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Glossary

Alberta Alcohol Strategy (AAS)
The AAS "is intended to help prevent and reduce the harm associated with alcohol use by developing a culture of moderation. The AAS is based on Canadian and international research and incorporates best practices that have proven effective in other jurisdictions for preventing and responding to alcohol-related harm."¹

Alberta municipal alcohol policy
Any alcohol-related policy (or combination of policies and bylaws) that Alberta municipalities have the jurisdiction to create, implement and regulate that aim to reduce the harmful use of alcohol, adverse alcohol-related health outcomes and social harms.

Examples include
- policy, as the Canadian Centre on Substance Use and Addiction puts it, to “help run safer events on municipally owned or managed property where alcohol is available, such as festivals, sport stadiums and community centers.” This may include “roles and responsibilities of management, strategies to manage over drinking, […] and enforcement procedures and penalties to be used when rules are not followed”²
- bylaws or stipulations within bylaws to regulate, for example,
  - the distance between alcohol-serving establishments (e.g., liquor stores, bars, clubs)
  - the hours of operation for alcohol-serving establishments

Options like these could also be included in an overarching municipal alcohol strategy that outlines all of the steps (policy, practice, programs etc.) a municipality can take to reduce the harmful use of alcohol, adverse alcohol-related health outcomes and social harms.

Alcohol/Liquor
The terms “alcohol” and “liquor” are used interchangeably in this document (i.e., liquor stores, alcohol policy, liquor applications).

Alcohol policy
According to the World Health Organization, alcohol policy is “a set of measures in a jurisdiction or society aimed at minimizing the health and social harms from alcohol consumption.”³ Successful alcohol policies outline comprehensive policy responses covering areas such as availability, marketing, pricing, [drunk]-driving, prevention interventions and treatment in health-care systems.⁴

Bylaw
Alberta Municipal Affairs defines a bylaw as “a law made by a local authority in accordance with the powers conferred by or delegated to it under a statute, in this case the Municipal Government Act. Council may pass a bylaw to govern the affairs within the council (the procedural bylaw) and bylaws that govern within the municipality. Common bylaws include vehicle parking and stopping regulations, animal control, licensing, noise, business regulation, and management of public recreation areas. A municipal bylaw is no different than any other law of the land, and can be enforced with penalties, challenged in court and must comply with higher levels of law. Municipal bylaws are often enforceable through the public justice system, and offenders can be charged with a criminal offence for breach of a bylaw.”⁵
Community drug coalitions
A coalition is a group of community members from different organizations (including teachers, parents, elected leaders, social workers, police officers, doctors, youth, etc.) who come together to pursue a common goal. Coalitions have been shown to be effective at identifying and addressing community health and wellness issues.6

Coalitions
- define a community's strengths and weaknesses, and use these indicators to plan a strategy
- identify gaps and work together to fill them
- share similar concerns but from a variety of perspectives, better representing the whole community
- improve communication delivery through their members
- are more visible to decision-makers, the media and the community than individuals
- conserve resources by eliminating duplication of efforts
7

There are more than 60 community drug coalitions registered with Alberta Health Services’s Provincial Addiction Prevention team.

Markup
"Mark-ups are basically the profit margins on individual beverages once the costs of manufacture, distribution and sale, as well as other taxes, are subtracted from the final retail price," says the Centre for Addictions Research of B.C. "This category of taxation contributes almost half of all the alcohol taxes collected in Canada. This form of revenue is not always adjusted to keep pace with the cost of living, nor does it usually distinguish between high and low alcohol content."8

Policy
In this document, "policy" or "policies" includes bylaws. Where the difference is important, "bylaw" will be specified.
Executive Summary

Goals
The goals of the Alberta Municipal Alcohol Policy Project (AMAPP) are to
- create awareness about
  - the effectiveness of municipal alcohol policy as a key strategy to reduce alcohol-related harm
  - alcohol policy options that fall under municipal jurisdiction in Alberta
- increase the number of, and effectiveness of, municipal alcohol policies in Alberta
- promote responsible alcohol consumption in Alberta
- reduce alcohol-related harm in Alberta municipalities

AMAPP Components
The components of the AMAPP include
- expert advisory to guide the project
- an environmental scan to determine the current landscape of municipal alcohol policy in Alberta
- a literature review on alcohol availability, how and where it is consumed and the association, if any, between alcohol consumption and adverse health and social outcomes among neighbourhoods
- a research study based on the literature review (to be determined)
- an AMAPP guide, which will
  - highlight successes and challenges of current alcohol policies
  - help the priority audience understand
    - the policy development process
    - how to include or improve a health and safety lens to alcohol policy
- a funding and training initiative to help the priority audience develop and implement alcohol policy
- an evaluation to determine the project’s successes and gaps

Purpose of the Environmental Scan
The purpose of the environmental scan is to
- determine the current landscape of municipal alcohol policy in Alberta, including the number of
  - municipalities that have municipal alcohol policies that exceed provincial legislation
  - municipal policies and/or stipulations within policies about alcohol that exceed provincial legislation
- investigate the factors related to policy development, implementation and evaluation
- use the results to aid the development of further AMAPP components

Environmental Scan Methods
The environmental scan consisted of the following methods:
- A primary online scan of 71 Alberta municipalities and a secondary online scan of 281 Alberta municipalities to look for alcohol policies that exceed provincial legislation.
- Interviews with key stakeholders from municipalities with alcohol policies that exceed provincial legislation, in order to investigate factors behind policy development, implementation and evaluation.
- A survey of municipalities with existing municipal alcohol policies that exceed provincial legislation, in order to confirm the findings from the interviews.

Primary and Secondary Scan Results Combined
A total of 71 policies pertaining either entirely to alcohol, or with a stipulation about alcohol that met the inclusion criteria, were found. These policies were found in 59 different municipalities, of which
- 49 have one policy
- 6 have two policies
- 4 have three policies

Of the 71 policies,
- 51 were land-use bylaws\(^A\) that included an alcohol stipulation
- 11 were policies entirely focused on alcohol
- 9 were policies that included an alcohol stipulation among other topics or stipulations

### Key Informant Interview Results
Municipal staff from six municipalities was selected to participate in the key informant interviews. From these, a number of themes emerged from the questions that each interviewee was asked.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **What was the impetus for implementation of liquor policies?** (*Impetus for implementation* refers to the reasons why the policy was created.) | • Specific event  
• Social behaviour and crime data  
• City decision making  
• City planning and traffic  
• Community voice/public engagement/consultation  
• Creating fair business opportunity  
• Aesthetic  
• Organization influence  
• Risk management |
| **In reference to the policy, what, if any, has been the impact?** (*Impact* refers to the effects, positive or negative, that the policy has had on the municipality.) | • No additional liquor stores have opened  
• Business owners support the policy (they are adapting and creating new business)  
• Business owners do not support the policy (expressions of concern from industry)  
• Improved public and business responsibility  
• Policy retraction |
| **In reference to the policy, what, if any, has been the public response?** (Perceptions, comments/feedback by citizens in a municipality that has been affected by an alcohol policy.) | • Supported  
• Not supported  
• No response |
| **When assessing liquor permits, what implications are considered?** (The types of information that are collected, analyzed and considered when assessing liquor store locations or applications.) | • Broad/general “negative impacts”  
• Community culture  
• Crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED)  
• Traffic and parking |
| **In the land-use bylaw, is there a specified distance requirement for liquor stores from specific landmarks?** (How were those specific distances selected?) | • Not sure |
| **Has the policy been formally evaluated?** | • No |

\(^A\) Technically, one of these is titled “zoning bylaw,” but in general it reflects the same type of overall stipulations as a land-use bylaw.
These themes were then confirmed by a survey that was sent to most municipalities in Alberta that have existing policies that exceed provincial legislation.

**Survey Results**

Municipal staff members from 52 municipalities were sent the survey. Thirty-three respondents completed the survey, for a response rate of 63%.

Most survey respondents were development officers (30%), followed by an equal number of managers of municipal space (15%) and city/land use planners (15%), with the majority of respondents indicating that they have worked in a municipal position for at least six years. A slight majority of respondents (55%) were familiar with what their municipality can do to address liquor control beyond provincial legislation in general. The same slight majority was also familiar with the reasons why their municipality created its specific alcohol policy. However, most respondents (64%) were not involved with the development of these policies. Furthermore, the vast majority of respondents (88%) were not aware of the impacts of the alcohol policies in their municipality, and less than half (45%) were aware of the information that is collected, analyzed and considered when assessing liquor permits. Finally, the vast majority of respondents (79%) would find a municipal alcohol policy guide beneficial.

**Conclusions**

- Municipalities care about reducing crime and creating safe, vibrant communities.
- Municipalities are autonomous and diverse, and as such
  - types of alcohol policies vary between municipalities
  - the reasons for developing and implementing policies also vary
- The majority of respondents would find a municipal alcohol policy guide beneficial.
- Community drug coalitions (one of AMAPP’s priority audiences) may require support to help them engage and work with municipalities.
- The AMAPP guide and the funding and training initiative must be marketed to the right people within municipalities to ensure the success of the project.

**Next Step**

Based on evidence, the discussions held with key stakeholders, survey feedback, AMAPP Advisor’s input, and a review of key resources from British Columbia, Nova Scotia and Ontario, the AMAPP guide will be developed and should include:

- jurisdictional (municipal, provincial, federal) responsibilities and opportunities as it relates to alcohol policy
- details about the diverse alcohol policy options available to municipalities
- a showcase of alcohol policies that municipalities have already developed and implemented for others to learn from
- evidence supporting specific alcohol policies and the strengths and weaknesses of each as they pertain to addressing alcohol-related harm
- a focus on the importance of CPTED, parking implications, traffic implications and the distance between key landmarks and liquor establishments as it relates to liquor permit assessment, as well as the importance of using a health focus
- the importance of engaging, and the specifics of how to engage, a range of stakeholders, including
  - business owners
  - municipal staff
  - law enforcement (e.g., police, RCMP)
Health equity considerations will also be embedded in the AMAPP guide. This aspect will encourage and provide guidance to municipalities on how to examine the potential impacts that alcohol policies may have on populations most vulnerable to adverse health outcomes. Mitigation strategies will be suggested to minimize the negative impacts that widen the inequity gap.

**Research Opportunities**

It is recommended in the future that further research be conducted to understand
- why demographics matter to municipalities when they consider liquor permits
- how business owners perceive alcohol policies
Introduction and Background

About this Project
The Alberta Alcohol Strategy outlines six priorities and associated recommendations to prevent and reduce alcohol-related harm, including “foster[ing] the development of context-specific alcohol policies” by “assisting local governments in making decisions related to liquor licensing by developing a tool kit that includes best practice guidelines for the management of alcohol-related issues in public places and at public events and the effective use of bylaws and fines to manage local concerns related to location, density or operation of licensed premises.” To address this priority and recommended action, Alberta Health Services’s Provincial Addiction Prevention team developed and implemented the Alberta Municipal Alcohol Policy Project (AMAPP).

AMAPP Goals
The goals of the AMAPP are to
- Create awareness about
  - the effectiveness of municipal alcohol policy as a key strategy to reduce alcohol-related harm
  - alcohol policy options that fall under municipal jurisdiction in Alberta
- Increase the number and effectiveness of municipal alcohol policies in Alberta
- Promote responsible alcohol consumption in Alberta
- Reduce alcohol-related harm in Alberta municipalities

Priority Audience
The priority audience for the AMAPP includes
- AHS Addiction and Mental Health community drug coalitions
- AHS Addiction and Mental Health Zone Staff
- municipal staff and leaders
- other community groups

AMAPP Components
The AMAPP is comprised of the following components:
- An advisory committee, to guide the process of the project and provide advice, guidance and expertise in the fields of alcohol research, policy and practice.
- An environmental scan, to determine the current landscape of municipal-level alcohol policy in Alberta and use the findings to shape the AMAPP guide and funding program.
- A literature review, to discover whether there is a relationship between alcohol availability, consumption and deprived neighbourhoods and the association, if any, between alcohol consumption and adverse health and social outcomes among neighbourhoods that are most deprived.
- A research study, based on the literature review (to be determined).
- An AMAPP guide, which will
  - highlight successes and challenges of current alcohol policies
  - help the priority audience understand
    - the policy development process
    - how to include or improve a health and safety lens to alcohol policy
- A funding and training initiative, to help the priority audience develop and implement policies.
- An evaluation, to determine the success of the project, gaps and potential areas for improvement.
Government Roles in Alcohol Control

Federal
- The federal government collects excise and customs duties on liquor. Customs duties and excise duties both apply to imported liquor products, while only excise duties apply to domestic liquor products.
- The Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Corporation is an administrative tribunal that regulates and supervises broadcasting and telecommunications in the public interest. Through the Code for Broadcast Advertising of Alcoholic Beverages it regulates alcohol advertising on radio and television.
- Administered by Advertising Standards Canada, the Canadian Code of Advertising Standards “set[s] the criteria for acceptable advertising in Canada.” This means that how alcohol industries market their products to Canadians is regulated by this code.

Provincial
- The Alberta Gaming and Liquor Commission (AGLC) develops and enforces policies and procedures that govern liquor activities in Alberta. The AGLC is responsible for regulating the manufacture, import, sale, purchase, possession, storage, transportation, use and consumption of liquor in Alberta. These stipulations are outlined in the Gaming and Liquor Act, and are also found in several handbooks developed by the AGLC, including the Liquor Licensee Handbook, the Retail Liquor Stores Handbook, the General Merchandise Liquor Stores Handbook and the Liquor Agency Handbook.
- The AGLC sets and collects provincial markup and collects and distributes the federal excise and customs duties.
- All alcohol advertising must adhere to the Canadian Code of Advertising Standards; however, most of this is regulated at the provincial level and therefore must also follow the stipulations set in the Gaming and Liquor Act and the handbooks developed by the AGLC.

Municipal
- Although the AGLC is the provincial body that governs, regulates and enforces liquor activities in Alberta, Alberta municipalities have the right and ability to establish, implement and enforce policies that further restrict (i.e., exceed) some of the provincial legislation outlined by AGLC.
- Municipalities do not have the authority to relax provincial standards and must adhere to Municipal Affairs and to the Municipal Governance Act.
- Municipalities can, however, choose to collect fees for liquor licenses beyond what is required provincially.
- Municipalities can also implement policy that restricts liquor advertising and/or liquor industry sponsorship on municipally owned property and in municipally owned materials.

Purpose of the Environmental Scan

The purpose of this scan is to
- determine the landscape of municipal alcohol policy in Alberta, including the number of
  - municipalities that have policies pertaining to alcohol that exceed provincial legislation
  - municipal policies and/or stipulations within policies that pertain to alcohol that exceed provincial legislation

---

<sup>8</sup> Municipalities can, for example, further restrict the provincially set hours of operation for liquor serving venues. They cannot, for example, raise or decrease the age limit for liquor purchases.
investigate the factors pertaining to policy development, implementation and evaluation
use results to aid the development of further AMAPP components

Environmental Scan Methods

Understanding the Alberta Population
According to Alberta Municipal Affairs there are 356 Alberta municipalities, which are classified into cities (18), specialized municipalities (5), municipal districts (64), towns (107), villages (92), summer villages (51), improvement districts (8), Métis settlements (8) and special areas (3). The total population in these municipalities is 3,979,553. In addition to these 356 municipalities, there are also 140 reserves within the 45 First Nations in three treaty areas in Alberta, which include an additional 68,871 Albertans, and one town site with an additional 983 people. Alberta’s total population is 4,049,407.

Inclusion Criteria
For a municipal alcohol policy to be included in the scan, it was required that
- the entire policy pertains to alcohol and exceeds provincial legislation, or
- within a policy that addresses multiple topics, there is an alcohol stipulation that exceeds provincial legislation

Primary Scan
A total of 71 municipalities were selected for the primary scan. The total population of these municipalities is 3,526,282, which comprise 87% of the total Alberta population. The municipalities were selected if they had
- a population of at least 10,000 people, and/or
- a community coalition registered with the AHS Provincial Addiction Prevention

Between September and December 2016, the two project leads independently scanned the official municipal website of each of the 71 municipalities and scanned the subsequent policies found there. The project leads cross-checked their independent results against each other’s and addressed any discrepancies by referring back to the municipal websites. The compiled version was further cleaned by eliminating all policies that did not exceed provincial legislation. (See Appendix A for the full search method.)

Secondary Scan
The remaining 281 municipalities were scanned by one project lead. The total population of these municipalities is 458,325, which comprises 11% of the total Alberta population. In the primary scan, it was determined that most of the alcohol-related policies were found by using the search terms “alcohol” and “liquor,” and that most of the policies applicable to this scan were land use bylaws. As such, the secondary scan process was simplified. (See Appendix A for the full search method.)

Key Informant Interviews
After the primary and secondary scans were complete, and a total of 59 municipalities were found to have policies that fit the inclusion criteria. Representatives from six of those municipalities were then selected to participate in key informant interviews. The municipalities and interviewees were selected based on:
- the comprehensiveness of the municipal policy (e.g., an entire policy regarding alcohol control, or more than one stipulation within a policy)

---

\(^{c}\) Due to human error, four municipalities were missed in the second scan. This number should have been 285.

\(^{d}\) It was determined that only six municipalities would be selected for interviews based on project lead capacity.
for ease of connection, whether the AHS staff conducting the scan and/or any AHS registered community coalition had a pre-existing professional relationship with municipal staff within the municipality

- advice from the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association (AUMA) about who would be the most appropriate municipal staff to speak with about alcohol policies

Based on the above criteria, municipal representatives were contacted via email and asked to either participate in an interview themselves, or select a representative who would be most informed on the topic to participate instead. Final participants included

- one mayor
- two senior planners with planning/development departments
- one general manager of public safety
- one general manager of family and community support services
- one director of community services
- one program manager of small business and local economy

In five of the six municipalities, one representative participated in the interview. In the other, two representatives participated. Each interviewee was asked to reflect on the unique policy found in their respective municipality when answering 11 standard questions. An additional one to four unique questions were also asked of each interviewee based on the policy found in their municipality. (See Appendix B for the standard 11 questions and Appendix C for an example of the unique questions.)

Questions were sent to the interviewees prior to the interview to give them sufficient time to formulate informed responses. The intent of each interview was to determine:

1. The impetus for the policy development/implementation
2. Whether the policy has been evaluated
3. The positive impacts of the implemented policy
4. The negative impacts of the implemented policy
5. Public response (if any) to the policy
6. Any considerations that are made when assessing liquor permits
7. How the specific distances were selected if the municipality had a “distance between” policy pertaining to liquor serving establishments

The interviews were conducted by one of the AMAPP project leads via a recorded phone conversation, with consent provided by the participants prior to, or at the time of, the interview. The interviews were semi-structured and discussion based. The recordings of the interviews were then transcribed and independently themed by both project leads. A theme was recognized if there were at least two municipalities who gave the same response. The themes were then discussed between the two project leads and regrouped to best capture the context of the responses.

Survey

To confirm the themes identified from the interviews and to capture additional information, survey questions (see Appendix D) were developed from the interview themes. The survey questions were formatted into Select Survey, the AHS surveying tool.

The survey was intended for one contact person from all 59 municipalities that had an alcohol policy that met the selection criteria. Contacts to receive the survey were already established in the six municipalities that participated in the interview. To establish contacts in the other 53 municipalities, one of the AMAPP project

leads called the main contact number listed on each official municipality website and asked to speak with the person who would be most appropriate to receive the survey. In 30 instances, the project lead was able to make a personal contact and receive a personal email address. In 16 instances, the project lead was not referred to a specific person but did receive a general contact email. Three municipalities did not want to receive the survey and in four municipalities the project lead was not able to connect with someone on the phone or able to find a general contact email on the municipality’s website. In total, 52 municipalities received the survey.

The direct contacts (30) were sent a form email (see Appendix E) and the online survey link. The general contacts (16) were sent a different form email (see Appendix F) and the online survey link. All emails included a small section personalized to each municipality. The personalization was an overview of the policy or section of policy that was found in each respective municipality. The purpose of this personalization was to provide context to the municipal contact when they filled out the survey. The contacts from the six municipalities that participated in the interview were also sent the survey; however, the emails sent to these contacts were less formal as relationships had already been established through the interview process. The survey was open for a total of six weeks. At the four-week mark all contacts were sent a reminder email (see Appendix G). Once the survey closed, descriptive statistics were used to analyze the survey results.

**Results**

**Primary Scan Results**

A total of 375 policies\(^E\) pertaining either entirely to alcohol, or with a stipulation about alcohol within a broader policy, were found or reviewed. Of these, 42 policies met the inclusion criteria. These 42 policies were found in 32 municipalities, of which

- 24 had one policy or section of policy pertaining to alcohol
- 6 had two policies or sections of policies pertaining to alcohol
- 2 had three policies or sections of policies pertaining to alcohol

Of the 42 policies,

- 26 were land use bylaws that included an alcohol stipulation
- 16 were other types of policies, of which
  - 9 were policies where the entire document was focused on alcohol, including
    - Drinking Establishment Regulatory
    - Business Hours Bylaw
    - Drinking Establishment Licensing Bylaw
    - Alcohol Management Policy and Procedures (found in two municipalities)
    - Municipal Alcohol Policy
    - Beer Garden Policy
    - [City name removed] Alcohol Management Policy
    - Alcohol Consumption Zero Tolerance Guidelines
  - 7 were policies that included an alcohol stipulation among other topics/stipulations, including
    - Business License Bylaws (found in two municipalities)
    - Special Events Guideline
    - Public Events Bylaw

\(^E\) In most of these policies there was simply a reiteration of what is stated in provincial policy. These were excluded from the scan total as they did not exceed provincial legislation. However, the AMAPP guide will include all policy options, including those that were mere reiterations of the provincial policy.
Secondary Scan Results
A total of 146 policies pertaining either entirely to alcohol, or with a stipulation about alcohol within a broader policy, were found or reviewed. Of these, 29 met the inclusion criteria. These 29 policies were found in 27 municipalities, of which

- 25 had one policy or section of policy pertaining to alcohol
- 2 had two policies or sections of policies pertaining to alcohol

Of the 29 policies,
- 25 were land use bylaws that included an alcohol stipulation
- 4 were other types of policies, of which
  - 2 were policies where the entire document is focused on alcohol, including
    - Alcohol Policy
    - Alcohol Free Municipal Properties Policy
  - 2 were policies that included an alcohol stipulation among other topics/stipulations, including
    - Business License Bylaw
    - Alcohol and Illegal Drugs Policy

Primary and Secondary Scan: Combined Results and Findings
A total of 71 policies pertaining either entirely to alcohol, or with a stipulation about alcohol that met the inclusion criteria, were found. These 71 policies were found in 59 municipalities, of which

- 49 have one policy
- 6 have two policies
- 4 have three policies

Of the 71 policies,
- 51 were land use bylaws\(^6\) that included an alcohol stipulation (see Appendix H for examples)
- 11 were policies entirely focused on alcohol
- 9 were policies that included an alcohol stipulation among other topics or stipulations (see Appendix I for examples)

Interview Results
The following chart\(^5\) includes
- the compiled interview questions
- the compiled themes
- the theme descriptions
- examples of supporting statements

---
\(^5\) One of these 52 is titled “zoning bylaw,” but in general it reflects the same type of overall stipulations as a land use bylaw does.
\(^6\) Details in the chart have been edited to eliminate any city identifiers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Theme description</th>
<th>Supporting statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What was the impetus for implementation of liquor policies? (<em>Impetus for implementation</em> refers to the reasons why the policy was created.)</td>
<td>Specific event</td>
<td>Alcohol policies were considered due to a specific occurrence. For example: • riot • increased number of liquor stores • new venue</td>
<td>“The riot was the precipitating event that got everybody's attention.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social behaviour and crime data</td>
<td>Alcohol policies were considered based on information that supported the need for stronger liquor control, including • crime data • calls from the RCMP • observed social misconduct • social implications</td>
<td>“We have a really good working relationship with our RCMP and our superintendent. He was saying that about 80% of the calls they get are after 11:00 at night and about 75% of those were related to alcohol.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City decision making</td>
<td>Municipalities have the responsibility to implement policies that have the best interest of their communities in mind.</td>
<td>“We wanted to basically make it clear that as the city of [identifier city name removed], we are going to look at where it is appropriate to license, and then once an individual or an event is hosting, they have to follow and be aware of all the legislation.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City planning and traffic</td>
<td>The community shared its perception of liquor stores with the municipality.</td>
<td>“We have had the community overwhelmingly saying… we don’t want the liquor store here.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community voice/public engagement/consultation</td>
<td>Alcohol policies were considered to allow business development to suit the needs and wants of the community.</td>
<td>“Just simply it was prohibitive for some opportunities. So council determined that it was not in the community’s best interest to limit growth of any business.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating fair business opportunities</td>
<td>Municipalities were concerned with the way they may be viewed if they have too many liquor stores and liquor advertisements.</td>
<td>“We are getting a lot of them. Clusters of them. Where customers would drive down the streets and there would be liquor, liquor, liquor. It was getting visually and aesthetically challenging.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>Alcohol policies resulted from advocacy bodies that promoted liquor businesses or, conversely, health and safety. Advocacy bodies included • coalitions or drug task forces • the Alberta Liquor Store Association</td>
<td>“It was brought forward by our drug task force to city council and senior administration.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization influence</td>
<td>Alcohol policies were considered a preventative measure to reduce any potential harm or social misconduct.</td>
<td>“First and foremost, we are going to reduce and manage the risk associated with alcohol being served in our facilities and on our lands.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2</td>
<td>Themes</td>
<td>Theme description</td>
<td>Supporting statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In reference to the policy, what, if any, has been the impact? (<em>Impact</em> refers to the effects, positive or negative, that the policy has had on the municipality.)</td>
<td>No additional liquor stores</td>
<td>In compliance with the policy, no additional liquor stores have been opened.</td>
<td>“I know that there is one liquor store in town that wants to move across the street, and if they were allowed to move, they would be infringing upon that distance, believe it or not, and so we are not letting them and they are not very happy with us.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business owner support (they are adapting and creating new business)</td>
<td>Since enacting more restrictive alcohol policies, liquor businesses have been observed supporting the decision and using the new opportunity to adapt their business to the changed environment by: - decreasing overhead by closing early - creating new/unique business tactics - maintaining a safer store</td>
<td>“We have had feedback that the new method is a little more coordinated and has resulted in businesses having a better understanding of their responsibilities for the patrons once the patrons leave their establishments.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business owners not in support (expressions of concern noted from industry)</td>
<td>Since the policies have been implemented, liquor business has been restricted. Business owners are not satisfied with the policy and have expressed dissatisfaction about the following issues: - big-box stores are not permitted to open a liquor store due to an independent store in proximity - the inability of owners to relocate their business due to another liquor store already in the area - some competitors are not affected because they have been grandfathered in and this creates an “unfair” business environment - the perception that there is still a lot of demand for more business</td>
<td>“We are getting a lot of push back. So far council is just saying ‘too bad.’ But how long this will last, I don’t know…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved public and business responsibility</td>
<td>The transparency of the policies has increased public and business awareness of their responsibilities to ensure appropriate liquor use.</td>
<td>“Anyone in the community can download this policy and they can read it and really think differently about the implications of having alcohol at an event, and be more purposeful in saying, ‘Gee, do I really need it? And why would I want it there?’”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | Policy restructions | After implementing a restriction via an alcohol policy (e.g., increased distance between stores, reduced hours of liquor service), public and business dissatisfaction has resulted in some municipalities reducing the restriction or retracting the policy altogether. Reasons for retraction include: - to increase uptake of event space - bylaws will be appealed or struck down anyway - businesses have found loopholes - support for additional locations in the

*In suburban locations, as grocery stores have got into the market of selling alcohol, they often found that where they were located, they were unable to co-locate liquor stores because a smaller operator had already moved into the commercial development that they were located in. And with the 500-metre separation distance, that is why council asked us last year to look at an exemption that would provide a few more opportunities in these suburban, commercial, strip mall contexts or power*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 3</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Theme description</th>
<th>Supporting statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **In reference to the policy, what, if any, has been the public response?** (Perceptions, comments/feedback by citizens in a municipality that has been affected by an alcohol policy.) | Supported | The feedback from members of the public, primarily the community at large, indicates they are in favour of policies that are more restrictive than what is set at the provincial level. In general, the community supports:  
- decreasing the number of liquor stores  
- increasing community safety  
- addressing the proximity of liquor stores to family-oriented landmarks  
- reducing noise and social misconduct in their neighbourhoods  
- improving the coordination of liquor stores and the responsibilities of patrons once they leave establishments. | "We sent [community members] a letter saying this is what's being applied for, and any feedback would be great. We got quite a bit of feedback. 'Why do we need more liquor stores?' 'Why do we need more?' Especially about the number of outlets. 'Don't we have enough liquor stores already?' 'Why would you consider allowing another liquor store?'" |
| | Not supported | The feedback from members of the public, primarily business owners, is that they do not support some of the more restrictive policies implemented in their municipalities. In general, the business owners perceive:  
- a lack of fairness  
- that negative impacts have nothing to do with the physical business  
They are also frustrated with the inability to develop new liquor venues. | "[In] the type of license that we had for the venue, we didn't allow parties to provide alcohol, and so the feedback was ‘Here we have this beautiful venue and event organizers can’t [serve liquor], because of the interpretation of the license.’ It was related to understanding Alberta Gaming and Liquor and the category of license that we had. So we went through our policy to see [what the barrier was], and it was very much the license that we had for that venue.” |
| | No response | There has been no response to the policy. | “The accepted [bylaws already in place] stuff, nobody has an issue with, which is really great.” |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 4</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Theme description</th>
<th>Supporting statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **When assessing a liquor permit, what implications are considered?** (The types of information that are collected, Broad/general negative impacts) | When assessing liquor applications, one needs to consider  
- safety  
- the impacts on the community | "When we approve a liquor store, which is a discretionary use, pretty much everything is up for grab. So as long it is a planning-related decision, we [might] limit hours of operation in order to manage impacts on communities.” |
| | Community culture, including community demographics | The make-up of the community is considered when assessing liquor applications, including  
- whether it fits the fabric of the community | “Does it fit in the fabric of the community and neighbourhood?” |
analyzed and considered when assessing liquor store locations or applications.)

| Crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) | When assessing liquor applications, CPTED stipulations are considered, including  
| • safety, visibility and accessibility | “They will have to go down the back alley to access this parking area. And because it is in the back of the building, it’s a poorly lit, kind of disorganized area where there are waste bins and stuff like that, and telephone poles and just really bad sight lines because the back of the buildings didn’t line up. So they asked this individual to provide more info as to how they were going to manage the CPTED considerations.” |

| Traffic and parking | When assessing liquor applications, parking/traffic implications are considered, including  
| • traffic patterns  
| • access to the store  
| • parking lot use/parking requirements | “How else are customers going to get here? You have to provide parking spaces based on the provision of the bylaw. They said, ‘Oh, that is fine, we have some parking spaces out back.’ But it is right in the middle of the block. So they will have to go down the back alley to access this parking area.” |

### Question 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Theme description</th>
<th>Supporting statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the land use bylaw, is there a specified distance requirement for liquor stores from specific landmarks? (How were those specific distances selected?)</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Generally, municipalities did not know how the specific distance listed in their land use bylaw was selected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Theme description</th>
<th>Supporting statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Has the policy been formally evaluated? | No | Most interviewees indicated that to the best of their knowledge, formal evaluation had not occurred. However, most indicated some type of feedback process, including  
| • public and staff feedback on access and usability of municipal venues  
| • discussion about fairness of bylaws/policies for all groups  
| • tracking public responses and reporting these back to council  
| • adhering to a standard time cycle for review of bylaws | “As far as evaluation goes, it’s basically just tracking all the things that are going on, engaging and getting public feedback, and then reporting back to council what is working and what may need to get looked at.” |
Survey Results
The survey was sent to municipal employees from 52 different municipalities. Thirty-three respondents completed the survey, a 63% response rate. This report does not include the answers given to question 6 ("What is the name of your municipality (optional)?"), in order to protect the identity of the survey participants. In regards to question 11 ("Any other comments?"), there were no responses of note to provide.

Summary
Most survey respondents were development officers (30%), followed by an equal number of managers of municipal space (15%) and city/land use planners (15%), with the majority of respondents indicating that they have worked in a municipal position for at least six years. A slight majority of respondents (55%) were familiar with what their municipality can do to address liquor control beyond provincial legislation in general. The same slight majority was also familiar with the reasons why their municipality created the specific alcohol policy. However, most respondents (64%) were not involved with the development of their alcohol policy or policies. The vast majority of respondents (88%) were also not aware of the impacts of their alcohol policy or policies, and fewer than half (45%) were aware of the information that is collected, analyzed and considered when assessing liquor permits. Finally, the vast majority of respondents (79%) would find a municipal alcohol policy guide beneficial.

Details
Question 1: What is your role?
Most respondents were development officers (30%), followed by an equal number of managers of municipal space (15%) and city/land use planners (15%).

![Figure 1: Respondent's Professional Role](chart.png)
Question 2: How long have you been working in a municipal position?
Eight (24%) respondents have been working in a municipal position for 0–5 years, 15 (45%) for 6–15 years, and 10 (30%) for 15+ years.

Figure 2: Respondent's Years of Service in a Municipal Position

Question 3: Were you involved in the development of the alcohol policy/bylaw in your municipality?
The majority of respondents (64%) were not involved with the development of the policy, while 36% were involved.

Figure 3: Number of Respondents Who Were Involved in the Alcohol Policy/Bylaw Development
Question 4: Are you familiar with what your municipality can do to address liquor control beyond what is legislated provincially?

The majority of respondents (55%) were familiar with what their municipality can do to address liquor control beyond provincial legislation, while 45% respondents were not familiar.

![Pie chart showing familiarity with liquor control beyond provincial legislation.]

Figure 4: Number of Respondents Familiar with What Their Municipality Can Do to Address Liquor Control Beyond Provincial Legislation

Question 5: Would you find a municipal alcohol policy guide beneficial to you or your community?

The majority of respondents (79%) would find a municipal alcohol policy guide beneficial, while 21% would not.

![Pie chart showing willingness to use a municipal alcohol policy guide.]

Figure 5: Number of Respondents Who Would Find a Municipal Alcohol Policy Guide Beneficial

Question 6: What is the name of your municipality (optional)?

Answers are not provided to this question in order to protect the identity of survey participants.
Question 7 (a, b and c): Do you know the reasons why your municipality created the specific alcohol policy/bylaw?

More than half of respondents (55%) were familiar with the reasons why their municipality created the specific alcohol policy in their municipality, while 45% did not know why the policy was created.

Figure 6: Number of Respondents Who Are Familiar with Why Their Municipality's Alcohol Policy/Bylaw Was Created

The 18 respondents who indicated that they were familiar were further asked to qualify the applicability of a number of reasons for the development of their municipality’s alcohol policy/bylaw.

A specific occurrence:
- 9 (50%) respondents answered “strongly applicable” or “applicable”
- 9 (50%) respondents answered “minimally applicable” or “not applicable”

Community pressure/influence:
- 9 (50%) respondents answered “strongly applicable” or “applicable”
- 9 (50%) respondents answered “minimally applicable” or “not applicable”

Aesthetics:
- 10 (56%) respondents answered “strongly applicable” or “applicable”
- 8 (44%) respondents answered “minimally applicable” or “not applicable”

Pressure from external advocacy bodies:
- 2 (11%) respondents answered “strongly applicable” or “applicable”
- 16 (89%) respondents answered “minimally applicable” or “not applicable”

Potential harm:
- 9 (50%) respondents answered “strongly applicable” or “applicable”
- 9 (50%) respondents answered “minimally applicable” or “not applicable”

Social misconduct:
- 10 (56%) respondents answered “strongly applicable” or “applicable”
- 8 (44%) respondents answered “minimally applicable” or “not applicable”
Health outcomes:
- 7 (39%) respondents answered “strongly applicable” or “applicable”
- 11 (61%) respondents answered “minimally applicable” or “not applicable”

Other responses included:
- To minimize municipality risk if someone drinks irresponsibly or illegally in a public facility
- To reduce youth exposure to alcohol advertising and to reduce citizens’ concern of potential disorderly conduct near school sites and/or actual disorderly conduct near school sites
- To help control store locations and access to alcohol (mentioned by two respondents)
- To ensure city council was aware of the potential impacts of allowing alcohol to be served on public lands and facilities, and to ensure that the administrative procedures provide direction and guidance for safe and responsible alcohol management at the operational level
- To limit the proximity of liquor stores to vulnerable populations

(The corresponding table, Table 1, for this information can be found in Appendix J.)

Question 8 (a, b and c): Are you aware of any impact(s) in your municipality since the policy/bylaw has been implemented?
Most respondents (88%) are not aware of the impacts that resulted from the implemented alcohol policy.

![Figure 7: Number of Respondents Aware of Any Impact(s) in Their Municipality since Policy/Bylaw Implementation.](image)

The four respondents who indicated that they were aware of the impacts of the alcohol policy/bylaw in their municipality were further asked whether a number of impacts applied in their respective municipality. The majority of these respondents agreed that the following policy impacts applied in their municipality:
- liquor businesses appear to support the policy
- liquor businesses have adapted their businesses in response to the policy

The majority of respondents also indicated that the public is not more aware, than they were prior to the policy, of their responsibilities (e.g., where they can/cannot consume alcohol), nor is the public more informed, than they were prior to the policy, about alcohol-related harms. The majority of respondents also indicated that both the public and business owners appear to be satisfied with the policy. Finally, the majority of respondents indicated that new liquor stores have opened since the policy was introduced.

One other response included the following statement: “The [policy] limits on alcohol sales has resulted in the market not being well served especially in high population density centers like downtown. When one retailer
opens, [with a] certain model, [and if] it does not meet the needs of the community, it forces consumers to travel to the stores that cater to their interests."

(The corresponding table, Table 2, for this information can be found in Appendix K.)

**Question 9 (a and b): Have there been any changes, or are there future plans to change, the restrictions implemented in your municipal alcohol policy/bylaw?**

The majority of respondents (67%) claimed that there are no changes, or plans to change, the current alcohol policy. Twenty-one percent of respondents claimed that the municipality has made changes, or plans to change, its current alcohol policy, while 12% do not know if there have been changes, or plans to change, the current alcohol policy.

![Figure 8: Number of Respondents Aware of Changes, or of Future Plans to Change, the Restrictions Implemented in Their Municipal Alcohol Policy/Bylaw](image)

If the respondent answered yes to this question, they were then asked to describe the change and the rationale behind it. Responses included:

- “A private property owner has submitted a zoning bylaw application to release a portion of the downtown for the separation rules.”
- “Possibility of increase setback distance.”
- “Removing or changing distance restrictions for distance to recreation facilities, schools, etc. Not necessarily needed, we have a daycare center about 100 feet away from a liquor store and no problems. Given the small size of our community, having these types of separations does not make sense.”
- “A set of alcohol policy recommendations has been presented to council for consideration. Additional research and feedback from local businesses is currently being collected prior to making any decisions or implementing a change. Recommendations focus on hours of service, advertising and creating bylaw level offences for drinking/alcohol related contraventions (rather than provincial or federal legislation).”
Question 10 (a, b and c): Are you aware of the information that is collected, analyzed and/or considered when assessing liquor permits in your municipality?

The majority of respondents (55%) were not aware of the information that is collected, analyzed and considered when assessing liquor permits in their municipality, while 45% were aware.

Figure 9: The Number of Respondents Aware of the Information that Is Collected, Analyzed and Considered When Assessing Liquor Permits in Their Municipality

The 15 respondents (45%) who indicated they were aware of the information that is collected, analyzed and considered when assessing liquor permits in their municipality were further asked to qualify the applicability of a number of reasons. These included:

Crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED):
- 10 (67%) respondents answered "strongly considered" or "considered"
- 5 (33%) respondents answered "minimally considered" or "not applicable"

Parking implications:
- 11 (73%) respondents answered "strongly considered" or "considered"
- 4 (27%) respondents answered "minimally considered" or "not applicable"

Traffic implications:
- 11 (73%) respondents answered "strongly considered" or "considered"
- 4 (27%) respondents answered "minimally considered" or "not applicable"

Population demographics
- 14 (93%) respondents answered "strongly considered" or "considered"
- 1 (7%) respondent answered "minimally considered" or "not applicable"

Other responses included:
- “Distance to public parks.”
- “Proximity to schools, parks, arenas, daycares, churches, etc.”
- “Family values, drinking in public parks/open spaces is not normally allowed legally via a permit.”
- “Distance from parks and community recreation sites and schools.”
- “Locations that may impact children (e.g., proximity to a school, park or place of worship).”
• “Current use with the land use bylaw (e.g., permitted or discretionary use).”

(The corresponding table, Table 3, for this information can be found in Appendix L.)

Question 11: Any other comments?
No responses of note to provide.

Discussion

The scan results indicate that 59 out of 352 (or 17% of) Alberta municipalities have current alcohol policies that exceed provincial alcohol legislation. Based on the fact that 79% are interested in a municipal alcohol policy guide, many of these municipalities are interested in opportunities to explore their options when it comes to alcohol policy. While reducing alcohol-related harm is one of AMAPP’s priorities, this was not a predominate reason for developing municipal alcohol policy. However, scan results show that municipalities do care about reducing crime and creating safe and vibrant communities.

The types of policies found in the 59 municipalities vary from stipulations in land use bylaws and other types of policies covering multiple topics to standalone policies focused entirely on alcohol (e.g., alcohol use on municipally owned property, or liquor stores’ hours of operation). Reasons behind the development and implementation of alcohol policies are also varied and seemingly without a single stand-out cause. Specific occurrences (such as a riot), community pressure, potential harm, social misconduct and the effect of “numerous” liquor stores on the overall aesthetics of a community were reasons offered both by those interviewed and by survey participants.

There is not a one-size-fits-all alcohol policy in Alberta municipalities, which is not surprising, as municipalities are autonomous and diverse. However, there is an opportunity in the AMAPP guide, and through the funding and training initiative, to showcase the diverse policies in various municipalities, and how they were developed, to best suit the needs of other municipalities. While not all survey respondents were aware of the alcohol policy options available to municipalities, the majority would find an AMAPP guide beneficial to their municipality.

Despite policy being a proven and effective tool for addressing alcohol-related health harms,13,14 our survey results showed that health outcomes were not a leading reason for developing municipal alcohol policy, as 61% of respondents indicated that health outcomes were either a “minimally applicable” or “not applicable” reason. Furthermore, 89% of survey respondents claimed that external advocates (either liquor business advocates or, conversely, health and safety advocates) were also a “minimally applicable” or “not applicable” factor behind alcohol policy development. These two findings are critical for AMAPP, as some external advocates (e.g., community drug coalitions, other community groups) are among AMAPP’s priority audiences, and one of AMAPP’s key goals is to reduce alcohol-related health harm via policy.

The majority (64%) of respondents are not involved in alcohol policy development, which leads us to ask: Who was involved? Was it someone in a different role? Did the policy development occur outside of the survey respondents’ employment timeframe? Furthermore, 45% of respondents are not aware why the alcohol policy in their municipality was created, and 55% do not know what information is collected and analyzed when assessing municipal liquor permits. It might be that those who completed the survey were not always the most appropriate people, despite our careful process and targeting efforts. It will be important to ensure that the AMAPP guide and the funding and training initiative are marketed to the right people within Alberta municipalities. In addition, it will likely be helpful to clearly outline in the AMAPP guide the jurisdictional
responsibilities and opportunities between the three levels of government (municipal, provincial and federal) in regards to alcohol policy, and further, what the practical steps are to take a policy idea through to development and, ultimately, implementation.

With the majority of interviewees indicating that their alcohol policies have not been formally evaluated, and only four (12%) survey respondents aware of the impact of their alcohol policy, it is difficult to draw any firm conclusions about the effects (positive or negative) of municipal alcohol policies in Alberta. This provides an opportunity to showcase the evidence available on the positive outcomes of municipal alcohol policy in general, as well as the benefits of evaluation.

In regards to business satisfaction with alcohol policies, there is a discrepancy between the interviewees’ and the survey participants’ responses. The four survey respondents who provided feedback on this specific question indicated that liquor businesses appear to support the policy and/or have adapted their business in response to the policy in their municipalities. Interviewees, however, indicated that business owners are dissatisfied with current alcohol policy, and further that this dissatisfaction is a driver behind the decision, in some municipalities, to retract or revise restrictions in alcohol policy. More exploration is needed to understand how businesses owners perceive alcohol policies, as they will be a key group that municipalities interested in developing alcohol policy will need to engage with.

When assessing liquor permits, the majority of municipalities consider CPTED, parking implications and traffic implications. In addition to these, it was also made clear that the distance between liquor establishments and public landmarks, such as parks, schools and community centres, is also a key consideration. These factors will need to be addressed in the AMAPP guide and the funding and training initiative, while also advocating for the inclusion of a health lens. Municipalities also reflect on population demographics when considering liquor permits; however, more research is required in this area, as it is not clear what the population demographic considerations are.

Conclusions

- Municipalities care about reducing crime and creating safe, vibrant communities.
- Municipalities are autonomous and diverse, and as such
  - the types of alcohol policies vary between municipalities
  - the reasons for developing and implementing policies also vary
- The majority of respondents would find a municipal alcohol policy guide beneficial.
- Community drug coalitions (one of AMAPP’s priority audiences) may require support to help them engage and work with municipalities.
- The AMAPP guide and the funding and training initiative must be marketed to the right people within municipalities to ensure the success of the project.

Next Steps

Based on evidence, the discussions held with key stakeholders, survey feedback, AMAPP Advisors’ input, and a review of key resources from British Columbia, Nova Scotia and Ontario, the AMAPP guide will be developed and should include:

- jurisdictional (municipal, provincial, federal) responsibilities and opportunities as it relates to alcohol policy
- details about the diverse alcohol policy options available to municipalities
- a showcase of alcohol policies that municipalities have already developed and implemented for others to learn from
- evidence supporting specific alcohol policies and the strengths and weaknesses of each as they pertain to addressing alcohol-related harm
- a focus on the importance of CPTED, parking implications, traffic implications and the distance between key landmarks and liquor establishments as it relates to liquor permit assessment, as well as the importance of using a health focus
- the importance of engaging, and the specifics of how to engage, a range of stakeholders, including
  - business owners
  - municipal staff
  - law enforcement (e.g., police, RCMP)
  - school community representatives
  - post-secondary institution representatives
  - workplace representatives
  - general community members

Health equity considerations will also be embedded in the AMAPP guide. This aspect will encourage and provide guidance to municipalities on how to examine the potential impacts that alcohol policies may have on populations most vulnerable to adverse health outcomes. Mitigation strategies will be suggested to minimize the negative impacts that widen the inequity gap.

**Research Opportunities**

- Conduct further research to understand
  - why population demographics matter to municipalities when they consider liquor permits
  - how businesses owners perceive alcohol policies

**Limitations and Assumptions**

**Assumption that all alcohol policies/bylaws are posted on official municipal websites**
Alcohol policies were solely searched using official municipal webpages. If an alcohol policy was not listed on these webpages, then it was missed in our scan.

**Policy inconsistency and variability among municipalities**
Municipalities have the autonomy to establish alcohol policies that exceed some provincial alcohol legislation; however, there is no universal template or direction that guides this process. As such, municipal alcohol policies can be inconsistent when compared across municipalities. For example, policies were not consistently found in the same locations on municipal webpages, policies addressing similar topics were given different titles, and similar alcohol-related stipulations were embedded within different policies. This reoccurring limitation affected the way the policy search was conducted. While acting as systematically as possible, the staff conducting the scan quickly discovered that the process also required flexibility and intuition.

The range of municipal policies, from minor stipulations, such as “alcohol may not be sold in a bed and breakfast facility,” to city-wide strategies to address alcohol-related harms, also made identifying interview themes challenging. Developing and analyzing the surveys was also challenging for the same reason. Despite these limitations, the range of policies identified through the scan highlights the opportunities that municipalities have to advance alcohol policies.
Online scan limitation
The search process for the online scan was as systematic as possible. At times, however, a policy would be found in a way that was slightly different than the outlined process. It is beyond the purpose of this scan to detail each of these deviations.

Discretionary use
In every municipal land use bylaw, facilities are categorized as “discretionary use” or “permitted use” based on the district. When someone applies for a development permit, the development authority may issue a development permit with or without conditions. With this procedure, the discretion of the development authority is not systematic or consistent between municipalities, which can create variation among the stipulations related to alcohol within land use bylaws.

Contacts in municipalities
While efforts were made to reach the most appropriate municipal contacts for both the interviews and the surveys, it is likely that other knowledgeable individuals were missed. Their knowledge could have confirmed, conflicted with or added to the information we gained from the contacts we established.

Omission of municipalities without alcohol policies/bylaws
Municipalities that did not have an alcohol policy/bylaw that exceed provincial legislation were not included in the environmental scan process.

Indigenous Albertans
As the purpose of this scan was to survey Alberta municipalities, the 140 First Nation Reserves within the 45 First Nations and 3 Treaty Areas in Alberta were not included. However, working with Indigenous populations is a priority for Alberta Health Services overall, as well as for the Alberta Alcohol Strategy (AAS) with its connections to Alberta’s Valuing Mental Health recommendations. As such, a 2018/2019 AAS action and deliverable has been tabled to facilitate training for the AAS Working Group to learn how to appropriately engage with, and include Indigenous perspective in all work under the AAS; this includes AMAPP.

Snapshot in time
The scan was conducted between September 2016 and December 2016. It is likely that since December 2016, amendments have been made to one or more policies that were scanned. The status of these policies are dynamic and subject to change at any time.
Appendix A: Scan Method Details

Primary Scan Method
1. Search to see if the municipality has an online presence.
2. Select the "official" municipal website.
3. If included on the website, click on the "policies/bylaws" tab.
4. Scan list of policies and select ones for review based on search terms (see Table 1 below).
   a. Open each selected policy and search for a number of terms (see Table 2 below).
   b. If a search term was found, review the section around the term to determine if the policy should be included or excluded in the final count.
5. If the website had a search function, search the terms “alcohol” and "liquor." In the resulting list (if generated) repeat step 4 above.

Secondary Scan Method
1. Search to see if the municipality has an online presence.
2. Select the "official" municipal website.
3. If the website has a search function, search the terms “alcohol,” “liquor” and “land use bylaw.”
4. Open each policy in the resulting list (if generated).
   a. Search for a number of terms (see Table 2 below).
   b. If a search term was found, review the section around the term to determine if the policy should be included or excluded in the final count.
5. If the municipality does not have a search function, conduct a manual search of the website looking for “land use bylaw” only. If found, complete steps 4a and 4b above.

Table 1: Guideline of Included and Excluded Search Terms to Find Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terms to search to find applicable policies</th>
<th>Included search terms</th>
<th>Excluded search terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Liquor and alcohol</td>
<td>• Animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Land use bylaw</td>
<td>• Waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Parks or open spaces</td>
<td>• Weeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Development</td>
<td>• Council affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Business</td>
<td>• Safety/emergency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Special event</td>
<td>• Smoking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Health</td>
<td>• Water/utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recreation</td>
<td>• Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Community</td>
<td>• Off-site levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Drugs</td>
<td>• Curfew</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Guideline of Included and Excluded Terms to Search Within Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terms to search within applicable policies</th>
<th>Included search terms</th>
<th>Excluded Search Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Liquor and alcohol</td>
<td>• Restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Off- and on-premise liquor establishment</td>
<td>• Parking requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Retail liquor stores</td>
<td>• Building dimensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Liquor sales</td>
<td>• Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Nightclub</td>
<td>• Permitted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Standard Interview Questions

1. In your municipality, we found _______ (policy/bylaw). Are there any other liquor-related policies/bylaws that we missed? If yes, what are they?
   - Rationale: To make sure that we are accurately capturing all relevant liquor-related policies/bylaws for each selected municipality.

2. Does your municipality have any plans for revisions/amendments to any of the liquor-related policies/bylaws that we found? If yes, please describe.
   - Rationale: To determine if the municipality is planning on making any changes to current policies, to keep the findings as current and the context as applicable as possible.

3. Are you aware of any other municipal policies or activities used to reduce alcohol-related harms that go beyond the policies/bylaws that your municipality already has? If yes, have any of these policies been considered for implementation? Why or why not?
   - Rationale: To understand municipal awareness of policy options to address liquor availability and to grasp a sense of readiness to adopt policies if they are aware of options.

4. In reference to _______ (policy/bylaw), what was the impetus for implementation?
   - Probe: For example, to reduce noise, public interest, health concerns, safety concerns.
   - Rationale: To understand why the policy/bylaw was developed, and the driving force to policy/bylaw development.

5. Has the policy/bylaw been formally evaluated?
   - Probes: If yes, what evaluation was used? Is the tool validated? What were the indicators in the evaluation? What were the results?
   - Rationale: To determine whether the policy has been evaluated, the process used and the results of the evaluation. This can be used to determine the effectiveness of policy/bylaw.

6. In reference to _______ (policy/bylaw), what, if any, has been the positive impact?
   - Probe: Has the policy had an impact on reducing crime rates, health impacts, DUIs, amount spent on enforcement, smoother event management?
   - Rationale: To determine what, if any, the positive outcomes have been in order to showcase them in the future Alberta MAP Guide, and to differentiate between perceived impact and evaluated impact (if the policy/bylaw was not formally evaluated [see previous question], then the positive impacts may be perceived positive impacts).

7. In reference to _______ (policy/bylaw), what, if any, has been the negative impact?
   - Probe: Were there any unintended impacts of the policy (e.g., pushback from local businesses)?
   - Rationale: To determine what, if any, the complications may be with the current policy/bylaw. This will help inform the future Alberta MAP Guide, where we will look to potentially address some of the negative impacts and determine recommendations to mitigate them.

8. In reference to _______ (policy/bylaw), what, if any, has been the public response?
   - Probe: Has there been any negative/positive media responses, pushback from businesses, strong support from parents/schools.
9. In the land use bylaw, what does “discretionary” mean? What is the discretionary criterion for approval of a liquor license?
   - Rationale: This will spell out what municipalities are considering when they evaluate liquor permits. This information will be included in the future Alberta MAP Guide.

10. When assessing liquor permit application, what, if any, safety implications are considered? When assessing liquor permit application, what, if any, population health implications are considered? (Ex. Location based on population)
   - Probes: How, if at all, are vulnerable populations considered?
     i. For example: What, if any, health and safety impacts are considered when it comes to the environment of locations (e.g., low-income neighbourhoods, universities, primary schools, liquor outlets)? What opportunity, if any, is there for community input in the liquor permit application process?
   - Rationale: To determine if municipalities are considering health and safety when assessing the location of liquor stores. This information will help develop the future Alberta MAP Guide. It will also include/enhance a health and safety lens that can be applied when determining if liquor stores are appropriate for the municipality demographics.

11. In the land use bylaw, there is a specified distance of _____ (distance) from _________ (specified landmarks). How were those specific distances chosen?
   - Rationale: Since there is no standard about how far a liquor store should be from a landmark or from another liquor store, this helps us understand the decision-making process and determine what and why something is considered feasible for the municipalities.
Appendix C: Unique Interview Questions (Example)

1. Your municipality’s land use bylaw outlines many landmarks to monitor the distance of liquor stores from other locations. How is this monitored?

2. How does the development officer determine whether the permit requires design elements?

3. How are the cumulative impacts of the facilities determined?
Appendix D: Survey Questions

Alberta Municipal Alcohol Policy Survey

Introduction
The Alberta Municipal Alcohol Policy Project (AMAPP) is an initiative led by Alberta Health Services’ Provincial Addiction Prevention team. AMAPP intends to raise awareness about the importance of municipal alcohol policy as a key strategy to reduce alcohol-related harm. As part of this initiative, a guide is being developed to provide municipalities with policy options to address liquor control at the municipal level. You have been selected to participate in this survey because a policy/bylaw pertaining to liquor control that exceeds what is provincially legislated has been identified in your municipality. Your feedback will help inform the development of the Alberta Municipal Alcohol Policy Guide. Your participation is voluntary and no municipal identifiers or names will be released. All results will be reported in aggregate form. If you have any further questions about AMAPP or the survey, please contact: [name and contact details omitted]

Participant Demographics
In order to preserve your confidentiality, we will not share any identifiable information.

1. What is your role?
   - Mayor
   - City Councillor
   - Development Officer
   - City Planner/Land Use Planner
   - Manager of municipal space
   - Other, please specify

2. How long have you been working in a municipal position?
   - 0-5 years
   - 6-15 years
   - 15+ years

3. Were you involved in the development of the alcohol policy/bylaw in your municipality?
   - Yes or No

4. Are you familiar with what your municipality can do to address liquor control beyond what is legislated provincially?
   - Yes or No

5. Would you find a municipal alcohol policy guide beneficial to you or your community?
   - Yes or No
   (The guide may include policy options for municipalities to control liquor, how to develop liquor policies, municipal case studies of those who already do this type of work etc.)

6. What is the name of your municipality (optional)?
   - (The information collected will be used internally to ensure that we have representation across the majority of municipalities.)
Reasons for the Development of Alcohol Policy/Bylaw

7a. Do you know the reasons why your municipality created the specific alcohol policy/bylaw? (Example of reasons include crime rates, an event, community voice, etc)

   Yes or No

7b. How applicable is each statement to the reason(s) why the policy/bylaw was created?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
<th>Minimally Applicable</th>
<th>Applicable</th>
<th>Strongly Applicable</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A specific occurrence (e.g., a riot, increased number of liquor stores, new venue, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community pressure/influence (e.g. &quot;We don't want more access to liquor&quot;, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics (e.g., the way the municipality is viewed by having many liquor venues, liquor advertisements)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure from external advocacy bodies (e.g. Coalitions, Drug Task Force, Alberta Liquor Store Association)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To address potential harm (e.g., drinking and driving, domestic violence etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To address social misconduct (e.g., noise, fights, vandalism etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To address health outcomes (e.g. alcohol-related disease, injury or illness etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7c. If reasons for developing the alcohol policy/bylaw in your municipality were not included above, please specify them below.

Impact of Liquor Policy/Bylaw in Your Municipality
The impact refers to the effects (positive/negative/neutral or unintended) that the policy/bylaw has had on the municipality.

8a. Are you aware of any impact(s) in your municipality since the policy/bylaw has been implemented (e.g., change in crime rates and/or police call outs, perceptions from business owners and/or community members, etc.)?

   Yes or No

8b. Has implementation of the policy/bylaw led to any of the following scenarios or changes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived increase of safety in neighborhoods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in police call outs/crime statistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business seem to be more aware of their responsibilities related to liquor distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public is more informed about business responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public is more informed about alcohol-related harms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public see the importance of alcohol related policies/bylaws</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public is more aware of their responsibilities (e.g., where they can/cannot consume alcohol, processes for event application etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No new liquor stores have been opened since the introduction of the policy/bylaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor businesses appear to support the policy/bylaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor businesses have adapted their business in response to the new policy/bylaw (e.g., specializing in certain sales (wine/beer/craft/local etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business owners are not satisfied with the policy/bylaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public are not satisfied with the policy/bylaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8c. If there are other impacts that you have observed that were not included above, please describe them below.

9a. Have there been any changes, or are there future plans to change the restrictions implemented in your municipal alcohol policy/bylaw? (e.g., changes in separation distances, venue hours etc.)
   Yes or No or Don't know

9b. Please describe the change and the rationale for this decision in the space below:

Implications Considered When Assessing A Liquor Application

10a. Are you aware of the information that is collected, analyzed and/or considered when assessing liquor permits in your municipality (e.g., Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design, parking, traffic, community safety etc.)?
   Yes or No

10b. When your municipality assesses liquor applications, how much do you consider the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implication</th>
<th>Not Considered</th>
<th>Minimally Considered</th>
<th>Considered</th>
<th>Strongly Considered</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) (e.g., Safety, Visibility, Accessibility)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking implications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic implications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population demographics (e.g. Locations near a university, family neighborhoods etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations that already have an abundance of restaurants/pubs/clubs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10c. Are there any other considerations that are assessed when reviewing liquor applications? Please specify.

11. Any other comments?

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey! Your participation is very much appreciated.
Appendix E: Personal Contact Form Email (Example)

Hello [Name omitted]

Thank you for taking the time to speak with me last week and agreeing to fill out a survey related to municipal alcohol policy. You have been selected to participate in this survey because a policy/bylaw pertaining to liquor control that exceeds what is provincially legislated has been identified in your municipality.

The municipal alcohol policy/bylaw we found in your community is a section in your Land Use Bylaw that reads:

7.23 ALCOHOL SALE (1) Any new developments containing Alcohol Sale shall not be located closer than 100.0 metres (328 feet) to any site being actively used for community or recreation activities, public parks, playgrounds and play areas, daytime child care services, libraries and cultural facilities, religious assemblies, or public or private education uses at the time of the application for the Development Permit for the Alcohol Sales Use Class. For the purposes of this subsection only: (a) the 100.0 metres (328 feet) separation distance shall be measured from the closest point of the subject site boundary to the closest point of another site boundary, and shall not be measured from District boundaries or from the edges of structures; and (b) the term “public or private education facilities” is limited to elementary through to high schools inclusive only, and does not include dance schools, driving schools, or other commercial schools.

Please consider this policy when you fill out the survey. The link to the survey is here: [Survey link omitted]

The survey will take approximately 10 – 20 minutes, and depending on how you answer you may end up skipping some questions. Please fill out prior to August 18, 2017. As I mentioned, any information you can provide via the survey will be helpful to us, even if you do not know many (or any) details surrounding the policy in question.

For more background on who we are and what we are doing here is a brief overview. The Alberta Municipal Alcohol Policy Project (AMAPP) is an initiative led by Alberta Health Services’ Provincial Addiction Prevention team. AMAPP intends to raise awareness about the importance of municipal alcohol policy as a key strategy to reduce alcohol-related harm. As part of this initiative, a guide is being developed to provide municipalities with policy options to address liquor control at the municipal level. Your feedback will help inform the development of the Alberta Municipal Alcohol Policy Guide. Participation is voluntary and municipal identifiers will not be released. All results will be reported in aggregate form. If you have any further questions about AMAPP or the survey, please contact [name omitted] at [email addresses omitted] or at [phone number omitted].

Thank you and best,
[Name omitted]
Appendix F: General Form Email (Example)

Good morning [name omitted]

My name is [name omitted] and I am a Consultant with Alberta Health Services Provincial Addiction Prevention Team. I am working, along with my colleague [name omitted] (cc'd) and a number of other stakeholders, on the Alberta Municipal Alcohol Policy Project (AMAPP). AMAPP intends to raise awareness about the importance of municipal alcohol policy as a key strategy to reduce alcohol-related harm. As part of this initiative, a guide is being developed to provide municipalities with policy options to address liquor control at the municipal level.

Your municipality has been selected to participate in a survey because a policy/bylaw pertaining to liquor control that exceeds what is provincially legislated has been identified in your municipality. Your feedback, if you choose to participate, will help inform the development of the Alberta Municipal Alcohol Policy Guide.

The municipal alcohol policy/bylaw we found in your community is a section in your Land Use Bylaw that reads:

“Liquor Store” means a use: (a) where alcoholic beverages are sold for consumption off the retail outlet premises, that has been licensed by the Alberta Gaming and Liquor Commission; (b) must not be located within 300 metres of any other liquor store, when measured from the closest point of a liquor store to the closest point of another liquor store; (c) must not be located within 150 metres of a parcel that contains a school, when measured from the closest point of a liquor store to the closest point of a parcel that contains a school.

Please consider this policy if you choose to fill out the survey. The link to the survey is here: [survey link omitted]. The survey will take approximately 10 – 20 minutes, and depending on how you answer you may end up skipping some questions. If you could please fill out prior to August 18, 2017 that would be appreciated. Any information you can provide via the survey will be helpful to us, even if you do not know many (or any) details surrounding the policy in question. Participation is voluntary and municipal identifiers will not be released. All results will be reported in aggregate form. If you have any further questions about AMAPP or the survey, please contact my colleague [name omitted] at [email omitted] or [phone number omitted].

Thank you and best regards,
[Name omitted]
Appendix G: Follow-Up Form Email

Hello [name omitted]

If you haven’t already done so – there is still time to fill out the Alberta Municipal Alcohol Policy Survey. The link is here [survey link omitted] and it will remain open until August 18. On average, those that have already filled out the survey took approximately 7 minutes to complete. If you have already filled it out – thank you so much and please disregard this email.

Thank you for your kind consideration and best,
[Name omitted]
## Appendix H: Land Use Bylaw Stipulations (Examples)

In the scan, 51 land use bylaws were found that included an alcohol/liquor stipulation that exceeded provincial legislation. Here is a sample of stipulations found in eight municipalities.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>Retail liquor store must be located at least 100m from any school. Bed and Breakfast Facilities must not provide liquor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **2** | Liquor sales/distribution services may be refused if proposed within a multi-parcel subdivision (hamlets excluded) or within 305.0m (1,000 ft) of the boundary of a school site.  
   In evaluating the appropriateness of a Development Permit application for liquor sales/distribution services, the Development Authority shall consider factors as:  
   a) compatibility of proposed use with adjacent and neighbouring land uses;  
   b) impact of proposed use on existing traffic volumes and patterns of flow;  
   c) appropriate vehicle parking and site access/egress requirements; and  
   d) appropriate site securing requirements including, but not limited to, fencing and lighting. |
| **3** | A retail liquor store shall be located on a site at least 150 m from the nearest dwelling unit, arena, school, religious assembly, child care facility, community centre or park as measured from the boundaries of sites containing such uses;  
   Where a proposed liquor store is within 150 m radial distance of an existing liquor store, any cumulative impacts of the facilities on existing development within the area shall be considered in evaluating the application;  
   The Development Authority may, as part of the development permit, require design elements that promote ‘natural surveillance’ of the site and store, such as but not limited to Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) criteria by ensuring:  
   a. the façade of the store shall have a minimum of sixty 60 percent transparent surface including windows and doors;  
   b. exterior lighting should minimize shadows and glare by providing lighting that does not exceed the lumens required to adequately illuminate the site and shall meet all requirements of Section 15 (Outdoor Lighting) of Schedule 3 (General Standards of Development);  
   c. any landscaping around the facilities be low-growing shrubs or deciduous trees with a high canopy at maturity and that all foliage be kept trimmed back to prevent loss of natural surveillance;  
   d. all customer parking stalls shall be visible from the façade of the store and illuminated in accordance with 4(c) and all other applicable parts of this bylaw; and  
   e. customer access shall be limited to areas that are highly visible from the street, parking lot or from a point of access that serves multiple commercial uses such as but not limited to a shopping mall. |
| **4** | Mixed-Use Development  
   Notwithstanding the requirements of this section, should a retail liquor store be proposed on the ground level of a vertical mixed-use development, the following shall be taken into consideration:  
   1. the proposed location of the store shall meet all requirements of this section for all residences other than those located on any floors above the ground level of the vertical mixed-use development within which the store is proposed;  
   2. the customer access to the liquor store shall be located as far as possible from points of access to dwelling units on any floor above the ground level, including those points of access shared between residential and non-residential uses within the same vertical mixed-use development; and  
   3. retail liquor stores shall not be permitted within horizontal mixed-use developments. |
| **5** | The Development Authority must refuse a development permit application when the proposed development: is for a Liquor Store in any district, other than the C-R2, C-R3 and CR20-C20/R20 Districts, that requires more than a 10 per cent relaxation of a minimum separation distance specified in subsections 225(d) or 225(e), except where the development permit is for:  
   (i) the expansion or alteration of an existing approved Liquor Store or renewal of approval of a previously approved development permit for a Liquor Store; or  
   (ii) the expansion or alteration of a single use professional or commercial building located on a non-residential site that includes the liquor store as a secondary use. |

---

**Notes:**

- **C-R2, C-R3, and CR20-C20/R20 Districts:** These are specific land use zoning categories in Alberta, Canada, with different density and land use regulations.  
- **Municipality:** The mention of municipalities varies, indicating that stipulations may differ across regions.  
- **Land Use Bylaw:** These stipulations are legally binding regulations that govern land use and development within municipalities in Alberta.  
- **Appropriateness:** The development permit applications are evaluated based on various criteria ensuring public safety and community well-being.  
- **Design Elements:** Promoting ‘natural surveillance’ helps in preventing crimes by reducing opportunities for criminal activities.  
- **Outdoor Lighting:** Standards and requirements ensure adequate illumination of sites and buildings.  
- **Landscaping:** Low-growing shrubs and deciduous trees contribute to maintaining natural surveillance and aesthetics.  
- **Visibility:** Customer access areas should be highly visible to ensure public safety and discourage criminal activities.  
- **Horizontal Mixed-Use Developments:** These are mixed-use developments that may include both residential and commercial uses on the same floor level, requiring specific regulations to ensure safety and order.  
- **Relaxation of Minimum Separation Distance:** The development permit shall not allow for more than a 10 per cent relaxation of the minimum separation distances.  
- **Expansion or Alteration:** Refers to modifications of existing liquor stores, which must adhere to specific stipulations to maintain public safety and community standards.
(ii) an existing approved Liquor Store that proposes to move to a new location not within a minimum separation
distance specified in subsections 225(d) or 225(e), excluding the distance from the original location of the
existing approved Liquor Store

“Accessory Liquor Service”

a. means a portion of a premises used for the sale and consumption of alcoholic beverages for the
   patrons of another approved use;

b. is a use within the Subordinate Use Group in Schedule A to the Bylaw;

c. must serve only the patrons attending events or performances at the use in which it is located;

d. must not provide any seating area for the patrons;

e. does not require motor vehicle parking stalls; and

f. does not require bicycle parking stalls – class 1 or class 2.

Bed and Breakfast must not provide liquor
Beverage Container Drop-off depot must not be combined use with a liquor store

Liquor stores:

- in the C-N1 and C-N2 Districts, must only be located on a parcel with a front property line on a major
  street or a primary collector street;

- in all Districts, not including the C-R2, C-R3 and CR20-C20/ R20 Districts, must not be located within
  300.0 metres of any other Liquor Store, when measured from the closest point of a Liquor Store to the
  closest point of another Liquor Store;

- in all commercial and industrial districts, not including the C-R2, C-R3 and CR20-C20/R20 Districts,
  must not be located within 150.0 metres of a parcel that contains a School – Private or a School
  Authority when measured from the closest point of a Liquor Store to the closest point of a parcel that
  contains a School Authority – School or a School – Private;

5 Liquor Stores must not be located within 300 metres of any other liquor store, when measured from the closest
point of a liquor store to the closest point of another liquor store; and

Liquor Stores must not be located within 150 metres of a parcel that contains a school, when measured from
the closest point of a liquor store to the closest point of a parcel that contains a school;

6 Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design Principles: Crime Generators are areas that may generate
activities that facilitate crime. For example, 24 hour convenience or liquor stores are legitimate commercial
activities. They are not problems in themselves, but their location in the community may cause conflict or
unforeseen secondary activity such as late night loitering and may become ideal places for evening robberies;

7 A Liquor Store shall not be located within 150m of the property line of a school site.
A Liquor Store shall be exempt from this requirement if the school site and proposed Liquor Store site are on
opposite sides of Highway 1.

8 “motel” means a development where members of the traveling public are lodged for brief periods of time,
normally not exceeding seven (7) days, in rentable units, and where access to each of the rentable units is
individually available from grade, either at grade or via stairways. A motel may include eating establishments,
but shall not include alcohol retail sales or an entertainment establishment;
Appendix I: Examples of Stipulations in Other Types of Policies/Bylaws

In the scan, we found nine policies/bylaws that included an alcohol stipulation among other topics/stipulations. Here are three examples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Type</th>
<th>Stipulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilities rental policy</td>
<td>Facility users hosting functions which involve the consumption of alcohol in any Town-owned facility shall be required to obtain a liquor license/permit and to purchase Party Alcohol Liability Insurance at the user's own cost. The Town of [name removed] will rent Town-owned recreational facilities to individuals, groups and organizations based on the following priority:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Local minor groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Local adult groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Non local groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Commercial/alcohol related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Minor and Local Adult groups will be subject to higher rental fees if the facility rental involves alcohol. The Town of [name removed] levies fees for the use of Town-owned facilities based on the operating cost per hour:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Local Minor Groups 70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Local Adult Groups 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Non Local Groups 125%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Commercial/Alcohol Related 125%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Damage Deposits 1. Damage deposits equal to the value of the rental are required at the time of booking for non-regular users or alcohol related functions only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private advertisement bylaw</td>
<td>Morally Acceptable advertisement subjects would be those promoting a healthy, wholesome lifestyle and would exclude alcohol, tobacco, including smokeless tobacco and subject matter suitable to adult only audiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business license bylaw</td>
<td>Additional fee for tobacco and alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$25.00 w/in district boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$50.00 outside district boundaries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix J: Applicability of Reasons for the Impetus of the Policy/Bylaw (Table 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Strongly applicable</th>
<th>Applicable</th>
<th>Minimally applicable</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A specific occurrence</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community pressure/ influence</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure from external advocacy bodies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential harm</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social misconduct</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health outcomes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix K: Applicability of the Impacts in Municipalities (Table 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived increase of safety in neighborhoods</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public is more informed about business responsibilities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public is more aware of their responsibilities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public is more informed about alcohol-related harms</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public are not satisfied with the policy/bylaw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public see the importance of alcohol-related policies/bylaws</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in police call outs/crime statistics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor businesses have adapted their business in response to the new policy/bylaw</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business owners are not satisfied with the policy/bylaw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor businesses appear to support the policy/bylaw</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses seem to be more aware of their responsibilities related to liquor distribution</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No new liquor stores have opened since the introduction of the policy/bylaw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix L: Applicability of Reasons Considered when Assessing Liquor Permits (Table 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons Considered</th>
<th>Strongly considered</th>
<th>Considered</th>
<th>Minimally considered</th>
<th>Not considered</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking implications</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic implications</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population demographics</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations that already have an abundance of restaurants/pubs/clubs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
References