## APPENDICES

## Appendix 1 - City-wide mapping of the cumulative impact of alcohol-related harm



Appendix 2 - Individual data sources, weighting and individual data set ranking

| Set a score per indicator, per percentile band. <br> An LSOA can be in more than one percentile band as its position in Leeds is assessed for each indicator. For instance the same LSOA might be in the 'Super Max' group for Alcohol admissions, but only in the 'Medium' group for Deprivation, and so it would receive the relevant scores for each indicator. Ideally these scores are set and then left for consistency, records should be kept when changes are made | $n$ 0 0 $\vdots$ $\bar{\sigma}$ 0 0. 0. 0 $\vdots$ 3 0 | $n$ <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> $\vdots$ <br> $\bar{\pi}$ <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 |  |  | Leeds total scores by indicator and severity (the city wide results of the boundaries and scores per indicator) |  |  |  |  |  | 4 $\frac{3}{n}$ 2 8 0 3 3 3 | Value type | $\overline{\overline{7}}$ 0 0 0 0 0 $\sum^{3}$ $\vdots$ 0 0 3 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Deprivation score | 1 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 |  |  |  |  | 1.0 | 177 | 30 | score | L |  | 0 |
| Alcohol Specific admission all ages | 3 | 5 | 6 | 7 |  |  |  |  | 7.0 | 1 | 4,846 | DSR per 10k | M | $\mathbf{Y}$ | 0 |
| Alcohol Related admission all ages | 3 | 5 | 6 | 7 |  |  |  |  | 7.0 | 1 | 7,257 | DSR per 10k | M | $\mathbf{Y}$ | 0 |
| Pop 16 and under | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |  |  |  | 2.0 | 477 | 38 | count | L | $\mathbf{Y}$ | 0 |
| Audit-C scoring >7 more | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 21 | 140 | count | L | $\mathbf{Y}$ | 2 |
| Looked After Children | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |  |  |  | 2.0 | 277 | 1 | count | M |  | 64 |
| NEET | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |  |  |  |  | 3.0 | 22 | 20 | count | M |  | 236 |
| Youth offences | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |  |  |  | 2.0 | 272 | 5 | count | M |  | 39 |
| \% DID NUU a chieve grade $y-b$ in thg and IVIaths Leeds sahnals | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |  |  |  |  | 1.0 | 465 | - | \% | L |  | 18 |
| Alcohol Licensing - Off premises | 3 | 5 | 6 | 7 |  |  |  |  | 7.0 | 1 | 39 | count | L |  | 0 |
| Alcohol Licensing - On premises | 3 | 5 | 6 | 7 |  |  |  |  | 7.0 | 1 | 265 | count | L |  | 66 |
| Alcohol related ASB | 1.5 | 11 | 12 | 12 |  | I |  |  | \#\#\# | 1 | 359 | count | L |  | 337 |
| Alc Flagged Total Crime Excluding Violent | 1.5 | 11 | 12 | 13 |  |  |  |  | \#\#\# | 1 | 317 | count | L |  | 362 |
| Alc flagged Violent Crime | 1.5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  | 8.0 | 1 | 616 | count | L |  | 194 |
| Drunk Disorderly Or Over Prescribed Limit | 1.5 | 11 | 12 | 13 |  |  |  |  | \#\#\# | 1 | 379 | count | L |  | 388 |
| DISC Alcohol | 1.5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  | 1.5 | - | - | count | L | $\mathbf{Y}$ | 253 |
| Licensing risk scores | 2 | 3 | 4 | 6 |  |  |  |  | 6.0 | 1 | 1,218 | score | L | Y | 60 |

Appendix 3 - Category and Weighting Method Statement

The category allocation and data weighting used with the licensing alcohol data matrix has been agreed by Public Health, Public Health Intelligence team and Entertainment Licensing.

## Category Allocation

The decision of how many LSOA's to allocate to each risk category: Low, Medium, High and Very High has been based on ensuring there is a sensible spread across all categories.

Too many LSOA's in the higher categories would make it difficult to identify the areas which have the highest amount of alcohol related harm. The number of LSOA's in each category increases as the risk decreases to ensure the focus is where the harm is greatest.

## Data Weighting

Data sources have been chosen to correspond with the four licensing objectives. Alcohol-related health data has been included as this is an important addition and can be used to 'set the scene' of the wider alcohol-related harm in an area. This is in line with recommendations from Public Health England.

All data sources are not equally important in respect of the licensing objectives. Therefore, based on knowledge and experience of the Responsible Authorities, each data set has been given a different weighting which will affect how much it contributes to the overall ranking.

The higher the score given to each data set (yellow columns), the more this data contributes to the overall score and therefore ranking. The scores for each data set increase across the four risk categories to create the differentiation between each categories i.e. the higher the score the higher the risk category.

The overall citywide ranking of each individual data set is not affected by the weighting.

## Data Weighting and Contribution to Overall Scores



