to change the local culture for the better’ (Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority, 2013a; New Zealand Liquor Licensing Authority, 2009). This ruling refusing a licence was considered by many local professionals to be a landmark decision, significantly influenced by community concerns [MOH interview; PADC interview; RPH interview].
Throughout 2009 to 2011, consultation for a Law Commission inquiry into New Zealand alcohol law reform was taking place. Through NZDF contacts, Crawshaw was able to join a course that NZDF were running called ‘It’s your turn to shout’, which aimed to empower communities to have input into the alcohol law reform process (New Zealand Drug Foundation, 2010, 2013). That course provided useful information about issues surrounding alcohol, media training and the importance of community groups having key messages [Crawshaw interview].
4.2.3 Germinating the seeds: The warm up, ‘getting better at telling our story’

Crawshaw became the Chairman of the Russell School Board of Trustees (BOT) in 2009. A BOT governs each New Zealand school, and comprises the school principal, an elected staff member and three to seven elected parent representatives (Ministry of Education, 2009). In 2010-2011 Crawshaw, on behalf of the Russell School Board, made submissions to both the Law Commission Review on alcohol policy and the Justice and Electoral Select Committee hearing on the Alcohol Reform Bill [Crawshaw interview](New Zealand Drug Foundation, 2013; Russell School Board of Trustees, 2011). Crawshaw said that the Russell School BOT ‘wanted to get our point across that this is not the sort of community we want for our kids, where excessive drinking is seen as normal and they have to wake up every day with cans stacked on their lawn’ (New Zealand Drug Foundation, 2013). See Appendix D below for a copy of the Russell School submission on the Alcohol Reform Bill. In February 2011, the Russell School BOT presented to the Alcohol Reform Bill select committee. This was to ‘get better at telling our story… knowing that eventually this licence was going to come up for its regular renewal’ and to provide the select committee with a ‘street view of alcohol in our lives’ within the wider ‘Google eye view the select committee had to take’ [Crawshaw interview].

4.2.4 Drawing up the plans: bringing together a group of experienced gardeners

Over time, a number of conversations initiated by Crawshaw, the Russell School principal (Sose Annandale), and members of PADC led to contact with other people who had successfully opposed liquor licences. Crawshaw began to generate a support network of people interested in assisting the community to oppose the Fantame Liquor Store’s liquor licence. A NZDF contact put Crawshaw in touch with an employee of the then ALAC. The ALAC employee talked with Crawshaw at length, explaining the liquor licensing legislation. He advised that there was a clause about store opening hours that they could utilise in objections to the licence renewal [Crawshaw interview]. He also put Crawshaw directly in contact with the local MOH, Dr Stephen Palmer, who had been involved in opposing previous licences [Crawshaw interview; MOH interview].
A core group of stakeholders interested in opposing the Fantame Liquor Store’s liquor licence had their first meeting in the Russell School staffroom in May 2011, as they knew that the store’s licence was due for renewal in a few months [Crawshaw interview]. At that stage, the ‘Fantame liquor objectors working group’ comprised individuals with a professional interest in alcohol harm reduction and experience in liquor licensing, such as representatives from ALAC, RPH, the local Police Sergeant, as well as Crawshaw, the Russell School principal and two community members [Crawshaw interview; Police interview]. They strategized about the best actions for a successful hearing result. These strategies included having as many objections as possible that addressed the relevant objection criteria, having as large a group as possible at the hearing, and not putting effort into petitions, which are not given any weight in the licensing process [Crawshaw interview].

4.2.4.1 Gathering evidence

Throughout this time, the community, Police and MOH tried to gather evidence to support their case [Crawshaw interview; MOH interview; Police interview]. For example, the LLA had previously ruled that selling legal highs at a liquor store was considered unsuitable practice for a liquor licence holder. Therefore, the Police asked a local resident to purchase some legal highs and a six-pack of beer and pass on the receipt [Police interview]. The MOH and others also sat outside the store until midnight one night, to gather first-hand evidence of late-night happenings at the store (New Zealand Drug Foundation, 2013) [MOH interview].

Meanwhile, on June 25 2011, Fantame Liquor Store duty manager Sunil Patel was caught selling liquor to an underage male in a controlled purchase operation (CPO) (New Zealand Liquor Licensing Authority, 2011a; Torrie, 2011b). A CPO aims to monitor and enforce the legislation regarding selling to minors, using supervised volunteers aged 15-17 years. CPOs are administered by local Police, public health units and DLA officials (New Zealand Parliament, 2011).

Through contact with local liquor licensing officials, the core Fantame liquor objectors working group worked out that the off-licence and that Chiman Patel’s (the Fantame Liquor Store manager) general manager’s certificate renewal would be coming up in July or August 2011 [Crawshaw interview]. A general manager’s certificate is a legal authorisation to manage a licenced liquor store or other licensed premises. Applications are considered on the basis of character, convictions, and appropriate training (New Zealand Parliament, 2013b).
Based on predictions regarding the advertising dates for the Fantame Liquor Store’s liquor licence renewal, Crawshaw booked a community meeting at the Russell School hall. The timing turned out to be correct. The public notice advertising the licence renewal appeared in the Kapi-Mana newspaper on 12 July 2011, two days before the meeting (Kapi-Mana News, 2011a). The licence renewal was submitted to the Porirua City Council on 18 July 2011 (C. Patel, 2011). It is unknown why the licence renewal application was submitted after the first public notice advertising the renewal and one day before the second (Kapi-Mana News, 2011b).

### 4.2.5 Canvassing for more gardeners

To advertise the community meeting on 14 July 2011, Crawshaw and members of the local Salvation Army delivered 500-1000 flyers into the streets surrounding Fantame Liquor Store, as well as to the parents of the Russell School children. They mainly focused on delivering flyers to neighbours in the Caster Crescent and Driver Crescent areas [Crawshaw interview]. See Figure 5 and Figure 6 below for a map of the area and a copy of the flyer. In addition, Crawshaw and his Russell School BOT colleagues (Crawshaw, 2013d) went door-knocking in the streets surrounding the store, informing neighbours of the school’s issues with the liquor store, and of the upcoming community meeting. Crawshaw reported a universally positive response to the door-knocking, and hearing many stories of harm from the liquor store and from alcohol in the community [Crawshaw interview].

The first public meeting about the Fantame Liquor Store licensing was held on 14 July 2011, with around 60 attendees (Dando, 2011a; New Zealand Drug Foundation, 2013). It aimed to inform people how they could get involved in supporting opposition to the licence renewal [Crawshaw interview]. Speakers included a local MP (Kris Faafoi), the Russell School principal Sose Annandale (who grew up in Cannons Creek), Crawshaw and other church members, the MOH and a representative from NZDF [MacEwan interview]. They presented some ‘facts and figures’ about alcohol as well as ‘a quick grooming session on how to object’ [MacEwan interview]. See Figure 7 below for a photograph from the event.
Figure 5. Map showing the Castor Crescent (red line) and Driver Crescent loops (orange line) flyer delivery boundaries. Fantame Liquor Store is depicted by a yellow dot. Sourced from (Google maps, 2014b)
Are you concerned about the long hours of the Fantame Liquor Store?

Are you concerned about the effects of alcohol on the young people and children in our neighbourhood?

Do you think that it’s not ok for a bottle store to be open across the road from our children’s primary school?

Fantame Liquor License is up for renewal

We’re going to make our concerns and our voice heard.

Public Meeting

Thursday 14th July
Russell School Hall (18 Fantame Street)

6:00pm  Light refreshments
6:30pm  Minister open’s meeting
6:35pm  Community Leaders and Alcohol Experts
7:30pm  Meeting Close

We want you to come to talk about:

Our young people and the harmful effects of exposure to Alcohol

Damage to our property and safety in our neighbourhood

Hours of the liquor store reduced and the advertising controlled.

If you want to be a part of shaping the future of our neighbourhood come along and find out how you can be involved.

For more information contact Matt Crawshaw on 04 235 5787 or 021 2900 891

Figure 6. Flyer advertising a community meeting being held at Russell School 14 July 2011 to discuss the Fantame Liquor Store liquor licence renewal. Sourced from Porirua DLA
4.2.6 The working bee

Following on from the public meeting, Crawshaw and others from the core Fantame liquor objectors working group decided to host a safer neighbourhood celebration on 26 July 2011 as they ‘didn’t want it to be all negative about communities’ whinging’. Over 12 days they organised a community event with food, and local performances at Russell School. The performers were organised mainly by the former Russell School BOT chairwoman. This event was principally funded by the NZDF, with RPH donating funds for hiring the performance stage [Crawshaw interview]. The group again promoted the event with flyers delivered to the parents of Russell School children and local neighbours. They also utilised email chains and began a Facebook page called ‘Fantame Liquor Objections’ (FLOF) on 20 July 2011 (Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook page, 2011a). See Figure 8 and Figure 9 below, for a screenshot of the FLOF Facebook page and a copy of the flyer advertising the community celebration event.
Crawshaw noted the Facebook page was set up by someone else and that he was not a regular Facebook user. However, he recognised that Facebook added to the wider ‘circle of awareness’ of the issue, with some Facebook supporters even residing overseas. He noted that the intent of the page was to be a public forum, with Sunil Patel, the liquor store manager’s son, a Facebook friend initially, until he removed himself from the page [Crawshaw interview]. The first post encouraged people to object to the licence with instructions on how to do so (Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook Page, 2011b). In the first week photos of the community meeting were posted (Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook Page, 2011c) along with information and reminders about the community celebration event (Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook Page, 2011a, 2011d, 2011e, 2011f, 2011i).

Figure 8. Screenshot of the Fantame Liquor Objectors Facebook page as of 6 February 2014. Sourced from (Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook page, 2011a)
Figure 9. Flyer advertising the Caster loop family celebration on 26 July 2011. Sourced from (Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook Page, 2011a)
4.2.6.1 The media mucking in

Russell School and the Porirua Salvation Army church on the corner of Fantame Street, issued press releases about the celebration in the days leading up to the event, which invited the media to attend (Russell School, 2011; Salvation Army, 2011). This resulted in strong print, radio and television media coverage (Frykberg, 2011; Fuseworks, 2011; O’Neil, 2011; Radio New Zealand, 2011; Torrie, 2011c). One of the working group’s key messages was about protecting the local children from harm. To promote this message the event included a symbolic act whereby school children crossed the road to the liquor store surrounded by adults, and all of the children let off helium balloons [Crawshaw interview]. Refer Figure 10 to Figure 13 for photographs of this event.

4.2.6.2 Working bee was buzzing

During the event, teachers and others stationed in the staffroom provided support with writing objections in a form that would be accepted by the LLA. They used objection templates developed by the local MOH [Crawshaw interview; MOH interview]. The event was attended by over 200 locals and generated 55 out of the 88 objections to the Fantame Liquor Store liquor licence (Torrie, 2011c). Objections came from a range of people including local residents, church groups, parents of Russell School children, PADC and others (“Objections to the offlicence at 21 Fantame Street, 2011 [copies of all of the objections],” 2011) The objections were delivered to the council that night via the council electronic drop-box [Crawshaw interview] as it was the final day for objections to be submitted (Torrie, 2011c).

Following the event the FLOF Facebook page posted about how amazing the event was, thanked people for their support and also posted some photos of the event (Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook Page, 2011k, 2011m). In the coming days they posted links to media coverage, including an audio from Radio New Zealand morning report (Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook Page, 2011p), and a picture of local residents Jo and Jon Blackshaw in the Dominion Post regional newspaper (Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook Page, 2011n). See Figure 14 for a copy of this Dominion Post photograph. There were also links to video clips of the event taken by local MP Kris Faafoi (Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook Page, 2011o; Kris Faafoi Facebook Page, 2011) and to one by local resident Paula MacEwan (Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook Page, 2011q). See Figure 15 for a screenshot of Matt Crawshaw from Faafoi’s video clip.
Figure 10. Photograph of cooking sausages at the Castor loop family celebration 26 July 2011. Sourced from (Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook Page, 2011h).

Figure 11. Photograph of children surrounded by adults in a ceremonial walk across the road to the liquor store during the Caster loop family celebration 26 July 2011. Sourced from (Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook Page, 2011g).
Figure 12. Photograph of the Tongan group performance at the Caster loop family celebration 26 July 2011. Sourced from (Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook Page, 2011i).

Figure 13. Photograph of the Porirua College Tokelau group performance at the Caster loop family celebration. Sourced from (Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook Page, 2011j).
Figure 14. Photograph of Jo Blackshaw with his father Jon at the Caster loop family celebration 26 July 2011. Sourced from (Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook Page, 2011n; Torrie, 2011c) photo by Ross Giblin/Dominion Post

Figure 15. Photograph of Matt Crawshaw, chair of Russell School BOT, from a video by Kris Faafai during the Caster loop community celebration 26 July 2011. Sourced from (Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook Page, 2011o; Kris Faafoi Facebook Page, 2011).
4.2.7 Germination part one

On 8 August 2011, the Police wrote to the Porirua district licensing inspector who was processing the liquor licence application, opposing the licence on three grounds; suitability, manner in which the licensee had conducted the sale of liquor and the conditions attached to the licence, namely the hours of trade (Sargent, 2011). Then on 15 August 2011, the inspector wrote a one page report, and due to objections from the Police, MOH and community members, passed the application over to the LLA [Inspector interview] (Berkland, 2011; Porirua City Council, 2013b). Objectors were sent a letter on 15 September 2011, advising that an LLA hearing date had been set for 30 November 2011 at Porirua District Court (Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook page, 2011a).

The letter from the LLA was described as confusing (Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook page, 2011a)[Crawshaw interview]. Crawshaw described it below as:

*terribly confusing … most of my neighbours …didn’t know it was anything to do with their objection, they thought maybe they’d got in trouble for something and they were being told to come to court… there was no sort of, thank you for your objection, there was no anything that made sort of sense [of] what as a community that was going on*[Crawshaw interview].

As a result, Crawshaw had to educate fellow objectors through Facebook, email chains and conversations to ‘you know, help people to realise that it was ok and that this was part of the process’. He also had conversations with the LLA to educate them about the impact of the letter and to negotiate with them about bringing a representative sample of objectors to court, ‘although it did mean that a lot of those other people were excluded from the process as a result’ [Crawshaw interview].

In between the time the objections closed and the hearing (26 July to 30 November 2011) ‘there is that long waiting period and … the really challenging thing about this process is that it takes a lot of energy to get communities engaged and ideas and things…then it’s sort of like cold water gets poured on it because you gotta wait 3 months or whatever before anything else happens’ [Crawshaw interview].

On 1 November 2011 Crawshaw sent out a letter to fellow objectors on behalf of Russell School BOT, advising that they had selected some spokespeople to speak at the hearing so it
would speed up the process. He also stressed the importance of everyone showing up to the
court and the march that they were organising. It also noted that transport to the Porirua town
centre 4.5km away would be provided from Russell School (Google maps, 2014c). The letter
was also posted on the FLOF page (Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook page, 2011b). See
Appendix E for a copy of the letter.

A flyer promoting the march entitled ‘Come walk with us’ was delivered to 500-1000 local
residents of the weekend of 25 - 26 November 2011 (Dando, 2011a; Fantame Liquor
Objections Facebook Page, 2011r). The march was intended to be a peaceful walk to support
those that were going into court [Crawshaw interview]. See Figure 16 for a copy of the flyer.
During the following week, the Facebook page was used to promote the march, with a
Facebook event created, and three reminders posted by FLOF and others (Davies, 2011b;
Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook Page, 2011r; Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook
date, 2011c, 2011d). One hundred forty-one people were invited to the Facebook event
‘Come walk with us’ on 30 November 2011, with twenty one saying they would attend, and
nine saying they would maybe attend via Facebook (Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook
Page, 2011r). The FLOF page was also used to promote prayer meetings to pray for those
attending the court hearings in the week leading up to the hearing (Davies, 2011a, 2011b).
Our community doesn’t want Fantame Liquor Store operating for long hours in the middle of our neighbourhood and across from our school.

On **Wednesday 30th November** the court will decide on the outcome for our community.

**Come walk with us**

to show your support for a **safe and child friendly** neighbourhood!

Gather under the Canopies near i-SITE and Subway at 9:15 – 9:30am.

We will walk together through Cobham Court and over to the front of the Porirua District Court before the 10am court hearing.

**Children are welcome – balloons provided!!**

The more people that join the greater the impact, so let's have hundreds of us there!

---

People that need a lift down to Porirua Centre should meet at the Russell School car park at 9am and a lift will be provided!

For more information contact Matt Crawshaw on 04 235 5787 or txt 021 2900 891 or go to the Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook page and become a friend for more updates.

---

**Figure 16.** Flyer advertising community march to the courtroom on 30 November 2011 in support of the Fantame Liquor Store objectors going to the hearing. Sourced from (Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook Page, 2011r).
4.2.8 The hearings: take one – 30 November 2011

4.2.8.1 Walk of support

On Wednesday 30 November 2011 the first hearing for the Fantame Liquor Store liquor licensing renewal took place (New Zealand Liquor Licensing Authority, 2011b). At 9.45am, approximately 150 people gathered under the canopies at the Porirua city centre to peacefully march across the road to the courthouse. This march received television coverage from One News (McLean, 2011).

4.2.8.2 Entering an alien environment

There were 24 objectors officially recorded in the court documentation as being present at the hearing (New Zealand Liquor Licensing Authority, 2011b) with about 15 pre-selected to speak. For many objectors, attending the hearing required significant effort, including several taking unpaid time off work [Crawshaw interview]. The court environment was unfamiliar to all of the community objectors. MacEwan described feeling unprepared for the ‘alien environment’ with no windows [MacEwan interview].

The hearing was to hear evidence relating to Fantame Liquor Store liquor licence renewal, Chiman Patel’s general managers certificate and the outcome of the 25 June 2011 CPO (New Zealand Liquor Licensing Authority, 2011a, 2011b). Evidence was first presented relating to the CPO, which took most of the day [RS principal interview].

4.2.8.3 Adjournment

Later in the proceedings, Judge Hole’s assistant Dr J Horn noticed that the cheque for the renewal application was from the food-market adjoining the liquor store [Police interview]. He questioned Chiman Patel about the running of his liquor store and food-market and it became apparent that they were running as a single business. This is prohibited under the SOLA1989, with grocery stores being unable to sell spirits (New Zealand Parliament, 2013b). The lawyers for Chiman Patel at this stage requested the hearing be adjourned with presiding Judge Hole conceding that there was no other option (Dando, 2011b, 2011c; McLean, 2011; New Zealand Parliament, 2013b).
4.2.8.4 Death of the garden

This outcome left the objectors feeling despondent, deflated and frustrated. Without legal representation they were not able to voice their opposition to the adjournment in the court [RS principal interview; interview; Crawshaw interview] (Dando, 2011b; Torrie, 2011d). They were also upset that Chiman Patel was able to continue to trade illegally when this was known to be so by the Police (New Zealand Drug Foundation, 2013) [Crawshaw interview]. On 30 November 2011 a FLOF group member vented his frustration to his and FLOF’s Facebook friends and coined the below analogy restated by Crawshaw (Davies, 2011c). If a member of the public was caught driving illegally they would lose their licence and ‘get slammed,’ not told to go away while they sorted the matter out [Crawshaw interview].

In the interviews, three community members spoke of the injustice of the situation [RS principal interview, MacEwan interview, Crawshaw interview]. Crawshaw said ‘the injustice of the situation stung so much, and shattered us in terms of all the energy that had gone in, huge…three full leaflet drops… and we got sent away packing with not a lot to show for it’ [Crawshaw interview]. Crawshaw felt ‘guttered’ that they would have to come back and repeat the process again (Dando, 2011b). One FLOF group member expressed her disappointment at the ‘confusing’ media coverage (Friend B of Fantame Liquor Objections, 2011). She may have been referring to use of the term ‘technically illegal’ describing the running of the food-market and liquor store as one business by TV One News (McLean, 2011).

The next day Crawshaw began sending emails to government agencies such as the Police, local council, LLA, DLA and mayor. However, no one seemed to take responsibility for the situation [Crawshaw interview; RS principal interview]. A couple of days later, Crawshaw managed to get enough information to show each regulatory agency what was meant to happen. That is the ‘LLA sent an email to the Police who then sent an email to Chiman’s lawyers saying that they considered that the ongoing operation of the store would be highly irregular’. The store closed that evening [Crawshaw interview; RS principal interview]. Monday 5 December 2011 but was open again by the weekend (Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook Page, 2011s; Friend A of Fantame Liquor Objections, 2011)[Crawshaw interview; RS principal interview].
The closure was met with initial excitement and a bit of scepticism from objectors (Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook Page, 2011s, 2011t). The Russell School Facebook Page commented ‘Changes occurring across the road from the school. Just shows when the community works hard together - amazing things can happen. Fantame Liquor closed today at 5pm and the big Woodstock sign has been taken down too!’ (Russell School Facebook page, 2012).

Objectors were frustrated and disappointed at the minimal consequences of the illegal trading on the stores business [Crawshaw interview]. On 12 December 2011 the ruling for the breaches of the SOLA1989 that occurred during the CPO in June stated that Sunil Patel’s General Manager's Certificate would be suspended for 30 days commencing Monday 9 January 2012 and that Chiman Patel’s liquor licence would be suspended for 48 hours commencing Monday 9 January 2012 (New Zealand Liquor Licensing Authority, 2011a). Crawshaw expressed his frustration that the suspension occurred on the days with the lowest patronage, with even Mr Patel’s lawyer suggesting the suspension should occur on a Saturday, considering the breach occurred on that day [Crawshaw interview].

4.2.8.5 Germination part two

The Fantame Liquor Store objectors had to wait five months for the hearing to reconvene (New Zealand Liquor Licensing Authority, 2012). Most of the time was spent waiting, however Crawshaw and others supported another Wellington community in Newtown to oppose the opening of a liquor store (M. Stewart, 2012) [Crawshaw interview]. This resulted in the operator withdrawing the licence application in February 2012 (M. Stewart, 2012). A newspaper article quoted Crawshaw as calling the operator a hero. The Russell School principal was quoted as saying that the victory had buoyed their school’s battle, but expressed frustration at the delays in their objection process, saying these alienated ‘Joe Blow’ (M. Stewart, 2012). This article was posted to friends of FLOF page on 21 February 2012 (Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook Page, 2012a).

4.2.8.6 Can thirsty be associated with liquor?

During the waiting period, the Fantame Liquor Store rebranded to Thirsty Liquor. The MOH made a submission to the ‘Advertising Standards Authority Liquor promotions complaints board’ regarding the use of the franchise brand name ‘Thirsty Liquor’. He proposed that it was inappropriate to associate thirst with liquor and that ‘Thirsty Liquor’ brand name
breached the Advertising Standards Code for naming, labelling, packaging and promoting liquor, citing specific examples. The code has principals and guidelines in place to ensure responsible promotion of liquor that encourages social responsibility and discourages drinking to excess. A decision regarding this matter was released on 15 March 2012, which stated that the code only applied to the marketing of individual beverages and specific promotions, not to a brand name. Thus they had no jurisdiction to proceed with the complaint (Advertising Standards Authority Liquor Promotions Complaints Board, 2012). This decision was posted to the Thirsty Liquor Facebook page on 11 June 2012 inviting comments but none were received (Thirsty Liquor Porirua Facebook page, 2012b).

4.2.8.7 Re-digging the garden

Two weeks before the hearing was due to reconvene, core Fantame liquor objectors began to reignite interest in the hearing by contacting local media, and delivering more flyers to local residents and Russell School parents about a second walk to the courtroom (Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook Page, 2012d). See Figure 17 below for a copy of the flyer. The FLOF page was also utilised to re-engage objectors. Posts included links to media coverage of theirs and other New Zealand communities liquor store battles (Dando, 2012a; Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook Page, 2012b, 2012c, 2012e; McGillivary, 2012; McLean, 2011) as well as reminders about the upcoming walk of support (Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook Page, 2012d, 2012f).
In November we were at the court opposing the liquor license for Thirsty Liquor. Unfortunately we got sent away before we could put forward our concerns because Thirsty Liquor was found to be operating illegally.

The long six month wait is now over. It’s our turn to finish what we started.

On Wednesday 2\textsuperscript{nd} May the court will decide on the outcome for our community.

**Come walk with us**

to show your support for a safe and child friendly neighbourhood!

Gather under the Canopies near i-SITE and Subway at 9am.

We will walk together through Cobham Court and over to the front of the Porirua District Court before the 9:30am court hearing.

At our last hikoi (walk) we had hundreds join us and it was a very memorable occasion. Come and be apart of it again!

For more information or if you need a lift from Russell School down to the Canopies, contact Matt Crawshaw on 04 235 5787 or txt 021 3900 891 or go to the Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook page and become a friend for more updates.

There is a small amount of seating in the court room for those that would like to stay and support.

---

Figure 17. Flyer advertising community march to the courtroom on 2 May 2012 in support of the Fantame Liquor Store objectors going to the hearing (Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook Page, 2012d).
4.2.9 The hearings: take two – 2 May 2012

4.2.9.1 Same again

The second hearing began in a similar way to the first, with about 80 attendees at a peaceful march from Porirua city centre to the courtroom (Nichols, 2012b). One resident arrived at the courtroom with a box of alcohol bottles and beer boxes collected in the area surrounding Fantame Liquor Store the previous day [Police interview](One News, 2012). Ten objectors were prepared to give oral submissions (New Zealand Liquor Licensing Authority, 2012) mostly the same people as the first hearing [Crawshaw interview].

The LLA set aside one day for the hearing. Most of the day was taken up by Chiman Patel’s lawyer attempting to establish his suitability, explaining the new systems put in place since the previous adjournment. Crawshaw and others felt infuriated sitting through this evidence which put Chiman Patel in a good light, knowing that the opportunity only came about due to his illegal trading [Crawshaw interview]. Chiman Patel also presented a petition signed by customers from across the larger Porirua and Kapiti area. Crawshaw tried to question the applicant about continuing to trade after being found to be operating illegally, however the Judge would not let him speak, saying that this information was irrelevant [Crawshaw interview].

4.2.9.2 Regulatory agency reports

The DLA inspector submitted a brief report stating that the application had been advertised correctly and considering the number of objections it needed to be passed over to the LLA. He did not take an active part in the hearing. The Police and the MOH objected to the application and gave evidence. The Police objected to the application under three of the four grounds that the LLA can consider under Section 45 of the SOLA1989. These include concerns about (a) applicant suitability, (considering the recently failed CPO), (b) conditions attached to the licence, (namely the long hours of trade) and (c) the manner in which the licensee has conducted the sale and delivery of liquor pursuant to the licence (New Zealand Liquor Licensing Authority, 2011b).

4.2.9.3 Impact of the liquor store on the safety of the garden

Warwick Peter Gibbs, Police intelligence analyst, was called as a witness for the Police objection (New Zealand Liquor Licensing Authority, 2012). Mr Gibbs presented evidence
comparing disorder, domestic, suspicious and damage events reported to Police in a 500m radius from Fantame Liquor Store. He compared this to a nearby comparison 500m radius area, with a school but without a liquor store (Gibbs, 2012; New Zealand Liquor Licensing Authority, 2012). See Figure 18 below for maps of these areas.

The Police report noted a higher number and rate of police events per population in the Fantame Street area, with a liquor store, relative to the comparison area without one. In particular, there were a greater number of police call outs for disorderly behaviour, many occurring between the hours of 12am - 4am Friday to Sunday. The number of events occurring Friday to Sunday increased markedly over the study period. The report also highlighted a decreasing number of disorder events (compared to the previous year) in the year the Fantame Street licence comes up for renewal. These patterns were not seen in the comparison area. See Figure 19 and Figure 20 below for graphs of the Police events in the two areas. Considering that the Fantame Liquor Store was the only off-licence in Porirua open until midnight, the report concluded it was likely the alcohol that appeared to be fuelling events in that area would have been purchased at Fantame Liquor Store [Police interview] (Gibbs, 2012; New Zealand Liquor Licensing Authority, 2012). The report concluded that having a liquor store in Fantame Street would be impacting negatively on the community, citing evidence from New Zealand research linking proximity to off-licenced premises with increased rates of crime (Gibbs, 2012).

Figure 18. Map showing location of 500m radius around Fantame Liquor Store and the comparison area of a 500m radius around Norfolk and Durham Street intersection in Cannons Creek, Porirua. Sourced from (Gibbs, 2012)
Figure 19. Graph showing yearly disorder, domestic, suspicious and damage events reported to Police in the 500m radius surrounding 21 Fantame Street from December 2004 - April 2012. Sourced from (Gibbs, 2012)

Figure 20. Graph showing yearly disorder, domestic, suspicious and damage events reported to Police in the 500m radius Norfolk and Durham Street intersection from December 2004 - April 2012. Sourced from (Gibbs, 2012).
4.2.9.4 Impact of the liquor store on the health of the garden

The MOH objected to the licence and exercised his power under Section 108 (c) of the SOLA1989 to appear at the hearing. (New Zealand Liquor Licensing Authority, 2012; New Zealand Parliament, 2013b). As the MOH was unwell, evidence was presented by Kristen Foley, Team Leader of the Alcohol, Tobacco and other Drugs team at RPH (Foley, 2012; New Zealand Liquor Licensing Authority, 2012).

Mr Foley noted that the Fantame Liquor Store was located in a residential area but was not a good neighbour, having little regard for community and Russell School concerns. He expressed concern about the store’s advertising and that it had been found to be selling single alcoholic ready to drink beverages, that ‘encourage pocket money spending, and entice the young’. Mr Foley made reference to a DVD that RPH had helped to fund where Porirua youth had articulated their mostly negative experiences with alcohol. He asked permission to play one of the clips from the DVD, however this request was denied by the judge (Foley, 2012).

The crux of Mr Foley’s submission was a comparison of rates of Wellington Hospital Emergency Department (ED) admissions for alcohol-related injuries in different Wellington Census Area Units (CAUs) over the period January 2010- February 2012. The data showed a high rate of ED admissions for alcohol-related injuries for males aged 15-34 years in the Cannons Creek East CAU (containing Fantame Liquor Store), and the neighbouring Waitangirua CAU, compared to other CAUs in the Wellington region. See Figure 21 below for a map of Wellington Hospital alcohol-related ED attendances for different Porirua CAUs . Furthermore, the majority of presentations to Wellington ED for alcohol-related injuries to residents of Cannons Creek East CAU of all ages were due to the person either being a victim or perpetrator of violence. Peak days for presentation were Friday and Saturday, and peak times between 12am - 5am. It was also noted that seven of the attendances were for individuals under the legal drinking age (Foley, 2012; New Zealand Liquor Licensing Authority, 2012).

Mr Foley noted that the Wellington ED data may under report alcohol-related harm for people in Porirua CAUs, as some people would be treated for injuries in the Kenepuru Accident and Medical Clinic in Porirua. He noted that other research suggests that alcohol is purchased close to home. Therefore, the Fantame Liquor Store was likely to be having an effect on alcohol harm of the residents in the area, and possibly in neighbouring CAUs as it was the
only liquor store open until midnight in Porirua. Mr Foley made reference to research showing associations between proximity to liquor stores and resulting harm. He also noted that reducing hours of licences had led to less night time violence in other areas. Thus he called for the hours of the licence to be reduced or the licence cancelled (Foley, 2012; New Zealand Liquor Licensing Authority, 2012).

4.2.9.5 Community concerns finally heard?

About four local objectors were able to read their briefs of evidence during the hearing. They felt relieved to finally have their say [Crawshaw interview]. Objections centred mainly around the effect of late opening hours bringing in patrons from outside the area, causing excessive noise and antisocial behaviour (New Zealand Liquor Licensing Authority, 2012). There was particular concern about the store’s impact on local children through exposure to aggressive advertising, intoxicated patrons and broken glass and bottles on their playground (Frykberg, 2011; New Zealand Liquor Licensing Authority, 2012; Radio New Zealand, 2011). See Figure 22 below for an example of advertising inside the store. Objectors called for the liquor licence to be cancelled.

Fantame Liquor Store neighbour Paula MacEwan’s statement expressed her concerns regarding the safety of the neighbourhood due to the presence of the liquor store. Customers would loiter, swear, argue, and leave glass on her fence and in the local parks. She noted that she had to remove the seat from the end of her driveway as people congregated there, causing excessive noise and leaving behind rubbish and cigarette butts. MacEwan and others cited many instances of people vomiting, urinating or even defecating on neighbouring property and in the school grounds. She expressed her concerns about the management of the store, citing instances where clearly intoxicated people bought alcohol from the store. She also described how Mr Patel hosed down the rubbish from the liquor store so that it ended up in her driveway. Furthermore, she often had to cross the street when walking past with her pram, due to the footpath being blocked by pallets of liquor (MacEwan, 2013a).

MacEwan and others noted that she and Russell School had put fences up to stop intoxicated people from entering the properties and causing vandalism and other damage. The locked school gates were a financial cost to Russell School and also negatively affected the local residents, with the community not able to use the playground outside of school hours. Submitters described the school as feeling like a prison or a fortress (Annandale, 2013;
MacEwan, 2013a). Despite the fences, Russell School staff spoke of instances of teenagers drinking on school grounds during school events and of finding blood, glass, or intoxicated people sleeping on the property (Annandale, 2013; Broadbent, 2013).

Many submitters mention the unsuitability of the vulnerable residential neighbourhood as a site for a liquor store. It was noted that there were many Housing New Zealand and Salvation Army emergency homes in the surrounding area (Crawshaw, 2013d; New Zealand Liquor Licensing Authority, 2012). Therefore, residents had little choice regarding their proximity to the liquor store. Many residents in the emergency housing had suffered from alcohol abuse or were trying to recover from addictions themselves, and the location of the store and associated anti-social behaviour could be detrimental to their recovery. Many other stories were cited as examples of alcohol harm in the community, including an instance in which Matt Crawshaw’s chicken was kidnapped and killed by his drunken neighbours, as well as instances of drunken people smashing car windows, or entering properties drunk and delusional (Crawshaw, 2013d; Kapi-Mana News, 2013d).

Porirua College Deputy Principal Chris Wood spoke of his concerns about the store selling to his underage students, citing examples of students telling him this had occurred (New Zealand Liquor Licensing Authority, 2012). Others noted that the ‘Midnight Express’ team working with Porirua youth on the streets late at night had mentioned Russell School and nearby Calliope Park as hotspots of late night youth activity. This was suggested to be unsurprising, as Fantame Liquor Store was the only store open after 10pm (Crawshaw, 2013d).
Figure 21. Alcohol-related Wellington Emergency Department attendance rates for males age 15-34 years calculated between January 2010- February 2012. Sourced from (Foley, 2012)
Figure 22. Example of promotion inside the Fantame Liquor Store (Thirsty Liquor). Sourced from (Thirsty Liquor Porirua Facebook page, 2013b)
4.2.9.6 Deflated: No say

Following afternoon tea, Judge Hole stated the rest of the objector’s briefs of evidence were to be taken as read [RS principal interview, Crawshaw interview]. As such, objectors stood in the dock to answer any questions that arose while their evidence was quickly read [Crawshaw interview]. Submitters were not able to bring up additional points not covered in their written submissions [MacEwan interview; Crawshaw interview]. The objectors felt disempowered by the process, and left the court feeling dejected, and believing that their voices were not heard [RS principal interview; Crawshaw interview].

The group considered telling the media about their disappointment with the process, however decided such action would not be beneficial for their cause in the long term [Crawshaw interview]. Even the FLOF Facebook page was very quiet following the hearing. There was one post 3 May 2012, linking to TV footage of the march and hearing within a broader news piece focussed on potential upcoming alcohol law reform changes (Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook Page, 2012g; One News, 2012). One article in the local Kapi-Mana paper on 8 May stated residents were waiting for the decision (Dando, 2012b).

4.2.9.7 Deflation to elation

But for today, our celebration goes to a little community in Cannons Creek who stood up for what was right; and has achieved ground-breaking change. [New Zealand Māori Party Co-leader Tariana Turia] (Fuseworks Media, 2012)

Three weeks after the hearing, on Thursday 24 May 2012, the decision regarding the Fantame Liquor Store liquor licence was released (O’Neil, 2013a). It allowed the store’s licence to be renewed but with drastically reduced trading hours. Where the licence had previously traded until midnight, the new hours included a period of weekday closing between 2.45-3.15pm to protect Russell School children when they were leaving school. Hours were cut back to 8pm on weekdays, 9pm on Saturday and 11-6pm on Sunday (New Zealand Liquor Licensing Authority, 2012).

The decision to cut the hours was based on the premise that the store should be serving the local community and not those outside of it (Fairfax New Zealand, 2012; New Zealand Liquor Licensing Authority, 2012; Nichols, 2012c). The LLA acknowledged that their decision would impact on the business (New Zealand Liquor Licensing Authority, 2012) with
approximately 50% of the store’s income generated after 10pm Thursday-Saturday evenings [Crawshaw interview; Police interview]. However, they stated that profitability was not a factor to be considered by the LLA (New Zealand Liqour Licensing Authority, 2012).

Presiding Judge Hole noted that he had taken on board evidence heard by the objectors, Police and MOH [PADC interview; MOH interview; Police interview] (New Zealand Liqour Licensing Authority, 2012). The LLA noted that much of the evidence presented by the above parties was not directly relevant to the Fantame Liquor Store licence renewal. Particular mention was made of the ‘unsatisfactory’ nature of much of the objectors’ evidence. Judge Hole recommended that objectors talk to the inspector about the nature of evidence required by the authority if they had concerns in the future. He noted the high levels of adverse alcohol-related health outcomes for Cannons Creek residents and that the petition by Chiman Patel, containing signatures from customers residing all over Kapiti, supported the assertion by Mr Foley that the late night trading would be impacting on residents from other areas (New Zealand Liqour Licensing Authority, 2012).

Jude Hole noted that the Police data comparing Police events in the 500m radius surrounding Fantame Liquor Store to another similarly located area did not provide any evidence relevant to the criteria that the judge could consider. It appears the judge considered that Fantame Street was not a true residential area due to the presence of the liquor store, a few shops and a school, and should therefore have a higher number of Police events. He did however note the significance of a decrease in Police events prior to upcoming licence renewals and that good store management could reduce Police events (New Zealand Liqour Licensing Authority, 2012). He concluded overall that there was ‘considerable evidence of bad management leading to liquor abuse’ (New Zealand Drug Foundation, 2013; New Zealand Liqour Licensing Authority, 2012). Therefore, the liquor licence was only effectively renewed for one year instead of the usual three years (Davies, 2012; New Zealand Liqour Licensing Authority, 2012). The LLA noted in the ruling that ‘the shortened probationary term is intended to provide an incentive for the licensee and manager to improve his performance in a way that can be monitored both by the Police, and in particular, by the Inspector’ (New Zealand Liqour Licensing Authority, 2012).
4.2.9.8 The right decision

Professionals with experience in liquor licencing who had supported the community noted that that such a drastic reduction in hours in response to community concerns was a landmark decision [RPH interview] setting a helpful precedent for residential liquor licensing [MOH interview; PADC interview]. They were happy with the result, and believed it was the best outcome for the community that could have realistically happened at that time [PADC interview; Police interview; RPH interview]. They did however mention that they thought that the community would have preferred to have the liquor store closed completely [MOH interview; Police interview].

The community felt ‘stoked’ and ‘rapt’ with the reduction in hours [Crawshaw interview; RS principal interview]. There was a shift from complete depression at their voices not being heard (Nichols, 2012e) to elation [Crawshaw interview] (New Zealand Drug Foundation, 2013). Annandale, the Russell School principal, said ‘It seems like things have been righted. Now, the bottle store has to shut in deference to the school rather than the school having to defend itself against the bottle store’ (New Zealand Drug Foundation, 2013). Although the group had wanted the store closed [Crawshaw interview; RS principal interview] Crawshaw expressed he was happier with a reduction in hours, as it was more difficult than a licence refusal to appeal. He noted that if the licence had been refused, the applicant would have likely appealed to the High Court, with the group having little power to oppose any High Court ruling [Crawshaw interview]. The community also felt more peaceful and safer (New Zealand Drug Foundation, 2013) and noticed a marked reduction in liquor store advertising and damage to the neighbourhood [MacEwan interview; RS principal interview].

Wellington media took an interest in the result (Fuseworks Media, 2012; Nichols, 2012c, 2012d, 2012e) and Māori party co-leader Tariana Turia expressed her support and congratulations to the community for what they achieved stating ‘this is a case of a true victory for community action and each and every member that has contributed to this ruling can hold their heads high tonight’ (Fuseworks Media, 2012). On 29 May 2012 the local Kapi-Mana paper also posted a link to one of their articles (Nichols, 2012e) on their Facebook page, with the accompanying post entitled ‘Fantame Liquor Store hours drastically reduced after community protests’ (Kapi-Mana News Facebook page, 2012). This post got 13 ‘likes’ and a comment feeling for the business owner because the only thing he did wrong was being in the wrong location. This comment was challenged with a comment saying that he had
found to be operating illegally by not running his business separately and failing two CPOs (Kapi-Mana News Facebook page, 2012). Kapi-Mana news also tweeted ‘Fantame Liquor Store, opposite Russell School, has its hours drastically reduced’ (Kapi-Mana News, 2012).

Elsewhere, on social media, the FLOF page posted on 28 May 2012 ‘The Liquor Licensing Authority Decision is back!!! The hours have been reduced - and hugely....This is fantastic news for our community and a real tribute to the courage of all who were involved in making our concerns known. Kia kaha to you all’. This was ‘liked’ by 19 people and there were 9 comments of support, mostly thanking Crawshaw and Annandale for their work and expressing their relief and joy at the outcome for the community (Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook Page, 2012h). There were also comments on the FLOF and Urban Vision Facebook pages that praised God as well as links to media coverage of the outcome. Other comments expressed surprise that the system worked, emphasized how disillusioned some had become with the process and the ground-breaking nature of the decision (Crawshaw, 2012; Davies, 2012; MacEwan, 2012)

Thirsty Liquor Facebook page also posted about the change in hours on 28 May 2012 due to the court ruling, and apologised for any inconvenience caused to their loyal customers. The post generated 13 comments, one supportive of the reduction in hours, the other 12 expressed disbelief and disappointment, many using profane language to express their thoughts (Thirsty Liquor Porirua Facebook page, 2012a).

4.2.10 A new turn of events

Thirsty Liquor in Fantame Street traded with reduced hours from May 2012- April 2013 with a corresponding decrease in alcohol-related problems (Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority, 2013b; Dando, 2013) [Crawshaw interview; Inspector interview; RS principal interview]. The earlier closing times appeared to be significantly impacting on the profitability of the store [Police interview]. On 27 February 2013, Bhanumati and Umesh Patel, landlords of 21 Fantame Street and former managers of the liquor store at 21 Fantame Street gave notice that Chiman Patel’s lease was not going to be renewed (B Patel, 2013). This was apparently due to concerns regarding his management of the liquor store and the impact of that on the local community (Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority, 2013b; B Patel, 2013). Bhanumati and Umesh Patel of Nischay’s Enterprises Ltd (Nischay’s) wanted to take over the running of the liquor store and applied to the DLA for a ‘temporary authority’
which would allow them to sell liquor using the existing liquor licence already held for the premises while they applied for a new licence (Porirua City Council, 2013a).

4.2.10.1 A spanner in the works

However, Chiman Patel was unhappy that his lease was not renewed (Thirsty Liquor Porirua Facebook page, 2013d) and decided to voluntarily surrender his liquor licence for 21 Fantame Street as of 1 May 2013 (Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority, 2013b; B Patel, 2013). Therefore, when Bhanumati and Umesh Patel of Nischay’s Enterprises Ltd applied to the DLA for a temporary authority on 7 March 2013 it was not processed, as there was no existing licence (Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority, 2013b; Porirua City Council, 2013a). Nischay’s Enterprises Ltd applied for a new liquor licence for 21 Fantame Street on 26 March 2013 (Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority, 2013b) and the liquor store closed on 20 April 2013 when Chiman Patel’s lease expired (Dando, 2013; Thirsty Liquor Porirua Facebook page, 2013a).

On 8 March 2013 the Fantame Liquor Store posted on its Facebook page that they were clearing out their stock as the landlords had not renewed their lease (Thirsty Liquor Porirua Facebook page, 2013c). Just prior to closure the store had a big sale, advertised via Facebook and a large specials board outside the store (Thirsty Liquor Porirua Facebook page, 2013a). This prompted Crawshaw to contact the DLA about the advertising encouraging people to drink to excess. Crawshaw conceded that the actions were unlikely to be illegal but that he believed them to be inappropriate for the store’s location opposite a school (Dando, 2013). See Figure 23 below for a photograph of the specials board advertising.
The closing of the store was covered by the local media and Kapi-Mana news Facebook page posted a link to their article (Dando, 2013) saying:

*Thirsty Liquor in Fantame St, Cannons Creek, will close down next month, ending a long saga between it and neighbouring Russell School. But in a final pot-shot, Thirsty Liquor is selling its remaining [sic] booze off at cut-rate prices. ‘At the very least it’s encouraging people to buy in excess’ says Matt Crawshaw, Russell School’s board chairman*

This post drew 22 likes, and a variety of comments. Two expressed disappointment about the store closure and two talked about buying the cheap alcohol being the socially responsible thing to do. Kapi-Mana news replied ‘If that helps you sleep at night … ;)’ (Kapi-Mana News Facebook page, 2013).

When the news spread to the community that Nischay’s were planning on opening up a liquor store to replace Thirsty Liquor, Crawshaw, Annandale and other members of members of the Fantame liquor objectors working group knew they had to object again [Crawshaw interview; RS principal interview]. They felt their concern was justified, when they learnt that the
proposed liquor store hours were 9am until 9pm Sunday to Thursday and until 10pm on Fridays and Saturdays (Kapi-Mana News, 2013c), longer than the hours set down by the LLA hearing in 2012 [Crawshaw interview] (New Zealand Liquor Licensing Authority, 2012).

4.2.11 One last push

The official public notification of the proposed new licence for 21 Fantame Street appeared in the local Kapi-Mana newspaper on 9 April and 16 April 2013 (Kapi-Mana News, 2013a, 2013b). However, Crawshaw first emailed previous objectors and other key supporters on 3 April 2013, iterating his concerns regarding the new licence and the proposed longer hours. This was followed up by an email on 9 April 2013 inviting people to a community meeting on 16 April 2013 at 3.30pm. A further invitation to attend the community meeting was posted on the FLOF Facebook page on 15 April 2013 (Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook Page, 2013a).

The local Wellington Dominion Post newspaper paper ran an article on 12 April 2013 entitled ‘Porirua School ready to fight liquor store opening’ featuring a photograph of the Russell School Principal (McBride, 2013a). See Figure 24 below for this photograph. Upon seeing the article, Nischay’s directors Bhanumati and Umesh Patel organised a meeting with Crawshaw as Chairperson of Russell School and Annandale the Russell School principal the following week. This meeting was to discuss Russell School’s involvement in objecting to their proposed liquor store (Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority, 2013b). During the meeting, Bhanumati read out a letter stating they had never had any problems with the community or the school when they previously ran the store and had never failed a police sting, therefore they were responsible operators. They terminated Chiman’s lease after reading in the newspaper about the inappropriate operation of the store ‘to make the school and community happy and satisfied’. They therefore felt it was unfair that they were getting punished, (through community objections to their licence) for the actions of Chiman Patel. So they asked that the school let them ‘get on with the plan’ to manage the store appropriately, with very reasonable hours that wouldn’t disturb the community and the school (Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority, 2013b; Bhanumati Patel & Patel, 2013). However, they did not enquire into community concerns or what they could do to ameliorate them (Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority, 2013b).
4.2.12 A. Sherriff comes to town

One Sunday in early April, Crawshaw had a text message from Annandale, then a call from Alastair Sherriff [Crawshaw interview]. Sherriff was a prominent liquor lawyer, who co-authored the standard New Zealand publication on ‘Sale of Liquor’ (Dormer & Sherriff, n.d.) [Police Interview]. The publication provides a summary of the SOLA1989 and how to interpret it, using examples of case law (Dormer & Sherriff, n.d.). Sherriff called Crawshaw to offer his legal services to the community for free and they met at Russell School that day [Crawshaw interview]. Sherriff had heard about the community’s plight via his partner, who came into contact with the Russell School principal at an education conference [RPH interview; RS principal interview].

Sherriff attended the community meeting on 16 April 2013. He brought with him objection templates, for residents, Russell School staff and parents that he had written to conform to the legal requirements [Crawshaw interview]. Templates stated under what clauses community members were objecting to. They only required date, name, address, signature and how far
away they lived or worked from the proposed store. See Figure 25 below for an example of this template. This made objecting easier [Crawshaw interview], and 137 objections to the licence were received by the DLA by the closing date of 22 April 2013 (Berkland, 2013; McBride, 2013b).

Eighty-two objectors had an association with Russell School, including 54 parents or caregivers, 19 staff, three trustees and six volunteers. Other objectors included 25 residents (23 living within 1km of the proposed store), seven staff and seven parishioners from the local Salvation Army Church on the street corner, RPH, and the chair of Capital and Coast District Health Board (CCDHB). There were also nine Maraeroa School staff (this school services the area of Cannons Creek East, south of Warspite Avenue), a parent and staff from the Pukerua Kohanga Reo on Russell School grounds, two early childhood teachers and Porirua College staff (Berkland, 2013). See Figure 26 for a map of the location of objectors relative to the proposed store. The objections meant the proposal went to a hearing, which was set down for 5-6 August 2013 (Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority, 2013b). Changes to the law being phased in at the time meant the hearing was heard by the new ARLA which replaced the LLA (Ministry of Justice, 2012).

4.2.12.1 Representation by Sherriff

In preparation for the hearing, Crawshaw sent out an email on 28 May 2013 to all of the objectors, asking whether they were happy for Sherriff to represent them and asking if they wanted to present evidence (Crawshaw, 2013a). Sherriff represented 48 parties, including PADC, local residents and members of the Salvation Army and Russell School communities (Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority, 2013b) with those represented grateful for the assistance [Crawshaw interview; MacEwan interview; RS principal interview]. A representative group of 11 objectors was selected to speak at the hearing, mostly those who had agreed to appear at the previous hearings (Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority, 2013b; New Zealand Liquor Licensing Authority, 2011b, 2012)[Crawshaw interview]. Sherriff met with them individually mid-July (Sherriff, 2013), to go over their statements, and suggested they keep them similar to their previous statements, adding in evidence of what life had been like since the store closed [MacEwan interview] on the 20th April (Dando, 2013; Thirsty Liquor Porirua Facebook page, 2013a). Having Sherriff’s support meant less work for Crawshaw in the lead up to the hearing [Crawshaw interview].
Figure 25. Example of objection template produced by Alastair Sherriff for residents living in the area surrounding Fantame Liquor Store. Sourced from Porirua DLA
Figure 26. Map showing location of objectors from 21 Fantame Street, the circle denoting a 350m radius (or 5 minutes’ walk from the store). Sourced from (Berkland, 2013)
4.2.12.2 No pub in our hub

On 31 July 2013, a week before the hearing, Crawshaw, the MOH, a PADC representative and many others involved in objecting to the liquor store in Fantame Street, attended a large community meeting about a proposed (Mix) bar reopening in the Cannons Creek shops (Betteridge, 2013; Chipp, 2013; Russell School Facebook page, 2013a). This meeting was chaired by Porirua Deputy Mayor Liz Kelly, who runs the Whānau centre next door to the proposed bar (Betteridge, 2013; Parkin, 2013) with other local politicians also speaking (Betteridge, 2013). Over 400 people attended the meeting and a petition against the pub generated over 1900 signatures (O’Neil, 2013b; Parkin, 2013). See Figure 27 below for a photograph of this event.

![Figure 27. Over 400 residents gather at a community meeting at the Cook Islands Hall on 31 July 2013, to discuss the proposed reopening of a pub in the Cannons Creek shops. Sourced from (Betteridge, 2013).](image)

4.2.12.3 Come walk with us

Later that evening Crawshaw emailed his contacts inviting them to attend a peaceful march from the Porirua central city to the courtroom on 5 August 2013, to help keep the liquor store ‘closed for good’. He attached a flyer and asked them to pass it onto their contacts (Crawshaw, 2013b). The flyer was also distributed to Russell School parents [Crawshaw interview] and posted on the FLOF page on 4 August 2013 (Crawshaw, 2013c; Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook Page, 2011r, 2013b). See Figure 28 for a copy of the flyer.
Come walk with us

as we stand together for another ground breaking decision To Keep the Fantame Bottle Store CLOSED for GOOD

And keep the neighbourhood safe for our kids!

**When:** Monday 5 August

**Where:** Meet under Canopies in Porirua near Subway

**Time:** 9:30am – 10am

**What:** We will peacefully walk over to the front of the Porirua District Court before the 10am hearing

For more information contact Matt Crawshaw on 04 235 5787 or txt 021 2900 891 or go to the Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook page and become a friend for more updates.

There is seating in the court room for those that would like to stay and support

Figure 28. Flyer advertising community march to the courtroom on 5 August 2013 in support of objectors of the Fantame Street liquor store. Sourced from (Crawshaw, 2013c).
4.2.13 The hearings: take three – 5 August 2013

On the morning of 5 August 2013, local community members, other supporters, this researcher and the media slowly congregated in the Porirua mall. A few school children held banners and signs, and Crawshaw made a speech on a megaphone. The march attracted about 100 people, including members of the Tots Creeks Crew (Cannons Creek mother’s playgroup), local whanau centre, Wesley Community Action, Salvation Army, local MP Kris Faafoi, local counsellor Liz Kelly, (MacEwan, 2013b) RPH and many others. Upon arrival outside the court, the Russell School principal and Crawshaw gave inspiring speeches and everyone clapped. See Figure 29 to Figure 32 below for photographs from the event.

Those objectors presenting evidence and a few others filed into the courtroom. The proceedings began with a statement of evidence from Bhanumati Patel which lasted until morning tea time. Mrs Patel stated she was a responsible operator of eight local liquor stores with an impeccable record, having no convictions for trading illegally by selling to minors or intoxicated persons (B Patel, 2013). She maintained that she cared about the local community and that all of the objectors concerns could be traced back to irresponsible operating by Chiman Patel. Therefore having a responsible operator such as herself operating the store would not cause alcohol-related problems (Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority, 2013b; McBride, 2013c; B Patel, 2013).

4.2.13.1 The inspectors report

Evidence was then presented by the reporting agencies. The DLA inspector had originally opposed the application because the opening hours applied for were longer than those imposed by the LLA for that location in 2012. However, following a meeting with the applicant in early May 2013, the objection was withdrawn when they agreed to change the hours to match those of the 2012 Fantame Liquor Store decision. The inspector provided a summary of objectors and their concerns, with a map plotting their location relative to Fantame Street store (See Figure 26 above). He also provided a list and map of ‘sensitive amenities’ close to the store (Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority, 2013b; Berkland, 2013) which included areas where children congregate such as eight schools, seven churches, and two community and sports facilities within a 1km radius (Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority, 2013b; CCDHB & RPH, 2013). A map and list of other licenced premises was supplied in his report (Berkland, 2013).
Figure 29. Russell School principal and students gather at the Porirua mall before the protest march against the re-opening of a liquor store across from their school. Sourced from (MacEwan, 2013b)

Figure 30. Cannons Creek residents marching against the proposed liquor store across from Russell School. Sourced from (MacEwan, 2013b)
Figure 31. Walking for ‘peace in the east’ clockwise from top left, Chris Collings (Salvation Army representative), local counsellor Liz Kelly and other Whanau Centre employees, a local resident and MP Kris Faafoi. Sourced from (MacEwan, 2013b)

Figure 32. Cannons Creek residents protesting outside Porirua District Court against the re-opening of a liquor store in Fantame Street on 5 August 2013. Russell School principal Sose Annandale addresses the protestors. Sourced from (Easton, 2013)
4.2.13.2 Regulatory opposition to the application

The other reporting agencies, namely the Police and MOH, both opposed the application (Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority, 2013b). Senior Sergeant Steve Sargent from the Police objected to the application based on the hours of trade and suitability of the applicant (as they had a reputation for loss-leading and selling individual bottles of premixed ‘ready to drink’ beverages [RTDs]). There was also the question of who would be running the store, with the applicants previously telling the LLA that one of them would be present at one of their other licenced premises in Wainuiomata at all times (Berkland, 2013; New Zealand Liquor Licensing Authority, 2010). Sargent presented a report updating the evidence presented in the 2012 hearing (New Zealand Liquor Licensing Authority, 2012). This highlighted an association between a reduction in liquor store hours of operation and a reduction in reported Police events in the area surrounding Fantame Liquor Store (Sargent, 2013). The monthly average reduction in Police events was even greater in May-July 2013, when the store was closed. For example, the May three year average decreased from 1.03 to 0.71 incidents/month in May 2013 or from 32 to 22 incidents (a 31% reduction) (Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority, 2013b; Sargent, 2013). See Figure 33 below for a graph showing monthly average Police events in the area surrounding Fantame Street.

Figure 33. Graph showing an association between decreased reported Police incidents per day in the area surrounding Fantame Liquor Store with reduced liquor store hours. Sourced from (Sargent, 2013)
4.2.13.3 A suitable operator in a vulnerable garden?

The MOH, Dr Palmer, also voiced his objections at the hearing, again exercising his power under Section 108 of the SOLA1989 to speak (Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority, 2013b; New Zealand Parliament, 2013b). He noted that he felt so strongly against the proposal that he took the opportunity to submit both written and oral objections. His concerns mostly centred on the unsuitability of the applicant and the unsuitability of the location due to the vulnerability of the community. He argued that reopening of a liquor store would reduce ‘amenity and good order’ in the community (Palmer, 2013a).

Dr Palmer considered the applicants lack of consultation with, and regard for the community was out of line with good business practice and with public norms and expectations. He noted the applicant applied for longer hours than the 2012 decision. They also asked for a supervised store designation, which allows minors into the store if they are accompanied by a parent over 18 years. This was despite the store having previously been issued with a restricted designation, where minors under 18 years were not able to enter the store at all (Palmer, 2013b). Dr Palmer argued that the applicant might well be suitable to hold a licence in a commercial zone but not in a vulnerable residential area close to a school (New Zealand Liquor Licensing Authority, 2010). He noted that there was no evidence that Chiman Patel had been operating poorly following the reduction in store hours in May 2012 until store closure in April 2013, during a time when there was reduced but still noticeable alcohol abuse (Palmer, 2013b).

4.2.13.4 No liquor store = no concerns

*The only evidence we now have is the complete absence of all the negative effects of alcohol in our neighbourhood which were once commonplace [Matt Crawshaw]*

(Crawshaw, 2013d)

Eleven objectors gave moving testimonies citing their opposition to the liquor store. The speakers represented a wide spectrum of the community, including neighbours, long term residents, Matt Crawshaw, the Russell School Principal, teachers, Deputy Principal of Porirua College, Salvation Army representative and community workers. Each person provided an account of their personal experience of living or working near the liquor store. They all had the same underlying theme of drastically reduced noise, traffic, antisocial behaviour, rubbish and glass in the area in the three months the store had been closed (Alcohol Regulatory and
The community and Russell School felt safer as a result. Local resident Jonathan Blackshaw summed it up saying ‘With no hours of trading in that bottle store there is no evidence publicly visible of alcohol abuse in the neighbourhood’ (Blackshaw, 2013, p. 7). Locals also reiterated their concern over the unsuitability of their residential location for a liquor store (Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority, 2013b). Resident of 45 years and former teacher Juliet Bellingham gave a heartfelt submission, including the following statement regarding the suitability of the liquor store location:

*It is in the middle of local homes, close by a Family Home for the vulnerable young people and near several churches. A less suitable site for selling alcohol would be hard to find, let alone one which used to have in-your-face advertising billboards and heavy discounting of RTDs aimed at the young [Juliet Bellingham] (Bellingham, 2013, p. 2)*

It was a very emotional experience for the community, getting to hear their statements being read and their joint experience communicated to others. The Russell School principal described this below:

*So you know, for me the first time I heard those statements being read, ... that was a really powerful, that was very emotional for me. I knew all about it, ’cause we’d talked about it, but when she stood up and read it ... that really got me [RS principal interview]*

The experience of being able to speak to their concerns was validating [Crawshaw interview] with the emotion affecting others in the courtroom as well. In addition to the evidence presented, community members had other concerns that were never aired in the hearing. Some of these concerns centred around illegal or ‘immoral and ethically challenging’ things happening at the store [Crawshaw interview](Palmer, 2011). However, they could not get evidence to back up their concerns, so they were not raised [Crawshaw interview]. Local resident MacEwan forgot to put in her submission about the kura (school) bus, transporting children aged 5-18 years, that stops outside the Fantame shops after school. Her concern was that the bus comes past at 3.30pm, with the shop already re-opened by then. Furthermore, many other local children were educated in Wellington city so would be ‘grazing past’ until 4 or 5pm when the shop was open [MacEwan interview].
Mr Sherriff’s experience was invaluable, enabling him to cross-examine the applicants and draw on case law when making arguments to support the community’s concerns. Crawshaw compared the experience to watching theatre with Sherriff conducting the show [Crawshaw interview]. FLOF posted ‘… Looks like our case is coming across strongly thanks to the wonderfull [sic] support of our lawyer Alastair Sherriff…’ (Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook Page, 2013c) with a link to the media coverage (Watts, 2013). This post got 20 ‘likes’ (Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook Page, 2013c). Following the hearing Crawshaw sent an email out to all of the supporters thanking them and stating how well the hearing had gone (Crawshaw, 2013e).

4.2.14 Watershed moment

All went quiet until the hearing result came out on 29 August 2013. The ARLA ruling stated that the licence was refused, due to the evidence of the documented alcohol harm that would result with a liquor store open even with very reduced hours. Mr Holmes further noted that the applicants had not established themselves as suitable to run an liquor store in such a vulnerable location and indeed that it ‘might be impossible for any applicant to establish its suitability given the vulnerable location of the premises’ (Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority, 2013b).

The community felt ‘gobsmacked’ at the decision (McBride, 2013b; O’Neil, 2013b) with scenes of hugging and crying upon hearing the news (O’Neil, 2013b). Russell School principal Sose Annandale summed up her feelings on the decision, saying ‘It was a bit of a shock because we had taken quite a conservative approach. This is the third time we have been through hearings [to get the store permanently closed] so I guess it was third time lucky… We just hoopla'd and told the whole wide world’ (McBride, 2013a). Crawshaw stated the wider significance for residential liquor licencing saying ‘It's an unbelievable watershed moment, probably on a national scale’ (O’Neil, 2013b).

Crawshaw emailed the supporters of the opposition to the liquor store on 30 August 2013 stating the decision and its significance, with (‘Our Community WON! ... ) posted on the Russell School Facebook page on 29 August 2013(Crawshaw, 2013f) (Russell School Facebook page, 2013b). On 4 September 2013 FLOF posted ‘Just in case people haven't picked this up yet - we got some of the best news ever for our community last week! A long
determined process involving so many dedicated people. But what a ground breaking result!! We just can't stop smiling....’ (Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook Page, 2013d).

4.2.14.1 A team effort

The regulatory agencies also noted how good the outcome was for the community [Inspector interview; MOH interview; Police interview]. Both the Police and MOH noted the importance of their data in contributing the outcome [MOH interview; PADC interview; Police interview]. The MOH reiterated the importance of the ruling for residential liquor licencing case law, with applicants now needing to prove their suitability in vulnerable locations in terms of mitigating alcohol-related harm. He felt pleased that the LLA took on board his arguments regarding the broader aspects of suitability in the current climate. He did however think the ruling could have gone further to require all applicants to consult with their communities, not just those with proposed stores in vulnerable locations [MOH interview].

Local media also recognised the significance of the decision (McBride, 2013b; O’Neil, 2013b). The Māori Party sent Crawshaw and Annandale a letter on 10 September 2013, congratulating them for their heroic campaign. Tariana Turia called them inspirational for speaking out against social hazards to families and working collectively to keep communities safe from alcohol-related harm.

4.2.15 Celebrating the garden harvest: HEART: Honesty, empathy aroha, respect, teamwork

The community celebrated the liquor store closure on the evening of 17 October 2013, with an event held at Russell School (Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook page, 2013). Crawshaw and Annandale invited everyone who helped to make the closure of the store a reality, including MPs, health professionals, local residents and the whole of the Russell School community. Important guests were confirmed well in advance, with others invited by email from Crawshaw on 3 October 2013 (Crawshaw, 2013g). The event was promoted on the FLOF Facebook page, with an event created an event on 15 October 2013 called ‘An [sic] now it’s time to CELEBRATE’. Two hundred people were invited via Facebook with 17 RSVPs (Fantame Liquor Objections Facebook page, 2013), however, there were many more attendees on the day.
During the event Crawshaw spoke of the journey and the victory for the school and wider community. The Russell School children performed dance and singing items. All 150 children were invited to attend, with about half showing up on the night [Crawshaw interview]. People that had assisted the community in making objections were thanked. Dr Palmer the MOH, a member of the Salvation Army, local residents Paula MacEwan, and Matt Crawshaw were presented with leis by Russell School pupils. The children read out a blurb about each person, with each person assigned a Russell School value that they had shown through their assistance to this cause. The values were honesty, empathy aroha, respect and teamwork (Russell School Blog, 2014). See Figure 34 below for an illustration of the Russell School values. Sherriff was then presented with a Korowai (cloak) sewn by members of the community as a sign of deep respect for his efforts. The evening concluded with a shared ‘bring-a-plate’ meal, supplemented by food provided by Russell School. See Figure 35 and Figure 36 below for photographs of the event.

Figure 34. Illustration of the Russell School values: Honesty, empathy, aroha, respect and teamwork. Sourced from (Russell School Blog, 2014)
Figure 35. Russell School BOT chairman Matt Crawshaw and Fantame Street resident Paula MacEwan present lawyer Alastair Sherriff with a cloak made by local residents at the community celebration of the liquor store closure, 17 October 2013. Soured from (Room 1 Russell School Blog, 2013).

Figure 36. Russell School children perform at a community celebration of the Fantame Liquor Store closure, Russell School, 17 October 2013.
4.2.16 The future of gardening in Cannons Creek

As mentioned in section 4.2.12.2 above, community action opposing the proposed Mix bar at the nearby Cannons Creek shops occurred in 2013. Due to community objections regarding the proximity of the premises to a multitude of social services, many aimed to help those affected by liquor abuse (O’Neil, 2013b) the application went to hearings on 14 October and 7 November 2013. This time the community had the support of lawyer Alan Kowsley (Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority, 2013a). Evidence presented at these hearings appeared to indicate the immediate relevance of the Fantame Street case to similar situations (Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority, 2013a).

Interestingly, none of the regulatory agencies objected to the application prior to the hearing. The Police initially objected on the grounds of suitability, however following discussions with the licence applicants, the Police withdrew their application. Nevertheless, they advised that they did not support the application, and would support the objectors at the hearing. At the hearing all three regulatory authorities provided evidence which supported the community’s concerns regarding the vulnerability of the area and alcohol harm that would result should a licensed premises re-open in that location (Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority, 2013a).

This evidence from the regulatory agencies combined with the concerns of the ARLA regarding the suitability of the applicant, meant that ARLA was satisfied the application would not be successful. They therefore did not call the objectors as witnesses. The ARLA noted that this did not mean that the community objections were a waste of time, as the objectors lawyer effectively cross-examined the applicant, and the objections provided impetus for the regulatory authorities’ detailed evidence supporting their concerns (Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority, 2013a). They also noted much of the evidence that would be presented would be similar to that presented at the 2013 Nischay’s Fantame Street hearing. It is interesting to note that the ARLA also referenced the 2013 Fantame Street decision (Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority, 2013b) in their discussion of the suitability of the licence applicant. They noted that the more traditional interpretation of suitability to hold a licence had now been superseded with a broader responsibility to demonstrate how the applicant would mitigate liquor abuse issues. The ARLA thus denied the application based on the suitability of the applicant and the ‘incontrovertible and
overwhelming’ evidence of the alcohol harm that would ensue should the licence be granted (Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority, 2013a).

4.3 The idea of ‘a community’ as seen by interviewees

The section above details the events undertaken by members of the community interested in reducing harm from the Fantame Street liquor store. The interviewees in this case study generally agreed that ‘the community’ was self-identified and included everyone that came together for the issue, whether that be the residents, or someone who worked in or had an association with the area [Crawshaw interview; MOH interview; PADC interview]. Thus Alastair Sherriff their lawyer, Stephen Palmer the MOH, Ross Bell from the NZDF and others were part of ‘the community’ that worked together to reduce harm in the Fantame Street area. Below the keys to community action will be discussed, continuing with the metaphor of a garden. When quotes are used to describe text, text enclosed by square brackets has been inserted for clarity of understanding.

4.4 Community Action: keys to a fruitful garden

In this study, fruitful community action firstly required fertile soils which facilitated opportunities for action. A strong consensus within the community about the problems created by the liquor store and a resilient passionate community provided a solid starting point for action. Opportunities for action arose through the liquor licensing process permitting community input, the liquor law reform process allowing community participation and ultimate law changes giving community voice more weight. The pro-bono services of expert liquor licensing lawyer Alastair Sherriff also provided an invaluable opportunity for the community to participate in the liquor licensing process on an equal footing and have their concerns heard. This greatly enhanced the community’s experience of the process.

The community action occurred under the guidance of well-respected, passionate, driven leaders who were able to engage and enlist support from a wide range of local and other people. Help from highly committed professionals with an interest in reducing alcohol-related harm, in the form of information and in-kind assistance, appeared to be essential to community participation in the process. This support helped to legitimise community
concerns through the eyes of the court and to create a unified voice. Sections 4.4.1– 4.4.4 below provides some detail from the case study on the types of aids to community actions.

4.4.1 Opportunities: fertile soils

4.4.1.1 These weeds are driving me crazy: Consensus about the problem

The consensus about the liquor store issues, or a ‘low ongoing rumble of discontent’, [RPH interview] was felt by people both living and working in the community. These concerns facilitated the engagement of people with the liquor licensing process. Community members got involved for many reasons, including a desire to protect and create a better future for vulnerable members of the community, particularly children. For instance, local resident Paula MacEwan got involved as she was sick of the broken glass around the shop area [MacEwan interview]. The Russell School principal, MOH and local Police got involved because they were asked by Crawshaw [MOH interview; RS principal interview]. A strong consensus about the problem helped everyone involved join together as a community, with Crawshaw noting the visible problem assisted them to take action [Crawshaw interview].

4.4.1.2 Strong roots: The importance of a resilient passionate community

In addition to a strong consensus about the problems, the resilience of the community, despite their deprivation, set a solid foundation to work from when tackling the problem of the liquor store [MOH interview; PADC interview]. MacEwan expressed this saying ‘we’re not a tight community, but we’re in harmony, so if anything was to arise I feel the support and love is there to sort of, soak it up’ [MacEwan interview].

4.4.2 Planting the seeds and making the most of the seasons

Timing was an important success factor in this community action case study, with many opportunities afforded due to the opportune timing of successive and overlapping events and processes. These included the liquor law reform process, the 2008 protests about a proposed Cannons Creek liquor store, the 2011 liquor licence renewal process for Fantame Liquor Store, the 2013 termination of the lease for the shop, and the subsequent new licence application.
4.4.2.1 Liquor law reform

The Law Commission liquor law reform process from 2007 provided a major opportunity (New Zealand Drug Foundation, 2012). On a local level, this process enabled Crawshaw to meet contacts with a background in alcohol harm reduction. He was also able to attend a course that provided important alcohol knowledge and media skills that assisted him later in the process. The alcohol law reform process also provided the opportunity for Crawshaw and Russell School to practise telling their story through a presentation to the Law Commission select committee [Crawshaw interview].

The alcohol law reform report noted that liquor store placement was a common community concern (Law Commission, 2010), which highlighted a ‘raising of consciousness’ around the issue [Crawshaw interview] and brought it into the spotlight. The publicity surrounding community concern about liquor stores may have impacted on the shifting tide of the LLA decisions over the five years up to 2013. Over this time, these decisions shifted from favouring licence applicants to considering community concern relating to alcohol harm [MOH interview; Police interview]. Rulings on contested liquor licence applications heard by the High Court began to make reference to the object of the SOLA1989 [RPH interview; Police interview] namely using legislative means to contribute to a reduction in liquor abuse and minimise alcohol-related harm (New Zealand Parliament, 2013b). The liquor law reform process helped inform changes in the new alcohol law, giving community voices more say (Ministry of Justice, 2013).

4.4.2.2 Building on previous success

In 2008, members of a neighbouring community successfully opposed a liquor store opening in the Cannons Creek shops opposite Cannons Creek School (New Zealand Drug Foundation, 2013; New Zealand Liquor Licensing Authority, 2009). Timing again played a part in this outcome, with the hearing scheduled on the same day as the applicant’s law exams [Police interview]. Thus she did not personally attend the hearing to defend her suitability [Inspector interview; Police interview]. This made her suitability difficult to prove, and the licence was refused (New Zealand Liquor Licensing Authority, 2009). Crawshaw participated in 2008 by signing the petition, and joining in the march so had some exposure to the liquor licensing process [Crawshaw interview; Police interview; RPH interview]. The MOH and other local agencies also supported the objectors in 2008, so had experience to draw on when assisting
the Fantame Street objectors [MOH interview]. The positive outcome in 2008 helped agencies justify putting resources into supporting communities on this issue, as well as generated awareness of the issues surrounding liquor stores to the wider Porirua community [MOH interview].

4.4.2.3 A long fine spell

A further major opportunity arose in early 2013 when the landlords of 21 Fantame Street (Nischay’s Enterprises directors) decided not to renew Chiman Patel’s lease and Chiman Patel subsequently decided to surrender his liquor licence as of May 2013 [Police interview; RS principal interview]. This meant that instead of Nischay’s trading off a base licence under a temporary authority and applying for a licence renewal, they had to apply for a new liquor licence with stricter criteria [Police interview]. The criteria for establishing suitability were even tougher because of the new liquor law changes being phased in at the time of the application (Ministry of Justice, 2012). As a result, the effects of the proposed licence on alcohol harm and on the surrounding area were more able to be taken into account (Health Promotion Agency, 2012a).

The opportunity given by allowing the community to object to the Fantame Liquor Store liquor licence from 2011 provided an avenue for action, with the new licence application in 2013 providing a fresh opportunity to gather community momentum to object again [Crawshaw interview]. Community members were happy with the reduced problems associated with reduced hours of the liquor store [Crawshaw interview; RS principal interview] (New Zealand Drug Foundation, 2013) and felt motivated to at least keep things as they were [Crawshaw interview]. Thus, when the new applicants applied for markedly longer trading hours they did not want to see progress go backwards. So they felt compelled to object again, despite dread about having to partake in the process again [Crawshaw interview] and scepticism of a better outcome [MacEwan interview; RS principal].

The closure of Fantame Liquor Store for three months between May and July 2013 while awaiting the hearing allowed the opportunity for crime statistics to be gathered over that period and compared to periods with different liquor store hours (Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority, 2013b). As the period with no liquor store showed the lowest rates of reported crime, this evidence provided support for the argument that any liquor store hours in that area would increase alcohol-related harm [Police interview] (See Figure 33 above).
4.4.2.4 Help from the guru: Sherriff support invaluable

Finally, the ‘windfall’ [Crawshaw interview] presented by the free legal services of Alastair Sherriff the ‘guru’ [Police interview] of liquor law cannot be understated, both in its impact on the outcome and on the community experience of the process. Sherriff’s understanding of liquor law and the legal system enabled him to support the community’s concerns, utilising case law and relevant information to present legal arguments that the community would not have been able to generate themselves [RS principal interview].

Sherriff’s involvement meant reduced workload for Crawshaw leading up to the hearing [Crawshaw interview; MacEwan interview], a more relaxed community experience of the process and a feeling of validation that their voices were heard [Crawshaw interview; MacEwan interview; RS principal interview]. Due to his respectful and humble approach, they did not feel any tension about an outside person fronting their case [Crawshaw interview; MacEwan interview; RS principal interview]. However, MacEwan expressed frustration that she forgot to put in her objection a vital point about the kura (school) bus coming past as she got ‘slack’ and relaxed as she knew Sherriff would ‘take care of it’ [MacEwan interview]. Crawshaw expresses his experience of Sherriff’s assistance below:

And it was just such a different experience having that legal advice. I mean, certainly if I was going back, I would say that a really good sympathetic lawyer all the way through would make such a difference... because they understand the process and they are respected more when they want to challenge something, it was so worth it, ...the actual day itself separate from the decision, ... [was] such a thrill, it just felt so validating as a community, a truly beautiful thing to listen to, it was just so uplifting and came away from that thinking man, you know, that was so good, regardless of what this decision is, that felt like finally, we got what we came for which was to make sure our voice was properly heard [Crawshaw interview]

4.4.3 Leadership: a gardener who can rake people in

Another key to successful community action was a passionate, dedicated, well respected leader who was able to gather resources and support from inside and outside the community, empowering them to participate [MOH interview]. In this instance, Crawshaw, the leader of this community action was embedded in the community, wearing many hats as a community member, church member, community worker, father of a Russell School child and
Chairperson of the Russell School BOT [Crawshaw interview]. He had a vision, and was determined to see the liquor store in his neighbourhood closed, despite the setbacks, stating:

*I always held onto the thing, I always said, if it’s the last thing I do, I’m going to stay here until this bottle store’s closed* [Crawshaw interview]

Crawshaw used many tools to generate momentum and community support. This included (a) raising awareness, by utilising other community leaders such as the Russell School principal, church leaders and MPs, (b) organising community meetings and fun events to get the word out, aided by personally talking to neighbours, delivering flyers and social media and (c) generating publicity and support from agencies and the media to promote key messages.

From Crawshaw’s position on the Russell School BOT, he was able to promote the message of protecting the children to the school, residential and wider communities. This message was widely accepted, particularly by the media, who often made Russell School and its children the focus of their commentary around the liquor licence issue [Crawshaw interview] (Kapi-Mana News Facebook page, 2013; Kapi-Mana News, 2012, 2013c; McBride, 2013a, 2013c; Nichols, 2012a, 2012e; One News, 2012; Radio New Zealand, 2011).

4.4.4 Fertilising the garden: the role of the outside gardeners

*Naku te rourou nau te rourou ka ora ai te iwi*. *(With your basket and my basket the people will live)* [Māori proverb] (Woodward Chile, 2014)

A key to success was the unified voice presented by the community and the regulatory agencies, which as a gardening metaphor could be likened to everyone mucking in together singing the same tune. As Jenny Leister from PADC stated:

*The community can object to something but when you’ve got the organisations, the people that do have a say [a right to have a say in court], then [that] makes an enormous difference. So it’s not just the people who live in the area, it’s the supporting agencies as well, so if they’re all talking the same [way] it just makes an enormous difference* [PADC interview]

A great deal of time, energy, and support from passionate agency workers interested in alcohol harm reduction assisted the community to participate in the process [MOH interview; PADC interview]. The backbone of the action was a few core community members, with support from the local Salvation Army church, as well as the Russell School principal and
staff [Crawshaw interview]. Initial support from NZDF helped get the action off the ground [Crawshaw interview] and PADC brought some key stakeholders together. The MOH became a key partner, spending many hours helping the core working group [Crawshaw interview] and developing objection templates [Crawshaw interview; MOH interview]. Regional Public Health gave support in various ways, printing flyers and providing funds for the community celebration [RPH interview]. Similarly, various ALAC staff did ‘bits and pieces’ to support the community on their journey, including the editing of the community’s statements by a policy analyst for the first hearing. Another government employee printed flyers for free [Crawshaw interview]. All of this support helped in generating the eventual outcomes.

In both hearings the communities concerns were strengthened by the crime evidence presented by the Police, and public health statistics presented by the MOH [PADC interview; Police interview; RS principal interview]. This hard-to-dispute evidence helped legitimise the community concerns, giving them more credibility [RS principal interview]. Crawshaw likened the evidence (from the community, Police and health) to being like the spokes in a wheel and needing all of them for it to stay together and achieve the success of a complete licence refusal [Crawshaw interview]. Likewise the Russell School principal said:

\[
\text{We’re living it, we know it, but to have it backed up with evidence, [from the MOH and Police] that’s a really powerful thing, and I’m pretty sure, as a matter of fact, I’m absolutely sure, that without that evidence we would’ve had a real struggle, in the court [RS principal interview].}
\]

The Police and MOH were motivated to assist the community because they were passionate about their work, recognised that reducing the harm associated with the liquor store aligned with their work plan, and believed they could make a difference [MOH interview; Police interview]. Porirua Alcohol and Drug Cluster and RPH noted how hard it was for communities to participate in the process, [PADC interview; RPH interview] and that they, the MOH and Russell School principal helped out due to the community asking them [MOH interview; PADC interview; RPH interview; RS principal interview], thus went where the energy was [RS principal interview].
4.5 Community action: Obstacles to flourishing

In addition to the aids to community action described above, a number of factors acted as barriers to community action in this study. These included a lack of awareness of the problem, the need for strength to take action with an unknown outcome, against a backdrop of previous disempowerment.

The liquor licensing process itself was difficult to engage with for the community. The onus was on the community to take action. The process was also difficult for ordinary community members to hear about, and to then find sufficient information and support so as to engage in it. There was a short window to object, then a long waiting period between objecting and the court process, making the ability to keep the community engaged difficult.

The legal nature of the process was intimidating for most in the community, as it was an unfamiliar and unwelcoming environment, with an inaccessible language and culture, especially without legal representation. Thus, until they got pro-bono help from a lawyer, community members experienced the process as largely disempowering and invalidating, as many of their concerns were written off as not legally relevant and they perceived that they had no right of reply without a lawyer. Below sections 4.5.1- 4.5.3 provide details from this case on obstacles to action.

4.5.1 Weeds or seeds: the challenge of recognising what the landscape should look like

Community participation in the liquor licensing process firstly required community members to be aware that there was a problem. The DLA inspector, PADC and the MOH all spoke of the responsibility of the community to contact them if they had any concerns regarding licensed premises [Inspector interview; MOH interview; PADC interview]. In particular, the inspector noted that it was difficult for him to ensure the liquor store was being compliant with liquor laws as he was unaware of the community issues [Inspector interview]. The inspector explains this below:

Unless we know what’s going on out there, it’s hard for us to ensure they are being compliant... if we don’t know about the issues. It was three years earlier when they applied for the extension of the hours, we got no objections, and then now we’ve got all of these objections. When you read them, a lot of the issues we weren’t aware
about, in that timeframe, we hadn’t really received any complaints about the bottle store ... we’d heard nothing of it... We had never had complaints about the litter, or people going through the school, the glass in there, the fact they put up their gates because of it. We had no input into that, we didn’t know that any of these issues were around... It’s like well did these people know they could talk to us?? We’re a bit shocked to be quite honest [Inspector interview]

However, people living and working next to the liquor store got used to seeing and experiencing the harm that resulted from having a liquor store in a residential area, across the road from a school, with long opening hours that attracted people from outside of the area. They talked of becoming immune to the problem and it requiring someone coming in with an outside perspective to shed a fresh light on it. This was well articulated by MacEwan, and the Russell School principal who said:

> When you’re in the thick of it, it’s hard to see outside the bubble, there’s all this stuff going on and it’s normal, but actually it so isn’t normal. And even to this day when I had to read my objections, had I rewrote it in this moment it would’ve been completely different, because you forget what it is like and what it is now [MacEwan interview]

> So we know instinctively, we live here, we breathe it, we see it, um and I’d be pretty honest with you and say we become immune to it. Because it’s just part of our everyday lives. At first it’s like in your face, when I first came to work here I was like ‘oh my gosh that’s terrible’. Then I’m coming to work here day in and day out it’s just a part of my normal visual landscape, so I become immune to it. Then I bring visitors from out of town or my sister, .... and the first thing she says is she sees this huge, they used to have this big bourbon sign, she says ‘that’s disguising, that shouldn’t be allowed, what about the children?’ and it makes you question and it makes you think [RS principal interview]

**4.5.2 Going out on a limb can be dangerous**

In addition to recognising the problem, it can also be difficult for action to occur in a highly deprived neighbourhood, such as Cannons Creek, with a high degree of transience [Crawshaw interview; MacEwan interview]. Many community members were not used to having success and there was considerable doubt in the community as to whether they could make a difference [MacEwan interview; RS principal interview]. The Russell School principal described this well when she said:
'cause you're talking about people who are the most, dispossessed people, so often they've been downtrodden [by] authority or in the system, they don't necessarily, feel that they are going to win or be successful... So if you've had that through your life, it's really difficult to overcome that and find the confidence and the strength to stand up and actually say, 'well no, I don't agree with this, and this is why I don't agree with it', and feel like you've been valued, your opinion's been heard and it's been valued, even if we don't get change [RS principal interview]

It was also perceived to be risky to step up and ‘put your neck on the line’ and there was an expectation of negative repercussions [MacEwan interview]. Indeed the store owners initially responded in a threatening way to the community action via Facebook [Crawshaw interview].

Furthermore, due to the transient nature of the community many residents were not living there long enough to care or be able to take action [Crawshaw interview; MacEwan interview]. Other longer term residents lived there, but were detached from their neighbourhood, sending their children to schools in different suburbs [MacEwan interview]. Language barriers were also identified as a major obstacle to participation [Crawshaw interview; MacEwan interview; PADC interview; Police interview; RS principal interview] as was the possibility of having to appear in court [MacEwan interview]. The potential for the licence advertisement to go unnoticed or ‘slip under the radar’ was also mentioned [Police interview; RS principal interview].

4.5.3 Dark holes, manual labour and long germination time: Frustrations with the liquor licensing process

The community found the experience of participating in the liquor licensing process even more difficult than they imagined [Crawshaw interview; MacEwan interview; PADC interview; RS principal interview] (Nichols, 2012e). The Russell School principal expressed this below:

The process is difficult, like I said, it’s fraught with frustration at the beginning, and yet, I’m a fairly articulate professional person, so what about the lay person? [RS principal interview]
4.5.3.1 Short window to plant the seeds, long time to grow!

The timing of the process was difficult, with only a short 10-15 day time window from the advertisement of the liquor licence application to the time the objections were due. Then there was a long germination period before anything else happened [Crawshaw interview; Police interview; RS principal interview]. In this case study, when the community was sent away following the first adjourned hearing, it was particularly frustrating and took a great deal of time and energy to gain momentum again [Crawshaw interview; Police interview]. This is akin to the garden dying a little in between each hearing. The community frustration is articulated well by the Police below:

The public were, they started to get a little bit despondent about the process and ‘oh God we’re waiting another 3 months and what’s happening to it?’ We all had to come back again, because they hadn’t given their evidence at that stage ... I mean, I’m an ex-prosecutor so I know the wheels of justice grind slowly ... I knew we would eventually get back to it ... But in the meantime they were having to live in that trouble and the alcohol abuse and everything was still going on and they couldn’t see any light at the end of the tunnel [Police interview]

4.5.3.2 Digging deep to find support

Finding support in navigating the liquor licensing process was also challenging, with initial agencies approached not able to provide specific assistance. While the MOH provided invaluable assistance, it took a while for the community to hear that he was available to assist [Crawshaw interview]. The inspector noted that PADC would be the first call someone would make if they were to put in an objection [Inspector interview]. However, no information stating that PADC is available to assist communities is present on the local council website or in any of their information. The Police, licensing inspector and local council were hamstrung by their regulatory roles and therefore found it difficult to support community members whilst maintaining neutrality and impartiality to both community members and the liquor licence applicants [Crawshaw interview; Inspector interview; PADC interview; Police interview]. They were also reactive and only able to provide assistance within their jurisdiction [Crawshaw interview; Inspector interview]. The DLA inspector explains the change in his monitoring of the Fantame Street area following the 2012 hearing:
After the hearing and they had the hours brought back, it was more focussed on that area [Fantame Street], because we’re more aware of the issues. We took up a lot of monitoring of it, to ensure that they were operating within the hours, to check that no one was intoxicated and stuff like that. We spent a big proportion of our time, to ensure that the same issues weren’t happening [Inspector interview]

4.5.3.3 An excavator machine vs a child with a hand trowel: the challenge of shifting dirt and participating in the liquor licensing process

The liquor licensing process was a formal legal process which was unfriendly, unwelcoming and intimidating for community members to be a part of [MacEwan interview; RPH interview]. The Russell School principal described this well stating ‘I’m a professional person, and I felt guttered and felt like, oh my gosh, there is no place for me here’ [RS principal interview].

Under the SOL1989, suitability to sell alcohol was the only ground under which community members could object to licence applications. As a result, many of their concerns were written off as legally invalid [Crawshaw interview; Police interview] (New Zealand Liquor Licensing Authority, 2012) or as not holding the correct burden of proof. This was described by Annandale the Russell School principal:

*The last time we went to court, we couldn’t prove that they [intoxicated people walking through Russell School grounds carrying liquor] purchased it [alcohol from Fantame Liquor Store] ’cause I didn’t see a docket. But it’s just a no brainer, that, you know, they [Fantame Liquor Store] have those distinctive black bags that they’d [intoxicated people] walk through the school [with]... then when they’re challenged [they would] be abusive [RS principal interview]*

Greater legal weight is given to objections from people present at a hearing (New Zealand Liquor Licensing Authority, 2012). However, due to time constraints, it was not practical to have all objectors present evidence at the Fantame Street hearings, nor was there room for many in the court, thus some people were excluded from the process [Crawshaw interview].

The court environment was very formal, with an unfamiliar language and culture that was hard even for non-legal professionals to feel a part of [RPH Interview; RS principal interview]. It was seen by the local community as a very unfriendly process, whereby community members felt disempowered and like children, as articulated by MacEwan:
I was a bit worried, I thought the judge might tell me off for it [knitting] ‘cause he was really short tempered the first round, he really had low tolerance for anything in fact and we were well behaved, I thought we were really well behaved. I think perhaps he was disgruntled at the fact there was no lawyer so ... that respect and that culture thing that I saw going on in a courtroom wasn’t happening [MacEwan interview]

The process was also viewed as unfair and favouring business people, due to the applicant having a lawyer and community members not having legal representation [Crawshaw interview; RPH interview; RS principal interview]. It was confrontational and intimidating for community members to be put on a witness stand to verify their concerns, and was seen as unfair when no one was cross examining the applicant [PADC interview; RPH interview]. The process was difficult to participate in without having an understanding of the legal process and relevant liquor licensing case law [MOH interview; RPH interview; RS principal interview]. This point was eloquently articulated by the Russell School principal, using a timely metaphor of the America’s Cup:

You’re disadvantaged ‘cause you don’t understand, it’s like going off to do, the America’s Cup but not knowing what all of the rules are. Yeah we’ve got a boat and we’re going to sail- we’re out there and we’re gunna have a go. But then when you’re up against, the Oracle, it’s like, .... we’ve got a manual sort of whatever they had and the other one’s got an automated one. I mean it’s the same thing, ‘cause those people who are applying for their liquor licence they have legal representation. The communities really need legal representation [RS principal interview]

Following the adjournment at the first hearing the community felt despondent. Their feelings of injustice were heightened when they realised the Fantame Liquor Store was still open, despite trading illegally. None of the regulatory agencies were taking responsibility for enforcing closure [Crawshaw interview; MacEwan interview; RS principal interview]. Crawshaw and Annandale the Russell School principal describe this below:

Because we didn’t have any legal representation there was nothing that we could say. We were like, he’s illegal, like how can you just send him away? Whenever does that happen to us members of the public where we can trade illegally and we just get told ‘oh well go and sort it out come back in six-months then we’ll hear your case’! This was meant to be the point where you said right, you are trading illegally you lose your licence! ‘cause that’s what happens if you’re driving illegally and you get caught,
...you get slammed you know! So the injustice of it stung so much and completely shattered us in terms of all of the energy that had gone into it [Crawshaw interview]

So we finished for the day incredibly frustrated and despondent, and he’s operating as normal, and continues to operate as normal! We’re standing there, and honestly your emotions and everything about you is just really rock bottom as you’re thinking ‘how can this be?’ ... In our society how can that be right and just and fair that somebody who’s running an illegal business and known so by the court, still be operating? It’s just not right and nobody’s doing anything about it [RS principal interview]

4.5.3.4 Cut off at the roots

Without legal representation, the community participants in this study felt disempowered, shut down, and like their voices weren’t heard [Crawshaw interview; MacEwan interview; PADC interview; RS principal interview;](Davies, 2012). In the first hearing they did not get to say anything before the adjournment. Similarly in the second hearing, most community participants did not get to read their statements, and were not allowed to bring up any additional points or have a right of reply [Crawshaw interview; MacEwan interview; RS principal interview]. Crawshaw articulates his feelings following the second hearing below:

[We were] 100% disempowered by the thing, we were flattened ... Again, this process of being completely smashed and slapped down by the system. The group of us that left that hearing we were so dejected, we were just completely shattered. For all intents and purposes it seemed like we had 100% lost, you know, like nobody listened to us, nobody cared. They’d basically seen everything we had put as irrelevant. We were like woah, what do you do? We’ve done everything we can, we have put every ounce of effort into it, and this is what we kind of get out of it? [Crawshaw interview]

4.5.3.5 Legal process: The need for particular legal expertise

The legal nature of the process and importance of understanding case law was highlighted during the interviews. For example, the Russell school principal said ‘Because this is a legal process, they [communities] need to be supported with legal advice’. Their lawyer was able to support them through his knowledge of the legal system and liquor licensing case law. He was also able to find out relevant information and cross examine the applicants [RS principal interview]. The regulatory agencies also mentioned the importance of legal knowledge, with the local Policeman noting he kept up with all of the case law [Police interview; RPH
interview]. However, difficulties in keeping up with the case law were cited by public health representatives as a barrier to performing their public health role well. This is described below:

> It is really disconcerting that the applicant would have a lawyer who would know case law in and out. The community were never going to know that. Even [we] are not in a position to follow case law; we are not lawyers, the Police aren’t lawyers. From our public health perspective, we can present our case well, but you have to specifically orient it towards the case law. [So] it’s probably best to have a good understanding of case law but not necessarily refer to it! [RPH interview]

4.6 Community action: The impact of cleaning up the garden

> Doing your local thing, as well as you can, as powerful as you can, has the greatest impact [Crawshaw interview]

Community participation in the Fantame Street liquor licencing process helped reduce crime as well as foster relationships and community spirit in the local community. This community’s participation in the liquor licensing process may also have broader implications by setting precedents for liquor licensing in other residential communities and the use of data by the regulatory agencies. Section 4.6 discusses the impact of the efforts for the local community in terms of reduced alcohol harm, as well as increased community safety (s. 4.6.1) and community spirit (s. 4.6.2). The implications for other communities are also discussed (s. 4.6.3).

4.6.1 Removing the weeds and letting the light in

Community safety in the area around Fantame Street significantly improved following hearing decisions that reduced the liquor store trading hours then closed the store by refusing a liquor licence [PADC interview; Police interview]. Residents reported significant reductions in noise, glass and intoxicated behaviour. This was backed up by Police statistics which showed an association between decreased hours of operation of the liquor store and decreased reported crime in the area (Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority, 2013b). The role community action played to improve safety in this community is articulated by Crawshaw below:
Obviously for us it’s huge, … we can basically claim, with a bit of … poetic licence that we’ve reduced crime in our community by 30%. That’s a pretty big hit! As far as a win you can get in a community, to be able to say that we’ve reduced crime in our community by 30%, which is what the evidence showed, … that’s something worth celebrating [Crawshaw interview]

4.6.2 From caterpillar to butterfly: Growing of the community spirit

The outcome of reduced liquor store hours and ultimate closure was seen as a win for the community. However, it was universally expressed that the most valued outcome of engaging in the process was that standing together on a single issue overcame diversity and created unity [Crawshaw interview; PADC interview; RS principal interview]. This resulted in growth of community spirit through the fostering of friendships and the growing of confidence to tackle other issues [Crawshaw interview; MacEwan interview, MOH interview; RS principal interview]. MacEwan articulates this point:

But even if we didn’t get any of that it doesn’t matter, it’s our spirit, of the community is grown. It’s more consolidated, and there’s a foundation. That’s got to be more beautiful than anything. It’s a beautiful thing. So we just got the cream on the top really [MacEwan interview]

4.6.3 Process and caselaw: germinating seeds for other community gardens

[The] legal precedence set ... [can] further... other objections of similar nature ... so that particular ruling is a win for everybody not just Porirua [PADC interview]

This process generated learnings for all the agencies involved, and resulted in strengthening the relationships between the regulatory agencies and increased responsiveness of those agencies [Inspector interview; Police interview]. Furthermore, the type of data presented in this hearing by the regulatory agencies has become standard in Porirua and is predicted to become commonplace nationwide, giving more weight to community concerns [Police interview; RPH interview].

The decision to reduce the liquor store hours was based on the premise that the store should be serving the needs of the local community. This created case law and set the standard for liquor licensing in other residential communities [MOH interview; PADC interview; RPH interview]. Similarly, the rejection of the liquor licence, based on the harm that would ensue
in this vulnerable community, sets a strong precedent for liquor licence decisions under the new liquor legislation [MOH interview; PADC interview]. It also gave guidance for criteria the MOH can use in the assessment of off-licences [MOH interview]. These decisions ultimately have the potential to reduce alcohol-related harm in other communities [Crawshaw interview; PADC interview] and impact on political decision making related to alcohol [MOH interview]. Crawshaw talked about these wider impacts:

When it says ...in the ruling ... it would be difficult for any applicant to establish suitability in such a vulnerable location, and the ripple effects of that [statement] throughout our country in terms of the potential for reduced crime ... that's a big big impact in terms of alcohol harm ... I’m involved in this space just to be involved in what we can do in our neighbourhood, but that idea of 'local equals global’ or national. You know that in some ways doing your local thing as well as you can, as powerful as you can, has the greatest impact [Crawshaw interview]

4.7 Results: Conclusions

This chapter presented a detailed description of the community action events (s. 4.2), followed by a discussion of the idea of ‘community’ (s. 4.3). The facilitators to action were analysed and included strong leadership, action in the right climate, with support from interested professionals from a multitude of agencies (s. 4.4). Barriers to community action included problems recognising the harm from the liquor store and frustrations with the liquor licensing process (s. 4.5). The impact of these community action events on alcohol-related harm, community safety and community spirit in the local area were discussed along with suggestions of a broader impact resulting from these community action events (s. 4.6). The following chapter discusses these results.
Chapter Five: Discussion

5.1 Introduction

The objective of this chapter is to discuss how the results of this case study fit with the existing community action literature, and to discuss the implications of the results of this case study. This chapter argues that community action is a messy process, impacted by broader environmental factors such as central and local government policies, as well as community level factors. In this study, many factors came together to produce the outcome. This highlights that the community action process is context specific with no guaranteed formula for success. This work was a case study of one community, which allowed fine grain evidence to be collected about the mechanisms of community action. However, this method only allowed for a limited range of viewpoints and extrapolations, with significant further research required.

In this case, working together on alcohol harm increased the bonds within the community. However, the community action process was difficult and the caveat was that the community spirit only increased once the community felt their voices were being heard. This community action also contributed to decreased local liquor store trading hours resulting in reduced alcohol availability and decreased alcohol harm in the local area. Nevertheless, research indicates that other policies that impact the availability and the price of alcohol can have a more significant impact on alcohol-related harm. Communities can be supported to take action by policies that make participation easier, and also with support to navigate processes.

This chapter explores these points in more detail. It firstly discusses the barriers and aids to community action found in this study (s. 5.2- 5.3) and how they compare to the existing community action literature. This is followed by a commentary on the role of community action in progressing population health (s. 5.4). Implications for policy (s. 5.5) as well as the strengths and weaknesses of the study are then highlighted (s. 5.6). The thesis finishes with suggestions for further research (s. 5.7) and final conclusions (s. 5.8).
5.2 Barriers to community action

This case study highlighted many factors that hindered or supported community action. The section below discusses barriers to action including: problems identifying pervasive alcohol-related issues, and the difficulties that communities face engaging in the liquor licensing process, due to its legal nature.

5.2.1 Lack of awareness or leadership

This work highlighted that the first barrier to community action was the need for individuals to recognise the issue of community alcohol harm in Cannons Creek, and have the energy to do something about it [MacEwan interview]. In 2011, the Fantane Liquor Store had sold liquor next to Russell School for 12 years. Although the problems associated with the presence of a bottle store had been widely recognised by the community for a number of years, they had become normalised, and it was difficult for residents to ‘see outside the bubble’ [RS principal interview]. This was a problem, as the liquor licensing process requires the community to be proactive (see s. 4.5.1.).

In this case study, no coordinated community opposition to the liquor store occurred after the store first got a license in 1999, until Crawshaw emerged as a leader on this issue (see s. 4.4.3). This finding is consistent with prior research which suggests that community action will not occur without leadership (Barnett & Barnett, 2003; Holder & Moore, 2000; Pigg et al., 2013). Thus health authorities could support communities to take action by helping to identify and assist community leaders as well as highlighting health problems that may have become obscured due to their pervasiveness. These themes will be expanded in s. 5.5.3.
5.2.2 Struggle for participation

Another barrier to community action was getting people to participate. This is particularly important in the liquor licensing process, as more weight is given to community concerns if they are shown to affect large numbers of people (see s. 4.2.4). In Cannons Creek, the high level of deprivation, ethnic diversity, and previous disempowerment (see s.1.3 and s. 4.5.2) could have impacted on participation by reducing community cohesion and the ability to participate, and affecting beliefs about likely outcome of action.

5.2.2.1 Transience and diversity hinder community participation

The transient nature of the community, due to the high level of social and emergency housing, was mentioned as a barrier to participation, as many residents did not stay long enough to become invested in the neighbourhood. Furthermore, it was mentioned that some longer term residents did not appear to be well connected to the local community, as they sent their children to schools in other suburbs (see s. 4.5.2). Previous research suggests that these weak community ties and networks could result in lower levels of trust, and thus lower levels of participation (Uslaner, 2013).

Ethnic diversity was also mentioned in the interviews as a barrier to participation, with many people speaking English as their second language who would struggle with the written objection process (see s.4.5.2). The literature also suggests that high levels of diversity can lower the likelihood of community participation through lower levels of trust across the local community, and fear of the unfamiliar (Ohio State University, n.d.). Although trust was not
mentioned specifically by participants, it was mentioned that taking action could be risky and that the chance of negative repercussions was seen as high. The legal processes were seen by some as possibly dangerous, as evidenced by the reaction to court notices about the hearing (see s. 4.2.7).

**5.2.2.2 Did deprivation hinder participation?**

Some participants in this study considered that a high level of deprivation and previous disempowerment were obstacles to participation for many in the local community. These factors would have likely contributed to the considerable doubt within the community that they could make a difference (see s. 4.5.2). This is consistent with previous research finding that individuals’ values, attitudes and experiences are shaped by their immediate social group (Kollmuss & Agyeman, 2002) and influence an individuals’ locus of control (Abbott, 2010; Kollmuss & Agyeman, 2002), or belief that they can make a difference. This in turn influences their likelihood of taking action (Uslaner, 2013). Thus, if a highly deprived community believes they have a low chance of success, they are less likely to take action; for groups with few available resources such as time, money and expertise, the benefits may not seem to outweigh the costs (Kollmuss & Agyeman, 2002; Ohio State University, n.d.; Uslaner, 2013). For instance, it was noted that many people were unable to get the time off work or from other commitments to attend the hearings [Crawshaw interview]. At no stage was the local community able to hire legal counsel to assist in the preparation of evidence or its presentation in court.

However, the need to act, and the leadership found within the community, appears to have outweighed the effects of deprivation. For example, at the Caster Loop family celebration event in July 2011, there were about 200 people (Torrie, 2011c)(see. s. 4.2.6). In Cannons Creek East, there are 3,594 residents in 1005 households of whom 2343 are aged 18 and over (Profile. ID, 2013a, 2013d). Therefore, one way of quantifying how many residents were involved in taking action, is to say that 200 out of 3594 (or 5%) of residents took part.

Looking at objections, in 2013 there were 54 objections from parents and 23 others within a 360m radius (or approximately five minutes’ walk) from the school (Berkland, 2013)(see Figure 26 above). This makes 77 total residential objections, presuming most of the parents lived in the Cannons Creek East area too. Assuming mostly one objection per household, another way of looking at it is that there were 77 objections from about 1005 households, or
8% of households objecting. However, it is likely that some of the other objectors were also residents (living beyond 360 metres from the school). If 120 of the 137 objectors were residents, it would be 12% of households or 5% of adult residents lodging an objection.

The difficulty of getting support can be seen, considering that all of the residents would have probably been aware of the issue due to the leaflet drops to all of the households, and the door-knocking asking some of them to participate. The literature predicts people are more likely to take part if they are asked by someone they know (Ohio State University, n.d.; Uslaner, 2013).

Nevertheless, the percentage of people taking action appears to have been similar to that found in a recent New Zealand survey regarding action on alcohol issues (Kypri & Maclennan, 2014). This survey found widespread concern regarding alcohol issues, with only about 4% of survey participants taking action on alcohol, though taking action is not defined (Kypri & Maclennan, 2014). This was a postal survey with a 59% response, with the possibility that those more interested in action would respond (See s. 2.4.11.1.3 for more information).

There were however, a higher percentage of Russell School parents objecting. The Russell school roll is 140 pupils (FindTheBest.co.nz, 2014). If we assume this would be about 100 families, or approximately 180 parents, then with 54 objections, this is about a 30% response rate (or higher if each household only put in one objection). Reasons for the high participation would be due to the saliency of the issue to the school community and the support provided by Crawshaw and others to parents and caregivers, making it as easy as possible to participate.

5.2.2.3 Official processes and structures do not facilitate true participation and empowerment

The community experienced participating in the liquor licensing process as frustrating and disempowering (see s. 4.5.3). There was evidence of inequalities in power between official and community groups, and for much of the time the local community felt they had little support from the relevant official structures that had the power to make changes. There appeared few opportunities for true participation in crucial decisions, and little likelihood of long term shifts in power to the community (Gaventa, 2005; Innes & Booher, 2004; Painter et al., 2011).
5.2.2.3.1 On the back foot

The licensing process relies on community members seeing the relevant notices in the local paper and then coordinating a response, with 10-15 days allowed for objections (New Zealand Parliament, 2013a, 2013b). The literature predicts that the short time-frame could be problematic, as people need time to talk to others, and discuss whether action fits in with their values before taking part (Ohio State University, n.d.). Leaders need time to gather resources and organise community meetings, which can be a problem when public notifications appear in the local paper over Christmas or school holiday periods [Crawshaw interview; Police interview]. In this case study, Crawshaw began planning before the public notifications (see s. 4.2.4), but the short objections deadline made things more difficult than necessary for the local community (see s. 4.5.3.1).

The liquor licencing process allows community members to object and participate in the LLA hearings. However, there were inequalities in power and in access to information and resources between the community and the licensee and officials taking part in the process. Consistent with previous findings in the literature, the inequalities in power and access to information and resources made it difficult to participate equally and meaningfully (Painter et al., 2011). The literature predicts this can come about through the process being opened up for participation, without the structures being in place to support this happening in an equitable way (Gaventa, 2005). This happened with the liquor licencing events in this case study.

The community found the liquor licensing process unwelcoming, with an inaccessible language and culture. They found it difficult to access information about how to participate in the process. For most of the time they did not have a lawyer and as such, did not have access to legal information and understandings such as case law. Thus they were disadvantaged compared to the licence applicants. Furthermore, due to the prescribed nature of community participation in the liquor licencing process, the community had to try and adapt to that environment, with many of their concerns being dismissed as irrelevant, as they did not fit into the pre-set objection criteria (see s. 4.5.3). This fits with criticism of participatory approaches where the powerful actors shape the rules of the space, with the result that opportunities for real shifts in power are limited (Painter et al., 2011; Ransome, 2014).
5.2.2.3.2 Stuck in a rut

Previous research suggests that officials and institutional structures can struggle to change and incorporate community involvement into their processes. This is particularly the case when community involvement has not previously been prominent (Innes & Booher, 2004). In this case study, the liquor licensing officials were not used to dealing with a large number of community objectors. For example, the LLA were concerned about how to deal with of all of the objectors potentially presenting evidence at a hearing, so rang Crawshaw for advice. They also sent a formal letter that was viewed by the community as confusing (see s. 4.2.7).

Despite theoretical opportunities for community members voices to be heard effectively in the liquor licensing process, in practice things were different. For instance, Sections 108 and 106 of the SOLA1989 explicitly state that ‘any other person who satisfies the Authority or the Agency that he or she has an interest in the proceedings, apart from any interest in common with the public’ is entitled to ‘appear and be heard at the hearing, whether personally or by counsel, and to call, examine, and cross-examine witnesses’ (New Zealand Parliament, 2013b). Thus Crawshaw could have been able to bring up information and voice his concerns at the hearing, as someone with an interest ‘apart from any interest in common with the public’. However, the judge did not allow this to happen, and without a lawyer he was not able to voice concerns as they came up during the proceedings (see s. 4.2.9.6). Having a lawyer did help mitigate these concerns and is discussed below in section 5.3.7.

5.2.2.3.3 Digging into concrete

The community also felt disempowered through the process, by not being able to read their statements at the 2011 and 2012 hearings. The long waiting times throughout the process made them feel like their voices weren’t being heard. Community members felt very disillusioned when the hearing was adjourned due to the store trading illegally; but the store was able to continue to trade. Thus to them, it felt like the process was favouring business interests over community concerns. No officials were prepared to take responsibility for enforcing the steps required to halt the illegal trading. Little happened, even after Crawshaw put in considerable effort contacting and liaising between the regulatory agencies, LLA and local mayor (see s. 4.2.8.3). The need for local government agencies, politicians and the Police to appear independent, limited what they were able to do to support communities, with
communities expected to contact PADC for advice. However, there was no information about PADC easily available from the council (see s. 4.5.3.2)[Crawshaw interview].

5.3 Aids to community action

In contrast to the barriers detailed above, community action was aided by seven supporting factors. These factors are described in more detail below and include: consensus about a visible problem (s. 5.3.1), local institution to focus concerns (s. 5.3.2), media support (s. 5.3.3), formal avenues for participation (s. 5.3.4), timing (s. 5.3.5), leadership (s. 5.3.6) and support from professionals (s. 5.3.7).

5.3.1 Consensus about a visible problem and the need for action

This community action was enabled by the strong consensus within the community about the harm that came from the presence and activities of the Fantame Liquor Store (see s. 4.2.9). This theme is consistent with the idea that people are more likely to take action against things that directly affect their quality of life or that conflict with their moral, ethical, religious or other values (Kollmuss & Agyeman, 2002; B. A. Maclennan, 2010; McMillan, 1996; Ohio State University, n.d.; Wallin, 2007).

In this case study, many interviewees talked about action being the right thing to do, to protect children and other vulnerable members of the community (see s. 4.4.1.1). Previous research suggests that education is a value that people often feel strongly about, and there is strong community support for issues relating to schools (Ohio State University, n.d.). Indeed, 95 out of 137 or 70% of the objections to the 2013 Nischay’s Fantame Street liquor licence application came from people associated with a school. This includes the Russell School community, early childhood centres, Maraeroa primary school and Porirua College. (See s. 4.2.12 for a breakdown of objectors). This figure would likely underestimate the percentage of objectors concerned about the impact on children. This can be assumed from the evidence presented by local residents Juliet Bellingham and Paula MacEwan at the 2013 hearing. Although they were not specifically associated with a school on their objection form, they both expressed concerns about the impact of the liquor store on Russell School and other local children (Bellingham, 2013; MacEwan, 2013a).
Concern for other vulnerable members of the community was also expressed by objectors in this case study. This included fear for residents using emergency Salvation Army housing in the area with many escaping or recovering from alcohol problems. Concerns for families in Housing New Zealand homes with limited choice about where to live and underage youth purchasing alcohol from the store and loitering late into the evening were also mentioned (New Zealand Liquor Licensing Authority, 2012).

5.3.2 Local institution able to focus concerns

The proximity of the liquor store to Russell School provided opportunities for the community action process. Russell School became the hub of the community action efforts, hosting community meetings and events. The Russell School community including staff, parents and extended families of the children, were a great source of support of the efforts, providing volunteers for events, and generating significant numbers of objections to the liquor licences (Berkland, 2013). This is congruent with the idea of utilising resources already present in a community; in this instance, natural, built and social capital associated with the school (Flora & Flora, 2008). It also fits with the settings or placed based approach to health promotion (Inspiring Communities, 2013; World Health Organization, 1986).

5.3.3 Media support, framing the issue

The media reporting on the issue was almost universally supportive of the community efforts, particularly the local Porirua Kapi-Mana newspaper. The articles either directly supported the community viewpoint, or more subtly by the language used in the reporting. The media framed the issue as being about community as opposed to individual responsibility. Protecting children was a key message (see s. 4.4.3). The media coverage highlighted the strength of the local community, portraying the school and neighbourhood as peaceful and heroic, in contrast to Mr Patel as the ‘bad guy’.

Consistent with the literature, this reporting used ‘sound bites’ symbolising values that people could identify with. This could have contributed to shaping the general local public opinion of the issue (Whitman, 2013) and helped the community to feel that someone was taking notice of their efforts. The exception to this was the reporting of the adjourned hearing in November 2011, which expressed the community disappointment but did not challenge the fairness of the situation (Dando, 2011b; McLean, 2011; Torrie, 2011a, 2011d). This left some
community members frustrated with the media coverage (Friend B of Fantame Liquor Objections, 2011). The community was tempted to go to the media with their concerns about the liquor licensing process, but decided it would not look good for their image in the long term [Crawshaw interview].

5.3.4 Formal avenues for participation

In this case study, institutional arrangements that provided formal avenues for community participation supported the community action efforts to a degree. Community members were able to participate firstly in the review of alcohol laws and then the liquor licencing process. These processes benefited this community action effort by giving some structure and direction for the community action activities (Ohio State University, n.d.). The frustrations with the liquor licensing process have been discussed previously (see s. 5.2.2.3).

Previous research suggests that formal avenues for community participation may give participants some confidence that their voices could be heard (Uslaner, 2013). Nonetheless, in this case study, community members expressed frustration and doubt that their voices would be heard [Crawshaw interview; MacEwan interview; RS principal interview]. However, although they were not specifically asked, it could be assumed that community members had some trust in the legal process and the democratic structures behind the legal process.

Evidence for the above assumption includes that many interviewees felt it was unjust that the liquor store remained open when it was trading illegally, and expressed disbelief that this could happen in a fair democratic society [Crawshaw interview; MacEwan interview; RS principal interview]. It is also likely that some community members would have heard about the successful efforts of their neighbouring community in preventing the opening of liquor store across the road from Cannons Creek School [Crawshaw interview; PADC interview; Police interview]. In addition, a sense of efficacy, or belief that they could make a difference was expressed by the MOH and the Russell School principal [MOH interview; RS principal interview]. This was partly due to the changing tide of liquor licencing decisions, which were beginning to take into account the concerns of local residents [MOH interview; Police interview].
5.3.5 Timing: action in the right climate

The timing of the action in relation to the current political climate may have been crucial to success, and supported the community action in a number of ways. Firstly, the national liquor law reform process highlighted the issue of community concern with bottle stores. The national process may have impacted on the shifting nature of LLA decisions, and on law changes to give community voices given more weight in the liquor licensing process. Locally, Crawshaw was able to participate in the liquor law reform process and take part in a course facilitating community participation in alcohol policy. Both of these provided him with useful knowledge, skills and alcohol harm reduction contacts (see s. 4.4.2 for further explanation of the above points).

The importance of the current context (including the political liquor licencing climate) for community action efforts, is consistent with previous research (Agrawal & Gibson, 1999; Boots & Midford, 2007; Kollmuss & Agyeman, 2002; Midford, 2007). Five to fifteen years previously, local New Zealand communities with similar concerns regarding licensed premises did not have their concerns reflected in the LLA decisions [MOH interview] (O’Connor, 1998). Indeed in 1998 when the Fantame Liquor Store first opened, the Police, Russell School community, and local residents objected to the store, but it was still granted a liquor licence (The Evening Post, 1998). Similarly, thirty-two community objections to a pub in Cannons Creek did not stop a liquor licence being granted in 1999, but community objections were influential in a licence refusal in 2013 (Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority, 2013a; The Evening Post, 1999).

Furthermore, the opportunity afforded by Chiman Patel surrendering his liquor licence, resulting in a new licence application being submitted cannot be understated. Many interviewees mentioned that it is harder to cancel an existing licence than to block a new liquor store [MOH interview; RPH interview; PADC interview; Police interview]. As such, had the landlords not cancelled Chiman Patel’s tenancy, or had Chiman Patel not surrendered his liquor licence, it is unlikely that the community concerns would have resulted in a cancellation of the licence [Police interview].
5.3.6 Leadership

‘Te amorangi ki mua, te hapai o ki muri’. (The leader at the front and the workers behind the scenes) [Māori proverb] (Woodward Chile, 2014)

Without the leadership shown by Crawshaw who co-ordinated and brought people together, it is unlikely that this community action would have occurred at anything like the scale that was achieved. This is consistent with the literature, with studies finding strong leadership to be a key factor for successful community projects (Barnett & Barnett, 2003; Greenaway & Witten, 2006; Pigg et al., 2013; Wallin, 2007). Crawshaw had all the qualities of a successful leader that the literature describes. He was tenacious, passionate, organised, and had a vision of success (Barnett & Barnett, 2003; Boehm & Staples, 2005; Greenaway & Witten, 2006; Laverack, 2012; Midford, 2007; Pigg et al., 2013; Pilisuk et al., 2010). His tenacity was shown in his response to setbacks, and is summarised in his statement, ‘If it’s the last thing I do, I’m going to stay here until this bottle stores closed’ [Crawshaw interview] (see s. 4.4.3).

5.3.6.1 Communication for community action

Crawshaw was able to communicate well. He used many techniques to enlist support from within and outside the community, including networking and building relationships of trust (Barnett & Barnett, 2003; Greenaway & Witten, 2006; Larner & Craig, 2005; Laverack & Whipple, 2010; Laverack, 2012; Midford, 2007; Treno & Holder, 1997). One key to success was that Crawshaw talked to a wide range of people about the problem, developing networks and contacts as he did so. He also went door-knocking and spoke to the residents in the streets immediately surrounding the store (see s. 4.2.5). This enabled him to develop credibility and trustworthiness, a quality of successful community action leadership (Mohanty, 2011; Pigg et al., 2013). It also helped him enlist support, consistent with the literature suggesting people are more likely to take part if they are asked by someone they know (Ohio State University, n.d.; Uslaner, 2013). Indeed, the Russell School principal and the MOH said they got behind the campaign because they were asked by Crawshaw (see s. 4.4.4).

The methods of communication used by Crawshaw in this case study can be divided into three general areas; personal contact, low-level personal media, and mass media. Personal contact includes face-to-face discussions (one to one, or small group) and phone conversations. The low-level personal media include group emails (using lists), community
meetings, and neighbourhood flyer drops. Mass media includes newspapers, electronic social media (e.g., Facebook) and television (J. McLeod, Scheufele, & Moy, 1999).

The different methods of communication were selected for each stage of the campaign as appropriate. For instance, the flyers were important in getting the message out to the community initially. However personal contact was the peer influence that cemented participation (J. M. McLeod et al., 1996; Wallin, 2007). Providing information through community meetings and flyers, as well as providing templates and writers, assisted participation by making the objection process as easy as possible (Wallin, 2007).

It is difficult to assess the role of the FLOF Facebook group in assisting this community action effort. Some research suggests that Facebook would be useful for activism (Neumayer & Raffl, 2008). However, Gladwell argues that social media such as Facebook may not be successful for activism as it involves weak ties between people. This is good for new ideas and low risk activities, but will not get people to do something that is high-risk (Gladwell, 2010). Crawshaw found Facebook to be a poor event organiser [Crawshaw interview] and despite FLOF having 233 friends as of February 2014, only a small number of these made a contribution to the Facebook page, or RSVP’d to events (see. s. 4.2.15, 4.2.7 and 4.2.8.1).

There are many possible reasons why many people did not comment on the Facebook page or RSVP to Facebook events. They may not have noticed the invitations and notifications. Conversely, they may not have commented because they already told someone they were coming, and didn’t feel it was necessary to RSVP, or they did not want to make a public commitment to attending (FeverBee Community Consultancy, 2011; Gladwell, 2010). Others may not have lived in the community but were ‘friends’ with FLOF to show support for the community’s efforts [Crawshaw interview]. In this case study, it is likely that the Facebook group provided an adjunct to the other forms of communication, such as flyers, emails, community meetings and talking to people. Facebook may have aided in maintaining community momentum for the cause and re-energised the community after long breaks between events.

5.3.6.2 Gaining and maintaining personal support

With Crawshaw moving to Cannons Creek specifically to pursue community development work, he could have struggled to be accepted by the community and be considered an ‘outsider’. In relation to researchers, the literature highlights that the boundaries between
‘insider’ and ‘outsider’ are murky and whether or not someone is accepted relates more to perceived similarities or differences in power, education, age, ethnicity, gender, religion, values and culture (Kerstetter, 2012; Merriam & Johnson-Bailey, 2001).

Crawshaw’s background provided some advantages. He was well educated, with prior knowledge about community development and the council environment. He also possessed skills in community organising and networking. In addition, by moving into the community he was able to see more clearly the problems brought about by the liquor store (see s. 4.2.1). His status as a professional, middle-aged, pakeha male possibly aided in him generating partnerships with professionals outside of the community. Furthermore, through his employment at Wesley Community Action, which is a local social service provider, he was able to build and strengthen his personal and professional support networks. These assisted him throughout the community action process. However most of the work organising this community action was undertaken in his own personal time [Crawshaw interview].

Although Crawshaw’s social and ethnic background was different to many others in the community, he was accepted because he lived and dressing modestly (Kerstetter, 2012; Merriam & Johnson-Bailey, 2001), created shared decision making processes, and enlisted the support of Māori and Pacific leaders in the community. These included MP Kris Faafoi, the Russell School principal Sose Annandale, and local resident and community boardwoman Paula MacEwan (Bracht, 1991; Inspiring Communities, 2013). Furthermore, Crawshaw held many positions within the community including as a neighbour, father of children at Russell School, Chairman of Russell School BOT, employee at Wesley Community Action, and Cannons Creek Urban Vision community member. These contributed to his status as a credible community member and leader (Gaventa, 2004; Ohio State University, n.d.).

5.3.6.3 A tradition of church community leadership

One notable feature of Crawshaw as a leader is that he is motivated by his strong Christian religious beliefs of social justice and building community (Urban Vision NZ, 2013). This follows a strong legacy of Christian involvement in alcohol policy in New Zealand since the 1880s when Christian groups organised together to form temperance groups, gaining support of local politicians and the media and successfully campaigning for the right to vote on whether areas should be alcohol free (Christoffel, 2013; McLintock, 1966; Shoebridge, 2012;
Similarly, Crawshaw built connections with the local police, MOH, media and members of other alcohol organisations [Crawshaw interview]. Crawshaw’s religious connections also provided valuable support for both the action and Crawshaw himself throughout the process. Furthermore, the connections previous Russell School BOT chairwomen had with the local Pacific church communities were crucial in bringing together all the performers for the community event at short notice [Crawshaw interview]. This is consistent with previous research highlighting the power of religion in mobilising low income and minority citizens (Uslaner, 2013). Crawshaw’s religious affiliations were not present in media reporting, but emerge in the interview data. It is unclear to what extent his church membership was widely known in the neighbourhood or in the wider Porirua community.

5.3.6.4 What type of people lead community action for health?

When assisting communities to take action against alcohol, it helps to identify community leaders (Laverack, 2006). A sample of recent media coverage of New Zealand instances of community opposition to liquor stores, found those fronting the community action to the media included: representatives from groups such as community boards (Edwards, 2013; Lynch & Edwards, 2013), neighbourhood support groups (Fairfax NZ News, 2013), business associations (Lee, 2013; Ong, 2013) as well as local counsellors (Davidson, 2013; Neal, 2014) and a registered nurse (Price, 2014; A. Stewart, 2014). In some instances it was not possible to tell who the leader was (Dawson, 2013; Galuszka, 2012; O’Callaghan, 2014; Sharpe, 2013).

In the above instances, those fronting the media were either from community groups, had business interests or were local politicians. In the case of the politicians, it is possible that members of their constituency approached them to front and support the issue to give it legitimacy, and that they are not the organiser of the action (Ohio State University, n.d.).

The evidence from this case study fits with research which found community leaders to be community minded, involved in the community, optimistic, feel like they can affect change in their neighbourhood, and often concerned about social justice (Boehm & Staples, 2005; Greenberg, 2000). However in this case the situation appears different from one study which found that leaders did not differ in demographic status or education to those who ascribed them as a leader (Greenberg, 2000). Other research found that leaders often get involved in
things directly affecting their quality of life, and most learnt leadership skills on the job (Boehm & Staples, 2005). In this case study, Crawshaw was more educated than many others in his community, however the bottle store did affect his quality of life and he felt that he mostly learnt leadership skills as the process progressed [Crawshaw interview].

5.3.7 Support from professionals

When something works, when that magnificent alchemy of insider/outsider interchange electrifies and magnifies the potential for good, it is then the transformative capacity of communities, empowering themselves, becomes manifest. This is not a linear process. Rather it is life experience shared, permeated with the capacity to surprise. We are at our best when we are in service of those with whom we share joy [Pat Snedden] (Inspiring Communities, 2013)

In this case study, many individuals and organisations from outside the neighbourhood spent a significant amount of time and resources assisting the community throughout the liquor licensing process (see s. 4.4.4). Their support was crucial for successful action (Painter et al., 2011). This is consistent with a body of literature which suggests that community coalitions or partnerships between professionals and community members are a key to successful activism or community action (Barnett & Barnett, 2003; Casswell, 2001; Chavis, 1995; Conway et al., 2007; Golub, Charlop, Groisman-Perelstein, Ruddock, & Calman, 2011).

5.3.7.1 Leveraging and bolstering community capitals

The Community Capitals framework (CCF) describes the community development process. Community development research suggests that successful leaders utilise multiple capitals or community assets, which leverage each other to help create community change (Pigg et al., 2013)(see s. 2.4.10 for a description of the CFF). In this study, support from professionals helped to leverage existing community capital which the community could utilise. For example, assistance provided to Crawshaw by multiple professionals helped bolster his human capital and understanding of the liquor licensing process. The support also helped to generate strategies for action, including not worrying about petitions, and getting as many people as possible to object and turn up to court on the day. Similarly, the assistance from these professionals at the community meetings helped to educate the wider community. The involvement of PADC facilitated conversations with other professionals. One conversation
lead to another, helping to generate further human capital and bridging social capital, or links between organisations and communities (see s. 4.2.4) (Flora & Flora, 2008).

The financial support from NZDF, RPH, Sherriff and others who provided services for free or reduced cost, increased the accessible financial capital of the community. This enabled the community celebrations to go ahead. These celebrations helped focus on the community’s assets and further leveraged human capital by facilitating participation of a broader range of people. The community events also contributed to building bonding social capital, or closer community ties, and growing cultural capital by bringing people of different ages and ethnicities together to collaborate on a single issue (Flora & Flora, 2008).

Prior research suggests that political capital (the ability to influence regulatory change through access to power and power brokers such as officials) is one of the keys to sustainable communities (Flora & Flora, 2008). In this case study, the political capital of the community was increased by having the support of the MOH and Police, and in the final hearing through legal representation by Sherriff. Indeed, prior to receiving legal representation by Sherriff, the community felt disempowered by the liquor licensing process and that their voices weren’t heard (see s. 4.4.2.4 and 4.5.3).

5.3.7.2 Shifting the balance of power

The literature highlights concerns regarding outside help for community action, predicting a possible lack of acceptance and less ownership of the community issues (DiClemente, Ralph et al., 2009). However, looking at representation by Sherriff, the community was really grateful for his assistance, and, due to his inclusive approach, they still felt part of the decision making process. Sherriff’s help resulted in far less work for Crawshaw and a feeling of community confidence and power at the final hearing (see s. 4.4.2.4).

One possible reason why the outside help was so gratefully accepted was that it came at a time when the community had already clearly defined their priorities, and were personally invested in the issue. The community was happy to accept help in actualising these priorities, particularly following their experiences in the previous hearings. Evidence from other studies suggests that a main failure of outside help is when it imposes outside concerns or interests on a community, and as such the help is not as readily accepted (Treno & Holder, 1997).
The legal representation provided by Sherriff allowed the community to participate in the legal process on a more even footing. Sherriff was able to access information required to put the case together, utilise his extensive knowledge of case law, and exercise his power to speak and cross examine. This allowed him to voice the concerns of the community, presenting and arguing a convincing case (see s. 4.4.2.4). Interviewees generally agreed that a lawyer was required for their community to participate meaningfully in this process [Crawshaw interview; PADC interview; RS principal interview]. Thus paradoxically, outside support was required in this process to facilitate community empowerment.

5.3.7.3 Uniting inside and outside of the community for a common cause

Support from the MOH and Police, both before the hearings and in the hearing data that they presented, helped to legitimise and validate the community’s concerns, contextualising and framing them in a way that would be credible and relevant to the judge. Thus, there was a unified message from outside sources and the community (see s. 4.4.4). This is consistent with previous research suggesting that the involvement of officials can help to create legitimacy (Laverack & Whipple, 2010), credibility (Pilisuk et al., 2010) and helps to get things on the political agenda (B. Maclennan et al., 2013). As predicted by earlier studies, working together for a common cause helped to create unity and a shared identity within the community (see s. 4.4.4) (Chavis, 1995; Conway, 2002; Laverack & Whipple, 2010).

Building on the community coalition ideas further, the collaboration that occurred between the community and other agencies and individuals came about due to shared goals (Clark, 2007; New Zealand Police, n.d.). The Police chose to be actively involved due to alcohol being one of the major drivers of crime. Public health organisations shared the community’s focus on alcohol harm minimisation. The MOH noted that he was happy to get involved as the Cannons Creek community was a priority, due to their high level of deprivation. However, the agencies noted that they did not have the resources to help every community [MOH interview; Police interview]. Similarly the RS principal noted she got involved as she was asked by the community, and knew she could make the most difference by going where the energy was [RS principal interview](see s. 4.4.4). The difficulty in collaborating when parties have different goals was also noted by PADC [PADC interview]. This may partly also explain why the DLA and council were not able to provide much support, as they saw themselves as a neutral party, with processing applications as their priority.
5.4 Community action can be valuable for health

Alcohol is the issue that communities are really quite concerned about, ... to be motivated to [take action], which helps them in their cohesiveness. It very much dovetails into quite a few strategies in the Ottawa Charter .... . You’re enhancing personal skills, you’re creating more supportive environments, you’re influencing healthy public policy, you’re even bringing in the local health services, reorienting them ... Those communities will be better able to address some of the [other] health challenges that they’ve also got... The enthusiasm of the [Cannons Creek East] community was one of the positive things that really boded well for the future. So, the alcohol topic is like a catalyst to help nudge along the development of a whole different community that’s empowered to influence its own destiny. You’ve even got some people from that local community that are putting themselves forward for candidates for council and that. All of those things are subtle but they are actually incredibly important as well [MOH interview]

Section 5.4 below discusses the role of community action in progressing community health and explores the notion of ‘community’. It begins by examining the potential for reduced alcohol-related harm and improvements in community safety following reduced liquor store trading hours (s. 5.4.1). The benefits of the community action process for community empowerment are then explored (s. 5.4.2). This section ends with a discussion to the extent that local community action can benefit other communities through defining values, and influencing institutional structures and processes, as well as generating case law and learnings (s. 5.4.3).

5.4.1 Reducing alcohol-related harm

With no hours of trading in that bottle store there is no evidence publically visible of alcohol abuse in the neighbourhood [Jonathon Blackshaw, Cannons Creek resident] (Blackshaw, 2013, p. 7)

In this case study, both a reduction in liquor store trading hours and the off-licence refusal were associated with less visible and quantifiable alcohol-related harm and nuisance in the surrounding neighbourhood (see s. 4.6.1).

The observation of reduced alcohol harm with reduced liquor store hours is backed up by research evidence from previous studies. Although findings are not consistent, overall
evidence suggests increasing trading hours is associated with increased harm (Babor et al., 2010). Likewise, reducing trading hours by two hours or more is associated with lower levels of alcohol consumed and decreased violence, ED attendances, and drink driving among other harms (Babor et al., 2010; Popova et al., 2009). In this case study, the late trading hours attracted patrons from outside the local area. Community evidence suggests that these people often displayed antisocial behaviour (New Zealand Liquor Licensing Authority, 2012). Thus the reduced trading hours could have decreased violence and police events by fewer violence prone people being attracted to the area or there simply being less people around the area to be victims or perpetrators of violence and antisocial behaviour (Babor et al., 2010; J Connor et al., 2011; Law Commission, 2010; Livingston, 2011; Popova et al., 2009).

The association of reduced harm with reduced liquor store hours is also consistent with a large body of evidence linking increased regulation of alcohol with reduced alcohol-related harm (Babor et al., 2010). The strongest evidence comes from regulations that affect the availability and affordability of alcohol (Anderson et al., 2009; Babor et al., 2010). Previous New Zealand research suggests residents in highly deprived areas experience higher levels of harm from alcohol (Casswell & Thamarangsi, 2009; Jennie Connor et al., 2005; Jatrana et al., 2011; Law Commission, 2010; Wilson et al., 2011). They also have a shorter distances to travel to purchase alcohol at an off-licence (Cameron et al., 2012a; Hay et al., 2009; Health Promotion Agency, 2012b; Pearce et al., 2008). Adding to these concerns is the observation that alcohol typically increases problems that people are trying to escape from (Law Commission, 2010). The evidence above gives weight to the assertion that alcohol outlet placement contributes to inequalities in health (Cameron et al., 2012a; Health Promotion Agency, 2012b; Huckle et al., 2008).

However, this evidence needs to be considered in the context of further factors. The association between the clustering of off-licences and violence is unclear, with research showing variations between urban and rural areas. For example, in central Wellington city, the addition of an extra off-licence resulted in decreased reported violent offences whereas the addition of an off-licence outlet in other areas such as Porirua resulted in an increase in reported violent offences (Cameron et al., 2013). In this case study, the limited data available supports reduced police events of all kinds in the area surrounding the liquor store following its closure (see s. 4.2.13).
Prior to the Fantame Liquor Store closure, Wellington Hospital ED data indicates that residents from the census area surrounding the Fantame Liquor Store location had higher than expected rates of ED visits relating to alcohol (see s.4.2.9). Many of the attendances were violence-related (Foley, 2012). Thus, the late trading hours of the liquor store and its reputation for cheap prices could have been contributing to these high alcohol ED attendance rates (New Zealand Liquor Licensing Authority, 2012). However, these rates remained largely unchanged following the reduced Fantame Liquor Store hours (Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority, 2013b).

Many factors are relevant to these findings. Firstly, the number of attendances is small, so comparisons within and between census areas are difficult. Wellington hospital is not the closest hospital to the area; as such injuries sustained in Porirua would likely be treated at Kenepuru after hours facility (Foley, 2012). Porirua people receiving attention at Wellington ED would likely be drinking in Wellington city and have possibly purchased alcohol from other premises. At the 2013 hearing there was no ED data available for the period when the store closed. In addition, as many Fantame Liquor Store patrons were from outside of the area (New Zealand Liquor Licensing Authority, 2012), the impact of reduced hours and store closure on their health is difficult to ascertain.

5.4.1.1 Reduced liquor store hours = reduced alcohol harm

The balance of evidence suggests that alcohol-related harm to the residents of the area surrounding Fantame Street, and Russell School children decreased following a decrease in liquor licencing hours (Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority, 2013b). There may also have been a beneficial impact to people outside of the area from the shorter hours. This has important implications for the health of the local and wider community, and the store closure may also go some way towards reducing inequalities of health.

There was a strong consensus from interviewees, backed up by the licensing authority rulings, that community input was a significant factor influencing the judges’ decisions regarding the liquor licence decisions for Fantame Street in 2012 and 2013 (Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority, 2013b; New Zealand Liquor Licensing Authority, 2012). Thus, in this case study, community action was successful in contributing to improvements in community health and safety through reduced alcohol-related harm in the area.
5.4.2 Strengthening community

5.4.2.1 ‘Community’ is everyone who came together for the issue

In addition to reduced alcohol-related harm, the sense of community was also strengthened through taking part in the process (see s. 4.6.2). One commonly viewed definition of community in the literature encompasses a diverse group of people coming together for action on shared values (Jewkes & Murcott, 1996; MacQueen et al., 2001; Mannarini & Fedi, 2009). Thus, I would argue that the shared identity built between everyone involved in supporting the goal of reducing alcohol harm in the Fantame Street area can be thought of as ‘a community’, with most of the interviewees agreeing that this is the case (see s. 4.3). As a result, the boundaries between insiders and outsiders became at least temporarily blurry and arguably less important [Crawshaw interview] an idea also present in the literature (Painter et al., 2011).

There were mutual benefits to everyone involved in the collaboration, through the process and outcomes advancing their goals, consistent with the literature on community coalitions (Chavis, 1995). The literature also predicts successful coalitions require significant time and effort to share resources, build relationships, capacities (Chavis, 1995), and bridging social capital (Flora & Flora, 2008) which was certainly true in this case (see s. 5.3.7). Despite the efforts required, the process of the relationship building and participation were viewed as worthwhile, for growing community spirit, community empowerment, and building community capacity (see s. 4.6.2).

5.4.2.2 Communities within communities

However, ‘community’ is a complex phenomenon, consisting of multiple inter-linkages and memberships (Painter et al., 2011). In this case study, there were also smaller sub communities, or groups of people with shared ties (MacQueen et al., 2001) within the broader ‘community,’ that contributed to and were strengthened by the process. This includes the residential community, the Russell School community, as well as the various church communities including the Salvation Army, Urban Vision and Pacific church communities. These sub communities were not a direct focus of the study and their impact is difficult to quantify, due to much of the community behaviour occurring in the private realm (Painter et al., 2011).
5.4.2.3 Doing things together builds community

A stronger, more cohesive community was widely expressed by interviewees as the most valued outcome from this process (see s. 4.6.2). It is hypothesized that doing things together builds trust, shared understandings, social capital and networks which facilitate future action (Bach et al., 2010; Innes & Booher, 2004). McMillan proposes that the foundations for a strong sense of community include: sharing stories, truth telling, building trust, clear boundaries about what groups are for (or against), awareness that mutual benefits come from being together and shared experiences (McMillan, 1996). Similarly, Liz Weaver from the Tamarack Institute for Community Engagement was quoted by Crawshaw as highlighting shared stories, working and having fun together, as well as learning to care for each other, as important for neighbourhood development [Crawshaw interview].

In this case study, all of the above factors were present at various times, helping to build a strong sense of community. Opportunities to come together, have fun, share stories and experiences were facilitated by the community meetings, community events, walks of support, door-knocking, and through writing objections and participating in the court process. The Russell School principal noted that their unity on the issue overcame their diversity [RS principal interview]. Others noted firm friendships were made throughout the process [Crawshaw interview; MacEwan interview].

The belief of the interviewees about increased cohesion is supported by literature which predicts that trust in people different to ourselves leads to a more cooperative society (Bach et al., 2010; Uslaner, 2013). Previous research has found that the process of doing things together was important in building the social trust that leads to action on other issues (Bach et al., 2010). It is hypothesised that the process of building social ties can help move a community from being socially disorganised to more socially organised. As a result, people are more likely to intervene in problem behaviours and the behaviours are also less likely to occur, due to the perceived likelihood of intervention (Cunradi, 2010).

5.4.2.4 Communities as individuals and institutions

The advantages of community activity are consistent with ideas in the empowerment literature, where social capital is correlated with empowerment, or the ability to mobilise resources, affect change and feel a sense of control over the environment (Painter et al., 2011). Empowerment can be thought of as both a process and outcome of social capital
production through building relationships, trust and shared understandings, as happened in this case study (Innes & Booher, 2004; Painter et al., 2011). The idea that participation automatically leads to a sense of being able to affect change has been criticised for failing to take into account inequalities in access to power, information, and resources (Gaventa, 2005; Innes & Booher, 2004; Painter et al., 2011). Certainly in this case study, the community did not feel empowered in the liquor licensing process until they had a lawyer that was able to help mediate the differences in power and resources (see s. 4.4.2.4). This enabled them to have their voices heard, which they found empowering, regardless of the judge’s decision (see s. 4.6.2).

Community capacity is therefore determined by more than attributes such as human capital or leadership, and encompasses broader social, political, and institutional structures (DiClemente, Ralph et al., 2009). In this study, the broader political climate, and institutional opportunities for participation aided community involvement (see s. 5.3). Furthermore, the involvement of professionals was essential to help strengthen human, financial and social capital aiding participation in the licencing process (see s. 5.3.7).

5.4.2.5 Multiple pathways to health

Population health theory recognises that health is influenced by many factors in the environment. Health promotion theory predicts that participation in the liquor licensing process by this community will contribute to fostering their health via incorporating at least some of the health promoting strategies in the Ottawa Charter. These strategies include creating supportive environments and public policies, reorienting health services, strengthening community action and building personal skills (World Health Organization, 1986). The positive outcome of reduced liquor store hours, and then closure, in this case, would have contributed to the health outcomes through the creation of a better environment for the local community, with the case law changes also augmenting stronger public policy for other communities.

5.4.3 Paving the way for others

The [alcohol licence] applicant has not established its suitability to the satisfaction of the Authority. The Authority acknowledges that the threshold is very high; indeed, it might be impossible for any applicant to establish it’s suitability given the vulnerable location of the premises... Even very restricted hours are unlikely to reduce liquor
abuse to an acceptable level. Accordingly, the Authority concludes that it is not possible to impose conditions which would enable it to grant this application (Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority, 2013b)

Community involvement in the liquor licensing of the Fantame Street liquor store helped liquor licensing professionals to become more responsive to their concerns (see s. 4.5.3.2). Their involvement may also benefit other communities through helping to define values around alcohol (Alcohol Advisory Council of New Zealand, n.d.-a; Tenbensel, 2010), influencing power structures and roles of the actors in the liquor licensing process (Gaventa, 2005), and generating case law or licensing precedents which will be particularly valuable to other deprived communities (see s. 4.6.3).

5.4.3.1 Unearthing the problems with alcohol

The involvement of this community and others in the liquor law reform process, plus the media coverage generated, helped increase the visibility of the liquor store placement issue, helped get it on the political agenda, and highlighted community values towards the issue (Gaventa, 2005; Tenbensel, 2010). The literature suggests that community participation in policy making sometime helps elites become more responsive to citizen concerns (Uslaner, 2013). This suggests that community involvement across New Zealand may have contributed to recent changes in the law that gave communities greater input into licensing (Ministry of Justice, 2013). These changes were one of only a few of the Law Commission’s recommendations that were passed into law in 2012 (Kypri, Maclennan, Langley, & Connor, 2011).

The media reporting of the Fantame Liquor Store case also would have helped to frame the issue as being a social issue, rather than one of individual responsibility (Liz Stewart & Casswell, 1993; Whitman, 2013). This could possibly contribute to culture change around alcohol (Alcohol Advisory Council of New Zealand, n.d.-a). The strong media coverage of the process and outcome could have helped assist other communities to voice their concerns around liquor licences by increasing awareness and knowledge of the process. The positive outcome from the local process highlighted that change is possible (Uslaner, 2013). However, it is uncertain if there has been an increase in community participation, and whether that could be attributed to the Fantame Liquor Store case. If community participation had increased, it
would likely be due to a combination of factors including law changes which better facilitate participation (Ministry of Justice, 2013).

5.4.3.2 Reshaping the structures

The Fantame Liquor Store community action also assisted others to participate more meaningfully in the process, through utilisation of their learnings, changes in institutional processes, and development of case law (see s. 4.6.3). Since embarking on this journey, Crawshaw has been contacted by other community groups for advice on the process. This includes the Newtown community in Wellington, who generated so much community opposition to a licence that the applicant withdrew their application (M. Stewart, 2012). It is also likely that other local Wellington communities would have benefited from the learnings through contact with RPH and PADC, utilising the learnings from the process and the templates provided by the MOH and lawyer Alastair Sherriff. On a national scale, other communities could have benefited from advice from NZDF who published an article on the community efforts to oppose the Fantame Liquor Store (New Zealand Drug Foundation, 2013).

The strong community presence in the liquor licencing process also helped local liquor licensing officials to become more responsive to and accommodating of community concerns (see s. 4.6.3). The Police, MOH, and in the 2013 hearing, the licensing inspector, all produced detailed reports, utilizing previously untapped datasets. The reports supported the community concerns, providing evidence of alcohol-related harm in their neighbourhood in a format that would be considered legally acceptable. This level of reporting is now standard in the Porirua area, and from the Police standpoint is to be rolled out nationwide [Police interview]. This process also helped to define the role of the MOH in off-licence reporting [MOH interview], which has only become mandatory under the new alcohol legislation (New Zealand Parliament, 2013a). These outcomes will support other communities objecting to liquor licences.

5.4.3.3 Sharpening the tools

The discovery of the liquor store and food-market running as a single entity led to tighter enforcement of this part of the legislation by liquor licensing officials in the Wellington region and possibly further afield [Inspector interview; RPH interview]. In addition, Crawshaw’s persistence regarding enforcement of the store closure due to this breach may
ensure that the relevant officials know the process in this circumstance (see s. 4.2.8.3). The national licensing authority may also be more apt at dealing with community participation following conversations with Crawshaw (see s. 4.2.7), and the judge more partial to community involvement [MOH interview]. Thus better structures and processes for participation, alongside enhanced functioning of liquor licensing officials, may benefit other communities in the future. This is consistent with the literature suggesting that community participation can help shape new institutional designs for participation (Gaventa, 2005).

The case law deriving from the 2013 hearing may benefit future communities by broadening the consideration of applicant suitability, and ensuring that community vulnerability is taken into consideration (Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority, 2013b) (see s. 4.6.3). These rulings could be particularly beneficial for other vulnerable communities and have the potential to reduce alcohol harm in other communities (see s. 4.6.1). However, some potential areas of policy flow-on have not occurred. The drastically reduced hours in the 2012 Fantame Liquor Store decision could have set a precedent for off-licensing in the Porirua region. This did not occur, with little change to the hours of other liquor stores in the region following that decision [MOH interview].

The community’s experiences of opposing liquor licences for Fantame Liquor Store appear to have assisted a neighbouring community to successfully oppose an on-licence application for the Mix bar (Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority, 2013a). In this instance, several of the same officials were involved. The community utilised many of the same strategies including holding community meetings, utilising Sherriff’s templates, in addition to securing media coverage and funds for a lawyer (see s. 4.2.12.2). In addition, the case law generated by the Fantame Liquor Store decision regarding vulnerability and applicant suitability was referenced in the licensing authority decision (Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority, 2013a, 2013b).

5.4.4 Conclusions: the benefits of community action for health

This case study adds to the literature that indicates that communities can in some instances collaborate to influence their community’s health. Getting involved in the liquor licensing process can foster community spirit and collaborative ties leaving communities better able to tackle other health problems. Decisions that curb or prevent liquor stores from opening in neighbourhoods can also have an impact on alcohol-related harm and community safety.
These decisions can also help benefit other communities through making the licensing process more accessible for positive community experiences and outcomes (see s. 4.6). Supportive environments can assist in community participation. However, community workers and policymakers act in light of the warning that only some instances of community action will generate these benefits.

5.5 Policy implications and recommendations

This work highlights the role that communities can play in leading action to improve their health, through minimising alcohol-related harm and building community capacity (see s. 5.4 above). Some of the supports and barriers to action have been discussed above (s. 5.2-5.3). Section 5.5 suggests some of the ways that communities can be supported to overcome these barriers and best utilise their strengths.

The discussion begins with the role of central government in providing a supportive environment for action (s. 5.5.1). This is followed by the role of local government (s. 5.5.2). These two sections are largely about making the doorways to the policy process wider and easier to walk through. They move beyond the literature covered in s. 2.4.8.3, to discuss what can happen in New Zealand to help local communities to deal with alcohol issues. Many of the recommendations below should be considered by territorial authorities when formulating or revising their LAPs.

Finally, the ways in which public health agencies and other interested local parties can support communities is discussed (s. 5.5.3). This section is more about actively helping local communities to walk through the policy doorways. The general directions for policy are indicated, with some examples suggested by this case study. However, a detailed examination of policy options and practical steps is beyond the scope of this thesis.

5.5.1 Role of central government in minimising alcohol-related harm

5.5.1.1 Include health in all policies

International best practise suggests that governments can be most effective by considering the health impact of all policies (World Health Organization, 2013). The means to do this include requiring health impact assessments for alcohol licence applications (Public Health Advisory Committee, 2005). When considering policies to mitigate alcohol-related harm, a global
approach is required (Casswell & Thamarangsi, 2009), as globalization has resulted in threats to health coming from large international corporates (Babor et al., 2010). Thus governments need to work collectively to counter harm, as many cost effective interventions exist but are not implemented by politicians (Kypri et al., 2011). An example of international action that could support local communities would be an international treaty on alcohol, similar to the Framework Convention on Tobacco Control, which would limit alcohol marketing and availability (Casswell & Thamarangsi, 2009).

5.5.1.2 Implement policies that reduce inequalities of health

This case study occurred in a very deprived community and indicated some of the difficulties they had with liquor licensing because of their deprivation. A multitude of evidence supports a focus on general and targeted alcohol policies that direct attention to reducing inequalities of health (Commission on the Social Determinants of Health, 2008). This is particularly relevant in the New Zealand context considering obligations under the Treaty of Waitangi (Morgaine & Moore, 2007). Alcohol is a driver of inequalities (Thamarangsi, 2009) thus more resources must be focussed on supporting disadvantaged populations and communities to achieve equality in health outcomes. This research has noted the potential health benefits from fostering participation and a more collaborative society (see s. 5.4). Deprived communities may lack the resources to participate, providing further impetus to target assistance to deprived populations (Gaventa, 2005; Kollmuss & Agyeman, 2002; Uslaner, 2013). Policies must also support the priorities of deprived communities so that they do not become over burdened by having to become involved in every issue (Painter et al., 2011). Examples could include a requirement for relevant government agencies to gather information for communities when there is any alcohol licence application in a high deprivation area.

5.5.1.3 Foster a meaningful participatory culture

In this case study, the local community had difficulties meaningfully participating in the liquor licensing process. Meaningful participation must not be tokenistic and instead should allow for real opportunities for shifts in power, with the appropriate structures in place to support this (Gaventa, 2005; Inspiring Communities, 2013; King, Feltey, & Susel, 1998; Painter et al., 2011). Governments play a key role in facilitating this to occur across all levels of government (Gaventa, 2005). Communities can be supported by structures in place to facilitate partnerships and strategic alliances between central and local government (Inspiring
Communities, 2013; B. A. Maclellan, 2010; B. Maclellan et al., 2011). Positive outcomes for health and community safety emanate from nurturing collaborative societies, separate to the outcomes of the collaborations. Thus greater political priority should be given to fostering relationship building at all levels between social, ethnic and sector groups, and government staff, noting that this is a long term strategy. For instance, local Police participation in groups such as PADC should be considered as important as ‘front line’ work. In this case PADC was essential for the community front line response against alcohol violence, leading to fewer police call outs.

5.5.1.4 Support policies that reduce alcohol affordability and availability

The alcohol issues for Cannons Creek East occurred in the context of easily affordable alcohol, available at most hours in the heart of a very poor residential district. The most effective policies specifically aimed at minimising alcohol-related harm are those that reduce the affordability and availability of alcohol (Babor et al., 2010; Law Commission, 2010). (See s. 2.3.2 - 2.3.7 for further discussion on effective policy options to reduce alcohol harm). A combination of well enforced policies dictated by central government has the greatest effectiveness for reducing alcohol-related harm (Anderson et al., 2009; Babor et al., 2010; Law Commission, 2010).

One potential policy option to assist communities minimise local availability of alcohol would be to regulate the density of alcohol outlets. However, international and national research into density and harms is inconsistent. The relationships between alcohol and measures of harm with additions of on or off-licences varies in urban and rural areas (Cameron et al., 2012d, 2013). Thus policies should continue to allow for community input into determining the local availability of alcohol. A further option suggested by this case is requiring a higher level of argument for liquor licences in residential areas, compared to those in commercial areas.

5.5.1.5 Improve community access to the liquor licensing process

The current New Zealand legislation facilitating community involvement in the liquor licensing process is one avenue for community voice in determining the local availability of alcohol, and placement of licensed premises. However, this study highlights the difficulties communities can face participating meaningfully in this process with differential access to power, information and resources (see s. 5.2.2.3). For community involvement to be most effective, the process needs to more accessible to communities. Governments can facilitate
this, removing obstacles such as complexity, language barriers and ‘red tape’ (Inspiring Communities, 2013). One concern is the difficulty with engaging in the current legal process without a lawyer (see s. 5.2.2.3). Changing the process to be more like a tribunal, or providing legal assistance to communities through community law services or legal aid, are steps the government could take to help reduce barriers to equitable participation in this process.

Interviewees in this study noted that many licensing authority decisions get overturned in the High Court [Crawshaw interview; Police interview]. This may have contributed to some members of the community believing the decision to reject the off-licence application in Fantame Street was not going to be binding [MacEwan interview; RS principal interview]. It was also noted that breaches of the liquor legislation may only result in small fines if processed by the District Courts [Police interview]. Thus legislation needs to be clear and robust so it is easily applied and well enforced with appropriate punishments (Anderson et al., 2009).

5.5.2 Role of local government in reducing alcohol-related harm

5.5.2.1 Ensure community voices are heard

Local governments also play a key role in setting policies that minimise alcohol-related harm, foster collaborative societies, support community action and involve communities in local decision making (Gaventa, 2004). New Zealand research shows variation between constituencies in terms of the number of polices employed to reduce alcohol harm and in the degree to which local government policies to reduce alcohol-related harm have public support (B. A. Maclennan, 2010). Thus an inclusive participatory process could be one way to help policy makers be in touch with citizens’ concerns (B. Maclennan et al., 2011). An example could be a requirement for the relevant ward councillor to consult localities affected by proposed liquor licences. Where councils do not have wards, they would need to appoint a councillor for this. The need for easier participation is a theme that came across as being important in the interviews [RS principal interview; PADC interview]. Communities may be stronger if they feel that their voices are being heard (Painter et al., 2011).
5.5.2.2 Take a proactive approach to supporting communities through the licensing process

Local councils have a key role in setting and enforcing local liquor legislation and are the point of contact for community members with concerns regarding alcohol availability in their community (see s. 1.2.4). In this case study, citizens found it difficult to access the information and support they required from the local council, partly due to council fears of appearing impartial (see s. 4.5.3.2). This is a major barrier to be addressed.

A more proactive approach from local councils could support communities through better provision of information regarding the liquor licensing process along with ways to access further assistance. Another approach is to reduce the burden on local communities, for instance, by ensuring the more effective working of the local liquor licensing agency (New Zealand Liquor Licensing Authority, 2012). Rigorous enforcement of liquor policies could reduce alcohol harm in communities and lessen the need for citizens to become involved (Anderson et al., 2009; Anderson, 2009; Sim, Morgan, & Batchelor, 2005). The community in this study had concerns about the proximity of the liquor store to ‘sensitive amenities’ such as Russell School and local churches. Thus consideration of ‘sensitive amenities’ should be consulted on and built into local policy. Fostering collaboration between the regulatory agencies can also reduce the burden on local communities in alcohol policy processes, and assist in reducing alcohol-related harm (Hill, 2005; Sim et al., 2005).

5.5.3 How can other interested parties support communities to improve their health?

‘Titiro, whakarongo, korero’.(Look, listen, and then speak) [Māori proverb]
(Inspiring Communities, 2013)

Public health organisations, local Police, Non-Government Organisations (NGOs) and other interested parties can assist communities by better framing the health issues that might affect communities, assisting communities to identify their priorities, supporting leaders to build community capacities, and actively assisting local participation in the liquor licensing process.

Organisations can aid in fostering a participatory society thus assisting communities to build connections and grow their capital by committing to working collaboratively and supporting others to do the same. For example, this may include advocating for community events such
as community gardens and neighbours’ days, as well as collecting and disseminating a range of evidence to highlight the value of these approaches (Nutbeam, 1997). Organisations can also help advocate for meaningful participation that will result in opportunities for shifts in power (Gaventa, 2005).

There is also a role for organisations in framing and generating awareness of public health issues, as well as advocating for effective evidence based policy solutions (Anderson et al., 2009). Building relationships with the media and politicians can assist these aims (Babor et al., 2010; B. Maclennan et al., 2013). These approaches can help create a supportive environment in which to initiate action. They may also assist communities to identify their priorities and health problems which may have become obscured from view due to their pervasiveness. Talking with people in the community is a good first step to identify problems.

Start first by just wandering around and talking to the people, everybody matters. Yes the kuia and the kaumātua, but also the children and the tamaraki, young people and rangatahi, and all their whanau. That’s where you need to start. Only then can you know what to talk about with the government agencies and others, and what to pay attention to. Only then can you really begin to understand what the issues are.

[Barbara MacLennan, Inspiring communities team] (Inspiring Communities, 2013) p.47

Identifying and assisting community leaders (Laverack, 2006) is one way to assist communities to work towards their priorities (Bach et al., 2010). There is no set mould or pathway for a community leader, however, leaders tend to be involved in other community activities (Greenberg, 2000) and in various social groups (Morgan, 1990), having connections within the community (Greenberg, 2000). Research suggests that many community leaders get involved in issues affecting their quality of life (Greenberg, 2000). Leaders mostly learn by doing and as such most do not need to have specific training to become a leader (Boehm & Staples, 2005). Many people become involved in community activities through being asked by someone they know (Ohio State University, n.d.). Thus simply having conversations and asking people if they were keen to lead action could help identify leaders.

Community leaders can be supported by asking what they need help with. Assistance can help identify and build on existing leader and community strengths (Bach et al., 2010; Flora & Flora, 2008). One study found leaders requested assistance with enhancing their skills in strategic planning, recruitment, teamwork, conducting meetings, dealing with decision-
makers, public speaking, negotiating, and mediating group conflicts (Boehm & Staples, 2005).

For the liquor licensing process, this case study highlighted that population health officials, Police and others have important roles in supporting the community to navigate this process. This assistance includes education regarding the process, research and statistics that legitimise community concerns as well as provision of legal and financial support. In this case study, the provision of resources and education helped create a unified stance on the issue (see s. 5.3.7).

5.6 Strengths and limitations of the study

5.6.1 Strengths of the study

The overarching aim of this study was to better understand the role of community action in progressing alcohol issues. The case study method was used to explore this question, utilising in-depth interviews and documentary data sources. The main advantage of using a qualitative method to answer this question is the ability to generate a detailed understanding of what happened in a real world context (Simons, 2009; Yin, 2012). A strength of this study was the purposive sampling, or choosing interviewees with in-depth knowledge of the topic (Simons, 2009). This was essential to capture the detail of what happened, and the nature of the different relationships.

Opened ended questions during the interviews permitted people to express their views and provided a better understanding of how the different actors constructed their reality (Yin, 2012). The rich detail allowed for the results to be written in such a way that the readers could vicariously experience the community action process. This rich detail hopefully aided readers in drawing conclusions about what is relevant to them in their own settings (Yin, 2012) as well as useful policy insights (Simons, 2009). In addition to interview data, media reports, Facebook information and a wide range of documents were used to build up a picture of the story. Utilising multiple data sources generated at different points in time facilitated triangulation of the data, and a convergence of stories and information (Simons, 2009; Yin, 2012).
5.6.2 Limitations of the study

This study also had limitations, due to the uniqueness of the case and the qualitative method utilised (Simons, 2009; Yin, 2014). The research only focussed on one case detailing community involvement in the liquor licensing process. This process has some openings for community participation, even if they are difficult to use. Therefore the results and interpretations are most relevant to the liquor licensing processes and other processes where community participation is possible, as opposed to community action where there are fewer or no structures to allow engagement with officials and policymakers.

The study was also limited by the time available. While the interviews generated a large quantity of data to analyse, the data was limited in scope by the number of interviews undertaken, and the time available for each interview. Eight interviews meant that the background, values and experiences of the interviewees might have been narrower than if a larger number of interviews had been obtained. The largely retrospective nature of the case study design, positive outcome of reduced hours in the second hearing, long time period over which the case was conducted and proximity of the third hearing to the interview time would also have impacted on the interviewees opinions and recollection of the events. Thus a series of interviews with the same people over time might have provided more balanced or richer data.

The stakeholders were all chosen for their role in the process and because they held a wealth of information (Boots & Midford, 2007). As most of them had so much invested in the process, they may have given different information from more dispassionate informants. A limitation of the interviewee selection is that it might limit the variety of views to be expressed. There is limited data, for example, about the views and experiences of those in the neighbourhood surrounding Fantame Street who did not participate in the process. The liquor store owners and staff were not interviewed, nor their lawyers or a sample of the shop customer. However, it is arguable that these groups were largely not part of the local community.

As the informants were close to the events, some of the information would be presumed to be known. Therefore, it is likely that there is some data missing which would describe the intricacies of the process in more detail. However, the results timeline was shown to Matt Crawshaw before publication, who validated its completeness and accuracy.
Another major limitation of this case study method is the role of the researcher as the research instrument (Simons, 2009; Yin, 2012). The researcher’s background, values and experiences will have influenced all aspects of the study, from the questions asked to conclusions and interpretations drawn. In this case study, the researcher did her best to acknowledge her personal and professional values throughout the process and reflect on how these impacted the research (Simons, 2009). This was facilitated though regular entries in a reflective research diary and attending meetings of the University of Otago Wellington Public Health department qualitative methods discussion group (see s. 3.3.1). As this study was undertaken through a public health lens, it also is limited in its relevance to other disciplines such as education or public policy.

This particular case was chosen because the community input was viewed as a strong contributing factor to the outcomes (Yin, 2012). The case had many aspects to make it unique. These include the case occurring in a deprived setting, being facilitated by a community leader who moved to the area to do development work, as well as the substantial support provided to the community by public health professionals, Police and the media. It is likely that a combination of many factors contributed to the outcomes in this case. Caution should therefore be applied when asking if these factors individually could predict success in other settings. As with a range of successful alcohol policies, a combination of policy initiatives or changes often lead to successful outcomes, with the contributions of individual factors difficult to ascertain (Babor et al., 2010).

### 5.7 Recommendations for future research

The limitations of this study discussed above provide some initial insights into opportunities for future research. The areas of potential research include longer term investigations, detailed health impact changes, enquiries into unintended consequences and similar case studies.

Further research could be done to more fully investigate the impact of the community action process and outcome on the Cannons Creek and broader Porirua community, utilising more in-depth measurements and a longer term follow up. For example, future studies could investigate the impact on the local community both from ‘alcohol-related harm over time’ and ‘empowerment’ viewpoints. Further studies could check for displacement of alcohol harm to other areas of the community, for example through the use of the crime statistics near other local off-licences over time. Furthermore, research that encompassed the views of other
stakeholders and a broader section of the community including those who did not participate could generate insights into barriers to action and suggestions for ways in which communities could be supported. Further studies that explored this case through a political or education lens would also provide useful learnings.

To investigate the applicability of these case study findings to other settings, further case studies of community action utilising the liquor licensing process should be conducted. This would facilitate cross case comparisons, comparing and contrasting the factors associated with success or otherwise of the action (Simons, 2009). Further research into other New Zealand grassroots action on other health issues would also allow comparisons and fill a gap identified in the literature (Greenaway & Witten, 2006). Literature reviews highlight other research areas requiring attention. These include further delineation of the notions of community and community action, as well as the role of insiders and outsiders in the community action process. There is abundant room for further progress in examining supports to establishing a participatory culture and quantifying the benefits of collaborative participatory approaches to address community issues.

Policy implications arising from this work also suggest many important avenues for future research. These include research that would assist operationalising health in all policies, a policy focus on inequalities, as well as participation in central and local government decision making that facilitates changes in access to power without overburdening people. It would also be important to conduct further studies into the role of community factors in contributing to harm from liquor store locations. Identifying and supporting grassroots leadership is another key area for research. Finally, this study highlighted that there is much work to be done scoping opportunities to make the liquor licensing process more accessible to communities and the ways in which they can be supported. If the process does not change, research into the way in which legal support can be provided is essential.
5.8 Final conclusions

*We are each other's harvest; we are each other's business; we are each other's magnitude and bond* [Gwendolyn Brooks] (Johnson Lewis, 2014)

This case study highlighted that mucking in together was the key to a flourishing garden and successful community action, contributing to benefits over and above those related to the liquor licensing decisions. However, this case should not be seen as providing a blueprint for community action, as the gardening process was messy, difficult and complex. Many factors contributed to the growth of the garden and the community.

In this case study, the presence of a liquor store in a vulnerable residential location had a considerable negative impact on the local community. Cannons Creek East community involvement in the liquor licensing process contributed to the judge’s decisions to firstly reduce the store hours, and subsequently reject the liquor licence application. Decreased liquor store trading hours corresponded with increased community safety and reduced alcohol-related harm. Furthermore, the community found that working together and having their concerns more fully heard increased community cohesion, and they felt a greater sense of community spirit. This was seen as the most valued outcome.

This study aimed to describe community action, what helped and hindered it, and how it could be used to progress alcohol and other public health issues. The metaphor of planting a garden was used as an analogy. This work found community action was facilitated by a gardener or leader with a vision of what was required, and who possessed skills in gathering resources, such as funds and other expertise. Seeds of action were germinated through participation in the liquor law reform process. There was a fertile environment, in the changing tide of liquor licensing decisions and the strong consensus in the community that the weeds (alcohol availability effects) were a problem. This environment was one of the keys to success. Good growing weather (law changes that gave the community more say), as well as tools and resources (e.g. having a central base in Russell School to meet) assisted in the growth of the garden and the community. Experienced gardeners or professionals from multiple agencies also assisted in fertilizing the garden, buying plants, and providing the tools or know how for creating a viable garden, providing valuable assistance in navigating the liquor licence process.
Barriers to action included the difficulties of conceptualizing what the garden or community should look like, with the weeds (alcohol harm) being part of the normal landscape for so long. Finding expert gardeners to assist with planning was also difficult. It was considered dangerous to go out on a limb to create change, when it was uncertain as to whether the garden or community would flourish or not. Without legal assistance, participating in the licensing process or creating the garden was hard work, akin to digging a whole garden with hand trowels. The long germination time made progress difficult to see, and when the hearings did occur again there was a lot of work to be done re-fertilizing the garden and preparing the community. Finally, being unable to read their statements at the first two hearings left community members feeling unheard, as though they were cut off at their roots. The outcome of the hard work by the community resulted in the dense weeds cleared, or the liquor store hours cut. The community’s collective efforts led to a flourishing garden and community spirit.

This case study, despite its limitations, suggests that community action can have a role in reducing alcohol-related harm, improving community spirit and cohesiveness to tackle other health issues, as well as assisting with policy making through highlighting community priorities. Communities can be supported to take action by central and local government policies that facilitate action and participation.
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Appendix A

Research Project:

An evaluation of FANTAME liquor store’s liquor licence renewal process

Information sheet for participants

Thank you for showing an interest in this project. Please read this information sheet carefully before deciding whether or not to participate. If you decide not to participate there will be no disadvantage to you of any kind.

The project aim is to examine FANTAME liquor store’s liquor licence renewal process

In particular we are interested in:

- The role of the community and other agencies in the liquor licence renewal process
- Developing recommendations for others working with communities on alcohol issues

This project is being undertaken as part of requirements for a Masters of Public Health. It has received financial support from Regional Public Health, but as a University of Otago thesis is independent from Regional Public Health.

We are seeking to interview people who:

- Were involved in the FANTAME liquor licence renewal process
- Are interested in providing feedback

We hope to interview approximately 8 people

What is the next step?

- If you agree to take part, a semi-structured interview by Sarah Paterson will be arranged at a time and place that suits you, either over the phone or face to face
- We are interested in finding out your role in FANTAME liquor store’s liquor licence renewal process and your experience of that process
Interviews will take around 1 hour
You will be given a $20 grocery or petrol voucher to thank you for your time

Interview process

The interview will be recorded
The precise nature of the questions which will be asked have not been determined in advance, but will depend on the way in which the interview develops
You have the right to decline to answer any particular question(s) or to request the audio recorder be turned off at any stage, and you may withdraw from the project at any stage, without any disadvantage to yourself of any kind

How we will use the data

These recordings will be transcribed (typed out) and then analysed for key themes
On the consent form you will be given options regarding your anonymity. Should you wish we will preserve your anonymity. However, with your consent, there are some cases where it would be preferable to attribute contributions made to individual participants or organisations. It is absolutely up to you which of these options you prefer
If you wish, you may request copies of the recordings or transcript and have the opportunity to comment on these
You may also request to view and comment on any material quoted to you before it is put forward for publication
If you wish, we would be happy to send you the results of the project
The material collected will be securely stored in such a way that only the project staff mentioned below will be able to gain access to it. Summarised data may also be shared with staff at Regional Public Health
At the end of the project any personal information will be destroyed immediately, but a recording and transcript of the interview will be retained in secure storage for five years, after which it will be destroyed

What if you have any questions?
If you have any questions about our project, either now or in the future, please feel free to contact either:
Dr George Thomson (Supervisor) or Sarah Paterson (Masters Student)
Phone (64) 4 385 5999 ext. 6054
gorge.thomson@otago.ac.nz
Department of Public Health
University of Otago, Wellington

Please note that this project has been reviewed and approved by the Department of Public Health, University of Otago, Wellington.
An evaluation of FANTAME liquor store’s liquor licence renewal process

Consent form for participants

I have read the information sheet concerning this project and understand what it is about. All my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I understand that I am free to request further information at any stage. I know that:

1. My participation in the project is entirely voluntary.
2. I am free to withdraw from the project at any time without any disadvantage.
3. The interview will audio-recorded and I may choose to have the machine stopped at any time.
4. This project involves an open-questioning technique. The general line of questioning relates to your experience of the FANTAME liquor stores liquor licence renewal. The precise nature of the questions which will be asked have not been determined in advance, but will depend on the way in which the interview develops.
5. In the event that the line of questioning develops in such a way that I feel hesitant or uncomfortable I may decline to answer any particular question(s) and/or may withdraw from the project without any disadvantage of any kind.
6. The record of my name, address and contact details will be destroyed at the conclusion of the research, but a recording and transcript of the interview will be retained in secure storage for five years, after which it will be destroyed.
7. The results of the project may be published, but I have the option to choose below whether I and/or my organisation remain anonymous.
8. This project has received financial assistance from Regional Public Health.
9. This project has been reviewed and approved by the Department of Public Health, University of Otago (Wellington).

I would like to have a copy of my audio recording / transcript.................................Yes / No
I am happy for myself and/or my organisation to be named in any publications ...... Yes / No
I would like the opportunity to view/comment on any material attributed to me .... Yes / No
I would like a copy of the results sent to me .................................................................Yes / No
I agree to take part in this project. .......................................................... ..............

(Signature of participant) (Date)
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Fantame Liquor Store licensing process study introduction

If they haven’t given their consent already

Thank you for meeting up with me today, I really appreciate your time. As you know, I’m interested in finding out about your experience of the Fantame Street liquor store licensing process and would be keen to ask you a few questions. This should take about an hour. I would also be keen to record our conversation so I can transcribe it later and focus now on talking to you. If there are any questions you feel uncomfortable answering or if you want me to stop the recorder at any time please let me know. I would also be keen to use quotes in my final report and would like to be able to attribute them to you and (your organisation- name it !), however you have the option of you and or (your organisation, name it here!) remaining anonymous. I have an information sheet and consent form here explaining this information. I will give you a moment now to look it over and for you to select what options you are happy with.

Do you have any questions before we start? Great, thanks for that. Ok I will start the recorder now and we can continue talking as before.

How about we begin by you telling me a little bit about your job? How long have you been doing it for? OR

How about we begin by you telling me how you became involved in this licensing process?

If they have given their consent

Thank you for meeting up with me today, I really appreciate your time. As you know, I’m interested in hearing about your experience of the Fantame Street liquor store licensing process and would be keen to ask you a few questions which should take around an hour. I would also like to record the interview so will start the recorder in a minute. Do you have any questions before we start?

Excellent. How about we begin by you telling me how you became involved in this licensing process? OR

How about we begin by you telling me a little bit about your job? How long have you been doing it for?
Appendix C

FANTAME Project. Interview Schedule: Community members

Intro: I am looking into the “FANTAME liquor store story” and am interested in your experience of the FANTAME store liquor license renewal process leading up to the first hearing in November 2011 through to the second hearing in May 2012

1. Role
   How did you get involved?
   e.g.
   • What was your motivation for getting involved?
   • How did you hear about the liquor license renewal?
   • What was your role in process (paid/unpaid)? (professionals ask how long been in the job etc)

2. Overall process experience
   What was your experience of the process?
   (probe why)
   e.g.
   • What was good?
   • What could be improved?
   Who do you think the community is in relation to the Fantame Street liquor store?
   • What constitutes a community?
   • Whose voice is it?

3. Engagement with organisations
   What people or organisations did you work with?
   (specifically probe about engagement with RPH)
   e.g.
   • What did they do? (what was their role)
   • What/who supported/influenced you in the process?
   • How did you hear about the process, how clear was what it entailed?
   • How well did they [the organisations] work together?
   • What things were helpful/not helpful?
   • What would you have liked to be different?
   • What things would you have liked more/less assistance with?
   • What would you change in the future?

4. Outcome
   How did you feel about the outcome of the change in hours? (as separate from the process)
   • Has that changed over time?
   • What is your overall feeling about the experience?
   • Would you engage in this process again?
   • Do you have any suggestions of other processes that could be put in place that would make it easier to help to solve alcohol problems in this community?

5. Further comments
   Do you have any further comments about the FANTAME store licence process, about alcohol licensing in general, or about local or central government actions and policies on alcohol?
FANTAME Project. Interview Schedule: Employees

1. The liquor licensing process
   a) What is your role and how does it relate to the liquor licensing process or alcohol harm reduction?
      • How does the process work?
      • How clear is this process?
      • What was your role in process, how long have you been doing it?
      • Has your role changed over time?
      • What do you think your role in the process should be?
      • How will the new legislation affect your role?
   b) Other agencies role/collaboration
      • What is the role of other parties or agencies?
      • Is there any collaboration between different agencies?
      • How well does the process work- what is good, what can be improved?
   c) Community role
      • What is the role of the community? What constitutes a community? Whose voice is it?
      • What makes a successful community objection?
      • Any comments about how it could be easier for communities to participate in alcohol policy?
      • Do you have any thoughts about how will the new legislation affect communities?

2. Fantame Street in context
   I would now like to turn specifically to the Fantame Street liquor license renewal process and am thinking in particular about the time leading up to the first hearing in November 2011 up to the second hearing in May 2012
   • How did you hear about the liquor license renewal?
   • What was your motivation for getting involved?
   • What was your role specifically in the Fantame St renewal?
   • I understand the Fantame Street liquor store been around since 1999, do you know any of the history of the store?
   • How do the Fantame street community objections fit in with other objections in Porirua and Cannons Creek?
   • What is your feeling about the experience of the process of this stores license renewal?
   • How did you feel about the outcome of the change in hours?
   • Has that changed over time?
   • In general what do you think influences the outcome of the alcohol hearings? Has this changed over time?
   • Was there anything that you learnt from the first hearings that changed your practise for subsequent hearings?
   • Do you have any suggestions of other processes that could be put in place that would make it easier to help to solve alcohol problems in this community?

3. Further comments
   Do you have any further comments about the Fantame Street store licence process, about alcohol licensing in general, or about local or central government actions and policies on alcohol?
18 February 2011

Alcohol Reform Bill

Submission of Russell School Board of Trustees

This submission is made by the board of trustees of Russell School in Cannons Creek, Porirua. As a decile 1a primary school that is situated directly across the road (a mere 50 paces from the front gate) from a fully licensed bottle store the issue of Alcohol in our community and the matters addressed in the Alcohol Reform Bill are of significant interest and concern to us.

It is our submission that there is something critically wrong with a system that enables a license to be obtained for a bottle store situated directly across the road from a primary school. We believe it is an absolute injustice to our children to grow up with this liquor store across the road from their school and in the centre of their community.
The Impact of Alcohol and a bottle store on our school.

The impact of this bottle store on our school, our staff, and the children we work with is not fair and under current legislation we are seemingly powerless to do anything about it.

Currently the liquor store is open from 9am in the morning until midnight seven days a week. Advertising is blazoned around the premises and footpath. There are 'strategically' placed stands of liquor including vodka mixes, RTD's and other 'alcho-pops' that are commonly considered to be targeted at younger people. Frequently before and after school there are huge stocks of liquor being unloaded across the path of the children.

The school frequently has to divert time and energy away from the business of teaching and learning to deal with the damage caused around our school by drunk individuals. This runs the full gamut from the constant irritation of glass bottles being smashed in our playgrounds, to windows and doors being smashed and kicked in, to more serious acts of vandalism up to and including attempted arson. We have to have a rule against our children playing barefoot on our playgrounds or field due the constant danger of broken glass in the school. A parent in our school pointed out how often they come across half full bottles of liquor around the neighbourhood and in front of the school – the concern being that children have the opportunity to introduce themselves to alcohol.

As a result of the above factors staff, students and parent helpers can never guarantee that the school environment will be as safe as they have a right to expect it to be.

The right of Communities to have a say on Alcohol sales

Under the legislation currently proposed in the bill it could be 10 or more years before the regulatory framework is strengthened to a point that our school and community could demand our right to an education environment free from the influence and daily visual impact of the dark shadow side of alcohol in Aotearoa which our students already know all too well.
It is our submission that it should never be acceptable for a liquor outlet to be in close proximity to any school or similar institution. We believe that the legislation should have an explicit clause excluding the ability for liquor licenses to be granted within a defined distance from a school as a demonstration of this country's commitment to the importance of education.

We understand that the bill may intend for this issue to be dealt with through the introduction of voluntarily set local alcohol policies set by territorial authorities. The fact that the provision is entirely voluntary and very un-prescribed in terms of the matters a territorial authority must take into account renders this provision potentially pointless. At the very least we strongly support the strengthening of this provision to ensure that all authorities must have a policy by a set future date (while not limiting authorities who wish to act sooner) and providing more prescription around what matters are to be considered in such a policy, including for example trading hours, outlet density, location and local social factors need to be taken into consideration.

Restrictions to social supply
The Fantame liquor store once had its license suspended for selling to underage teenagers. Many of the people in our community know underage people who have been able to purchase alcohol from the store in recent times, but because this is extremely difficult to prove nothing seems to be able to be done about it.

Discussions we have had with licensing authorities have essentially led us to understand that there are very limited grounds for challenging the existence of this store (despite the fact that the license was already once suspended). Even if the current license holder were to loose the license common practice is to just get a new license under the name of another family member.
Members of the community have also observed under-age teens getting others to purchase alcohol for them. For this reason we strongly support the provisions in the bill to make it an offence to supply alcohol to underage teens and children. We would further support extending these provisions to including 18 and 19 year olds in anything other than an on-license premises.

**Purchase Age**

As an education institution we consider that giving access to alcohol for 18 and 19 year olds was always a mistake and leads to significant detrimental effects for this group who are still in a critical phases of brain development. For this reason we strongly support the Law Commission’s recommendation to raise the purchase age for alcohol to 20 years with no exceptions.

Further anecdotally it is this younger age group (and younger teens still) who cause the majority of the harm to our school in terms of damage and vandalism.

The bills provision to limit off-license alcohol sales to people 20 years and older will undoubtedly help to mitigate some of these impacts.

**Alcohol Pricing and Marketing – how to draw young children in early?**

In a shopping centre where most signs are hand written and taped to windows we consider the quantity of flash and expensive alcohol related signage on around and above our shopping centre to be obscene and abhorrent. It is deliberately suggestive of sophistication and glamour.

This is compounded by the fact that our children see much of the same branding on TV, and on their sports hero’s and other celebrities on a day by day basis.

Many of the products advertised at the liquor store are so cheap that our students could afford them with their pocket money. This is no way to encourage them in their adult life to use alcohol responsibly. In fact it is more likely to assist in indoctrinating them to believe that alcohol is a central part of every day life and that following from the example they observe outside their school, adults buy literally thousands of litres of it day in, day out, night in, night out.

Here we fully support all of the Law Commissions recommendations and implore our representatives in parliament to reconsider them.

Raising the excise tax has been shown to be one of the single most effective measures for reducing alcohol related harm, while achieving significant net savings to taxpayers. We are confident that households will be able to survive a 10% increase in this non-essential item.

Following the three stage plan for reducing and limiting the $200,000 per day spent on advertising will only achieve good things for our children and our community. There would seem to be no respectable reason why banning alcohol advertising
shouldn’t be achievable in the same way tobacco advertising is now a thing of the past.

Drink Driving
Road safety outside school gates is a concern at the best of times with many unpredictable factors – not least the road safety awareness and behaviour of school children. Reason would suggest that the presence of a liquor outlet will lead to a corresponding increase in the number of drivers in the vicinity that are intoxicated. Indeed many of us have neighbours who we know drive to the local store when they have been drinking heavily. This occurs at all times of day and not just in the evening. Our legitimate concern is that sooner or later there will be an vehicle/pedestrian collision outside our school which involves alcohol.

We are extremely concerned that the government has opted not to take advice of the Law Commission and a significant body of research, not to mention the standard practice of most other countries of having a BAC limit of 50mg per 100ml of blood. There are nearly 300 international studies examining this issue which overwhelmingly show that high BAC’s lead to greater crash risks. Projections of the number of lives and injuries saved per year are very significant with an estimated halving of the crash risk for drivers at the legal limit. The suggestion that we need New Zealand specific research is in our view simply untenable. Along with a majority of New Zealanders we support a BAC limit of 50mg/100ml or less.

In conclusion
In conclusion our submission is in support of many of the provisions of the bill before the select committee, however we feel that it must be strengthened in many places in order to be truly effective in reducing alcohol related harm and costs in neighbourhoods like ours in Cannons Creek, Porirua. We look forward to presenting our view and submissions to the select committee in person.

We appreciate the opportunity to make this submission and will watch developments with interest.

On behalf of the Board of Trustees
Russell School

Matt Crawshaw
Chairperson
Appendix E

Community Objections to Fantame Liquor Store

In August this year 88 people from the wider Castor Loop neighbourhood submitted objections to the application to renew the license for the Fantame Liquor Store. This was a huge achievement. I am writing to you as one of those people that objected or expressed interest in this.

Firstly thank you for taking the time to make an objection and express your concerns about the Fantame Liquor Store in our neighbourhood and opposite our school.

Hearing for Community Objections

Late in September you probably received a notice from the Liquor Licensing Authority giving the date of the hearing as Wednesday 30th November 2011 at 10am. The hearing will be at the Porirua District Court and we are all invited to attend. It is very important for us all to attend the hearing if we want the judge to take our written objections into account. It is not necessary for all of us to speak in the court, but it is very important for as many of us as possible to be there.

Spokespeople to present the Communities Objections

If all 88 objections take up the opportunity to speak to the court it would be a very long hearing!! We are proposing to select a small number of “spokespeople” to speak in the court, with everyone else providing them moral support by sitting in the courtroom. Suggested spokespeople include Sose Annadale and myself from Russell School, the Salvation Army, Porirua College and then about five neighbours who live very nearby Fantame Liquor.

Anyone is still welcome to speak in the hearing, but this approach means a few people can put together really strong presentations so all the points are put across without it taking all day.

March on the day of hearing

On the morning of the hearing we are organising a March from under the Canopies around the corner to the district court. We want as many from the community as possible to join us to show our support. Those that objected will go into the court for the hearing.

There will be transport provided down to the centre on the morning, if you would like transport we will meet at 9:15am at the Russell School car park.

Questions??

If you have any questions please don’t hesitate to contact us through Facebook – Fantame Liquor Objections!

Talk soon

Matt Crawshaw
Chairperson – Russell School BOT