

IN THE MATTER

Decision No.
of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol
Act 2012

AND

IN THE MATTER

of an application by **MILLIES LIMITED** for the renewal of an ON-Licence pursuant to s.127 of the Act in respect of premises situated at **78 Tancred Street Ashburton** known as "**Arcadia**".

BEFORE THE ASHBURTON DISTRICT LICENSING COMMITTEE

Chairman: Mr A Lawn.
Members: Mrs R Kilworth
Mr G Lee

HEARING at Ashburton on 19 February 2018

APPEARANCES

Mr P Millichamp – for applicant
Mrs H A Faass – Ashburton District Council Alcohol Licensing Inspector – in opposition
Sergeant G Sutherland – NZ Police – to assist
Mrs K Webster – for the Medical Officer of Health – in opposition

ORAL DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE

Introduction and Summary of Decision

Introduction

- [1] This is an application for the renewal, with variation, of an on-licence by **Millies Limited** in respect to premises situated at **78 Tancred Street, Ashburton**, known as "**Arcadia**". The business trades as a tavern.

- [2] The premise is a tavern style licence but primarily operates on Friday and Saturday nights as a bar and nightclub. On these nights security are employed to help control patrons. The premise has a function room which operates intermittently, no designation is sought for this area.
- [3] Trading hours of 8.00am to 3.00am were attached to the licence at the last renewal but since the Local Alcohol Policy has been introduced they are now Monday to Sunday 8.00am to 2.00am, with a 1.00am One Way Door. The applicant seeks to further reduce the hours reduced to Monday to Sunday 11.00am to 2.00am the following day.
- [4] A change to the designation of the premise is also sought. The applicant seeks a supervised designation for the whole premise, apart from the function area where no designation is sought, until 10.00pm when the whole of the premises will have a restricted designation. The agencies do not oppose any of the variations sought.
- [5] The operation originally included a restaurant but this has closed and as detailed above the operation is now a bar and nightclub. The premise is one of only two late night premises in Ashburton open to 2.00am.
- [6] The application is opposed by the Alcohol Licensing Inspector and the Medical Officer of Health. The Police reported no opposition but have sought to be heard, and call witnesses, under s. 204(3) of the Act.
- [7] In her report, the Alcohol Licensing Inspector stated;
- ‘..this premise has traded for many years and has appeared before the Committee on a previous occasion. Lack of good management appear to be the underlying theme to the agencies concerns. Employing more experienced managers more recently does not appear to have addressed these concerns and Mr Millichamp needs to take more responsibility to good management and not allow or serve intoxicated patrons on the premises’.*
- [8] One of the issues of concern raised by the agencies was the practice of Mr Millichamp to act as both the DJ and duty manager whilst the premises were operating. They were concerned that whilst acting as the DJ Mr Millichamp could not adequately fulfil his duties as manager.
- [9] The applicant called four witnesses in support of his application and to explain some of the evidence to be given by the Police. The Inspector and Medical Officer of Health’s representative gave evidence. The Police called four witnesses.

Summary of Decision

Renewal of Licence - Millies Limited

- [10] At the end of the public hearing the Committee adjourned for deliberations and returned with a decision which was issued orally and would subsequently be followed up with a more comprehensive written decision.
- [11] The Committee decided that after hearing all the evidence and submissions that the renewal of the licence would be granted for the usual three year term but that a number of conditions would be placed on the licence. These conditions are detailed at the end of the decision.

Renewal Application for Millies Limited

- [12] The applicant in this matter is Millies Limited. It has one sole director and shareholder, Mr Paul Millichamp. He has operated the business from this premise since 2013 but has run a similar operation from another venue in Ashburton since 2006. There was a break between the businesses between 2011 and 2013 due to the loss of a lease due to the Christchurch Earthquake sequence.

Preliminary matters

- [13] Mr Millichamp sought to have the evidence of the Police excluded as they had not objected to the application and were now producing evidence in opposition. He believed that this constituted a breach of natural justice.
- [14] The Committee is cognisant of its duty to uphold the rules of natural justice and recognises the guidance of the Authority as stated in its decision *Stephen Dennis Sargent v Kapiti Supermarket Limited* NZARLA [2015] PH194

[16] After the expiration of the 15 day period and at the hearing before the DLC, the Police were not entitled to alter their original stance. Further, the DLC should have assumed that the Police had no matters in opposition to the application – s.103(4) of the Act. In this case, the change of stance occurred approximately three weeks after the original indication of no opposition and arguably the respondent did have time to appreciate the nature of the Police opposition and answer it. However, it is important that District Licensing Committees and the Authority require compliance with the statutory obligations of the reporting agencies. Too often recently have reporting agencies failed in this regard and as a result breaches of natural justice have occurred. This must not be permitted to continue. Finally, the waiver provisions contained in s.208 of the Act will seldom apply as the neglect or omission will usually be wilful.

*[17] The foregoing comments are not at variance with those made by Heath J in *Otara-Papatoetoe Local Board v Joban Enterprises Ltd* CIV 2011-404-007930; [2012] NZHC 1406 as to supplementary reports by the Police and Inspectors. These should be provided when, for example, background community information arising out of an objection would be helpful to the DLC or Authority. However, the provision of those reports does not entitle a reporting agency such as the Police to change its stance and oppose an application when it had previously indicated no opposition.*

[18] Arguably, to do so constitutes an abuse of process. This point was not argued at the hearing; and the Authority has not sought submissions on it. An abuse of process of this nature might cause the Authority to strike out an appeal, as it did in Whittle (supra).

- [15] It was our view that the circumstances of this case can be distinguished from the above by virtue that the Police have not changed their stance. They have not sought to oppose this application, a public hearing was sought by the Inspector, as she is entitled to do, and the Medical Officer of Health opposed the renewal. Police sought to appear, as they are entitled to do, by virtue of s.204(3) of the Act. They sought to bring matters before the Committee they believed were relevant in assisting the Committee in the evaluation of the application. The applicant did have time to appreciate the matters being raised by Police and was afforded an adjournment by the Committee so as to fully address these.
- [16] The Committee recognises that in finding a balance between the statutory reporting timeframes as set in the Act and the ability of the agencies to appear by virtue of s.204(3) it should always view these in light of the right of the applicant to be afforded their right to natural justice.
- [17] Taking into account the above we are also mindful that District licensing Committees (DLCs) operate within an inquisitorial framework and therefore need information to make well informed decisions. If our decisions do not include relevant information it is more often than not the local community that will suffer and the object of the Act will not be upheld.
- [18] The evidence that the Police sought to adduce was therefore allowed and added to the evidence placed before the committee. The weight placed on the evidence was however a matter for us to consider.
- [19] The Committee would make the comment that although it is always the prerogative of the Committee to hold a public hearing into a matter, if the Police were the only agency to oppose this application then it is more likely than not there would have been no hearing. The agencies must make their inquiries and report within the statutory timeframes as set out in the Act (The Alcohol Licensing Inspector does not have a statutory time for reporting) and report as they see the application as it is before them. If they have subsequent concerns they then have the enforcement provisions of the Act that allow them to take any matters further.

Evidence for the applicant

- [20] Mr Millichamp represented himself, he stated that the reason for this was to save money. He outlined the business's history and asked the Committee to be mindful that the main issues raised by the agencies, who reported in opposition to the renewal application, were;
- (i) issues with management, or lack thereof, and

(ii) hours of operation.

- [21] Mr Millichamp called five witnesses, including himself. He called Ms Vanessa Collins, Mr Richard Walker, Mr James Rae and Miss Angela Baxter.
- [22] Ms Collins gave evidence in regards to an incident at the premises on 26 January 2018 where her daughter had a medical event which Police attended. Police had asserted that staff at the premise had not acted in Ms Collin's daughter's best interest and failed to seek medical treatment for her in a timely manner.
- [23] Police attended as a result of being informed of the incident by security staff after the Police patrol had stopped outside the premises to speak to them. Police quite rightly attended to the young female and rendered assistance. They transported the female to hospital as an ambulance was some time from attending.
- [24] Ms Collins confirmed that she had given specific advice to the staff and management of Arcadia that an ambulance was not required to be called if her daughter had a seizure but they were to call her. On the night they did this but also alerted a passing patrol car as well as placing Miss Collins in the recovery position.
- [25] We do not criticize Police for their actions in transporting the female to hospital, they acted as they should have. There was some suggestion from Police that the female in question was intoxicated. This was not substantiated, and in fact there was no mention of intoxication on the hospital notes tendered as evidence by Ms Collins.
- [26] We do not take this matter further.
- [27] Mr Richard Walker confirmed that he is a licensed security guard and works at Arcadia Bar and Nightclub in Ashburton. He read a statement that he had written in relation to the same incident as described above. He confirmed what had taken place. In answer to questioning he confirmed that he was the staff member who was assaulted in the bar on 10 December 2017. The incident involved a male patron who after being asked to leave by staff due to his state of intoxication became angry. Mr Walker was struck on the head with a glass by this male and the male smashed a door on his way out of the premises. Police were called and the male was arrested.
- [28] Mr Walker told the Committee that most people who turn up to enter the bar had consumed alcohol beforehand and about 60% of patrons would be showing the early signs of intoxication. He outlined how he dealt with 'influenced' and intoxicated patrons and stated that they would get around 60 to 70 people inside the bar on a typical Friday and Saturday night and would be lucky if they got over 100 patrons. He also stated that he thought the premise had a good relationship with the Police.

- [29] Mr James Rae gave evidence for the applicant and confirmed that he was employed as a duty manager for the premises. He read his statement in which he confirmed the matters discussed previously about the incident with Miss Collins.
- [30] Mr Rae went on to state that he was more than happy to have his name up as a duty manager at the premises and thought it was well run. In answer to questions put to him Mr Rae confirmed that he now acts as the duty manager whenever Mr Millichamp is DJ'ing and that he works about 20 hours a week.
- [31] He gave clear answers in regards to his duties and when dealing with intoxicated patrons as well as confirming that he had received no formal training since working in the premises.
- [32] In answer to further questions Mr Rae agreed that most patrons who turned up to the premises would have been drinking elsewhere. He also confirmed that the door handle on the main entrance when Police visited on 17 December 2017 was only able to be opened from the inside and staff generally opened the door to let patrons out and allow entry to the premises.
- [33] Ms Angela Baxter confirmed her statement that was then taken as read. She confirmed that she is the holder of a manager's certificate, works at the Ashburton RSA as a manager and has 25 years' experience working in both New Zealand and Australian bars. She felt that Arcadia was a well-run establishment.
- [34] In answer to questions she confirmed that she also works as a manager at Arcadia and she had not received any formal training since she has been working at Arcadia.
- [35] Mr Paul Millichamp gave evidence on behalf of the applicant. He commented on the evidence raised by the agencies. In particular he disagreed that the male who was spoken to by the agencies during a monitoring visit on 17 December 2017 should have had what was left of his bottle of RTD taken from him and that it would not have made a big difference to the patron's state of 'influence'.
- [36] In answer to questions Mr Millichamp gave a good account of his knowledge of the 'SCAB' intoxication assessment tool as well as detailing the way in which he intervenes if customers are showing signs of becoming intoxicated. He was happy to have all his staff undertake the 'Servewise' training but confirmed that there was no formal training offered to staff. He did not see the need as they were all fairly experienced and they held regular meetings to discuss issues that occur.
- [37] Mr Millichamp produced copies of the premises incident log, intoxication assessment tool and a security plan.
- [38] In relation to the incident, when Mr Walker was assaulted with a glass on 10 December 2017, he stated that he had turned down the music and turned up

the lights which seemed help. This was confirmed by the attending Police who commented favourably on the way he dealt with the situation.

- [39] Mr Millichamp confirmed under questioning that 70 to 80 % of his income was derived from alcohol, 10 % from food and the rest from gaming machines. He also confirmed that there are seven gaming machines on the premises.

Evidence of the Agencies

- [40] The Alcohol Licensing Inspector, Mrs Helene Faass, submitted her report as evidence. She had no further to add and there were no questions asked of her.
- [41] The issues identified by the Inspector in her report stem primarily from the concerns of the Police and Medical Officer of Health but reported that the applicant had appeared before both the Authority, and the DLC on previous occasions. The applicant had appeared before the Authority in 2011 (see *Millies Limited* [2011] NZLLA 713-716) for failing to have food available and again in 2012 (see [2012] NZLLA PH 489) for trading without a qualified duty manager. Finally the applicant appeared before the Authority in 2015 (see *Millies Limited* [2015] NZARLA PH 464-465) due to three separate incidents involving intoxicated patrons and one incident involving inappropriate activities on the premises. In total the license has been suspended for five days and Mr Millichamp's manager's certificate has been suspended for a total of eight weeks.
- [42] The Police called three witnesses, Constable Townsend, Constable O'Reilly and Sergeant Sutherland. The witnesses confirmed the statements tendered as evidence and detailed incidents that they had attended at the premises.
- [43] Constable Townsend detailed his involvement with the incident with Miss Collins. We take that matter no further as we have detailed our view previously in this decision. The Constable was asked questions in relation to the incident on 10 December 2017 when Mr Walker was assaulted and his response to the way the incident was handled by the premise was complementary. In relation to the details of a male who was disorderly outside the premises after being refused entry he stated he could not recall if the male was intoxicated.
- [44] When asked his impression of the premises he stated that it caused Police trouble at the end of the night and that without failure when he was on duty there were issues at McDonalds with patrons who had left Arcadia. The observed behaviour of these individuals was play fighting and shouting.
- [45] His response to a question asking if he has witnessed any intoxication on the premises he stated that he hasn't seen any to date.
- [46] Constable Hugh O'Reilly confirmed his statement which detailed an incident that he attended at the premises of Arcadia on Sunday 30 July 2017. It involved two females where one had assaulted the other. He described one of the females as moderately intoxicated, showing two signs, and the other

not showing any signs of intoxication. The Constable was asked how the bar dealt with the incident and he explained that they had separated the two involved and when he spoke to Mr Millichamp he was shown the CCTV footage.

- [47] When questioned by Mr Millichamp about the female who he stated was slurring her words and had bloodshot eyes and had a cut to the head he opined that the signs of intoxication were not from a blow to the head.
- [48] Sergeant Gregory Sutherland is the Alcohol Harm Reduction Officer for the Mid-Canterbury area. Although he is based in Timaru his area of responsibility includes Ashburton. He gave evidence that he was not involved in reporting on the Millies Limited file as his predecessor had carried out the inquiries and reported without any opposition. He had however carried out four monitoring visits to the establishment since August 2017. He detailed only one of these visits when he assessed a female who was being removed from the premises by staff on 13 August 2017. He spoke to the female and observed that she was in a “highly influenced to intoxicated state”.
- [49] He detailed his main concerns as
- (i) Mr Millichamp acting as the duty manager whilst performing the role of being the DJ.
 - (ii) A lack of staff training.
 - (iii) Lack of management of patrons who arrive highly influenced and then become violent and cause damage outside the premises
 - (iv) That the licensee is allowing disorderly conduct on licensed premises in breach of section 253 of the Act, and;
 - (v) The premise reduces the amenity and good order of the locality particularly in relation to nuisance and vandalism.
- [50] The Medical Officer of Health’s representative, Mrs Katie Webster, confirmed the contents of her report. This detailed her discussions with the applicant in regards to the premises hours of operation, the change in designation and the number of managers.
- [51] She also detailed her observations from monitoring the premises on four separate occasions. The main issue from monitoring the premises was that Mr Millichamp was both the duty manager and the DJ when they visited. On one visit made with Police a male was spoken to and assessed regarding his level of intoxication but he was found to be influenced but not intoxicated and after confirming this with Mr Millichamp it was agreed that the male should not be served any more alcohol. There was a disagreement in regards to whether the male could finish a small amount of the RTD that he had in front of him. We take this no further. The male was not intoxicated and the recommendation of the agencies that the male was not served any more alcohol was agreed to.
- [52] There was some evidence referred to in Mrs Webster’s evidence around litter and amenity issues such as vomit and discarded rubbish. Mr Millichamp has stated that he sends staff around the outside of the premises after closing and

that this sort of thing is cleaned up. There is no direct evidence that the rubbish etc is from the premises and we take Mr Millichamp at his word that staff will indeed continue to monitor the outside of the premises and clean up what they can.

- [53] Mrs Webster confirmed that her main concern was the ongoing training of staff and she recommended that all staff complete the 'ServeWise' online training as well as receive 'Tri-agency' training.

Committees Decision and Reasons

- [54] When considering an application for the renewal of a licence the criteria which we must have regard are found at s.131 of the Act and includes matters in sections 105 of the Act. Sections.131 and 105 state;

131 Criteria for renewal

- (1) In deciding whether to renew a licence, the licensing authority or the licensing committee concerned must have regard to the following matters:
- (a) the matters set out in paragraphs (a) to (g), (j), and (k) of section 105(1):
 - (b) whether (in its opinion) the amenity and good order of the locality would be likely to be increased, by more than a minor extent, by the effects of a refusal to renew the licence:
 - (c) any matters dealt with in any report from the Police, an inspector, or a Medical Officer of Health made by virtue of section 129:
 - (d) the manner in which the applicant has sold (or, as the case may be, sold and supplied), displayed, advertised, or promoted alcohol.
- (2) The authority or committee must not take into account any prejudicial effect that the renewal of the licence may have on the business conducted pursuant to any other licence.

105 Criteria for issue of licences

- (1) In deciding whether to issue a licence, the licensing authority or the licensing committee concerned must have regard to the following matters:
- (a) the object of this Act:
 - (b) the suitability of the applicant:
 - (c) any relevant local alcohol policy:
 - (d) the days on which and the hours during which the applicant proposes to sell alcohol:
 - (e) the design and layout of any proposed premises:
 - (f) whether the applicant is engaged in, or proposes on the premises to engage in, the sale of goods other than alcohol, low-alcohol refreshments, non-alcoholic refreshments, and food, and if so, which goods:
 - (g) whether the applicant is engaged in, or proposes on the premises to engage in, the provision of services other than those directly related to the sale of alcohol, low-alcohol refreshments, non-alcoholic refreshments, and food, and if so, which services:
- And:
- (j) whether the applicant has appropriate systems, staff, and training to comply with the law:
 - (k) any matters dealt with in any report from the Police, an inspector, or a Medical Officer of Health made under section 103.

- [55] In regards to reports made under s.129, the Inspector and Medical Officer of Health reported in opposition to the renewal. Police did not oppose the renewal but subsequently sought to be heard and call witnesses under s.204(3) of the Act.
- [56] The Inspector's opposition to the renewal application relates to three of the criteria primarily relates to the evidence of the Medical Officer of Health and that which the Police sought to adduce. These issues were identified as
- (i) Appropriate systems, staff, and training. 105(1)(j)
 - (ii) The manner in which the applicant has sold, supplied alcohol. S.131(1)(d).
- [57] The evidence in this case, in our opinion, points to three key issues.
- (i) The role of Mr Millichamp as DJ and Duty manager.
 - (ii) Staff training, and;
 - (iii) The managing of patrons who have arrived at the premises and who have already been consuming alcohol.
- [58] The role of the Committee is to stand back and evaluate the evidence placed before it, weigh it against the criteria with which the application fits and return a decision which, in its opinion, will fulfil those criteria and ultimately fulfil the purpose and object of the Act. There are two fundamental questions we must ask ourselves when we evaluate a renewal;
1. Should the licence be renewed, in the light of the evidence placed before us?
 2. If the licence is to be renewed should the licence be renewed on the conditions presently attached to the licence or should the conditions be altered?
- [59] When we evaluate the evidence presented to us we note that there was one case of intoxication on the premises. This incident happened on 9 December 2017 when an intoxicated male was asked to leave by staff and whilst being removed struck one of the staff on the head with a glass. The male was described as 'heavily intoxicated' by Police however Police complemented the premise on the way with which they dealt with the incident.
- [60] We take the incident involving the young female who had a medical event no further. We believe that both the staff and Police acted appropriately. There was no credible evidence that the female was intoxicated.
- [61] In regards to the male who was assessed as 'influenced' but not intoxicated on 17 December 2017 we make the comment that it appeared that Mr Millichamp was annoyed that the agencies were monitoring his premises and his comments to Mrs Webster when he said, "Oh, we're going to play this game are we" were not helpful and suggest that he does not want to work with the agencies. His lack of cooperation was evident when he argued that the male should finish his drink even though the male offered up the drink. Having said that there were no offences committed. The evidence does speak to suitability. Licensees must cooperate with the agencies.

- [62] There were two other incidents mentioned in evidence, 13 August 2017 when Sgt Sutherland spoke to a female who was being removed from the premise. She was observed as being in a highly influenced to intoxicated state and an incident that occurred on 30 July 2017 where a female had assaulted another female. The victim was assessed as showing two signs of intoxication.
- [63] These incidents appear to show that some patrons are allowed to get to a point where they are having to be removed or are causing issues within the bar due to their state of intoxication. This concerns us as this is not a new situation in which the applicant finds himself. He has appeared before the Authority on similar matter in 2015.
- [64] On that occasion, as mentioned previously in this decision, the licence was suspended for three days and Mr Millichamp's manager's certificate was suspended for 28 days.
- [65] There is good and bad within the evidence presented before us. Mr Millichamp has been commended for the way he dealt with the situation involving the male who assaulted his staff member. The negative is that the male was intoxicated on his premises.
- [66] The Police did not oppose the renewal of the licence. They have however detailed incidents which point short comings in the management of the premises. We agree with the Police, and it is confirmed by the applicant's staff, that patrons who have been drinking elsewhere are seeking to enter the premises. They are allowed to enter after being assessed for intoxication but after a few drinks they start to show signs of intoxication and must be removed from the premises. This is the precarious nature of a late night venue.
- [67] A case often referred to by the Authority in regards to the privilege of holding a licence is *Hooper v Clark* [1999] NZLLA PH 1169. It is very pertinent to this application and it states;
- "A liquor licence is a privilege. It may colloquially be regarded as a "package deal". Both the burdens and the benefits run with the licence. Mr Clark as licensee must either accept those burdens and control the sale and supply of liquor in a satisfactory manner, or he will not continue to enjoy the privilege. Either the licensee can manage the premises and on-licence satisfactorily, or he cannot."*
- [68] The applicant now runs the very real possibility that if it appears on similar matters before the Authority again then the licence could be suspended for a much longer time, or the licence could be cancelled.
- [69] If there was ever a motivation to improve the premises it must be the prospect that awaits it if it appears in front of the DLC or Authority again on similar matters.
- [70] The matters which have been detailed in evidence before us are not as serious as the matters previously take before the Authority but they still give

cause for concern. However Mr Millichamp has undertaken to not work as both the duty manager and DJ. He has also undertaken to do the following within three months of the hearing;

1. Update the security Plan
2. Update the Host Responsibility Policy
3. Reinstate the training manual and record all training.
4. All staff will undertake training with the agencies.
5. All staff to complete the online ServeWise course.

[71] These undertakings have satisfied the Committee that the licence can be renewed for three years, which will in reality will be two years three months from the date of the expiry of the licence.

[72] We are satisfied as to the matters to which we must have regard as set out in s.105, 106 and 131 of the Act, the licence renewal is granted for three years, with the undertakings as given. The variation to the designation of the premises is granted.

[73] **The licence will not issue until the expiry of 10 working days from the date this decision is given to all parties.** That period is the time provided by s.155 of the Act for the lodging of a notice of appeal.

The renewal and conditions of the on-licence

The applicant must comply with all conditions specified on a licence.

The licence will be subject to the following conditions:-

Compulsory conditions – section 110 (2)

The following conditions are compulsory:

- (a) No Alcohol is to be sold on the premises on Good Friday, Easter Sunday, Christmas Day, or before 1pm on ANZAC Day to any person who is not present on the premises to dine.
- (b) Alcohol may only be sold the following days and during the following hours:

Inside the premises.
Monday to Sunday 11.00am to 2.00am the following day
- (c) Water will be freely available to customers on the premises while the premises are open for business.

Discretionary conditions – section 110 (1)

- (a) the following steps must be taken to ensure that the provisions of the Act relating to the sale of alcohol to prohibited persons are observed:
 - Display of appropriate signs adjacent to every point of sale detailing the statutory restrictions on the supply of alcohol to minors and the complete prohibition on sales to intoxicated persons.
- (b) the following steps must be taken to ensure that the provisions of the Act relating to the management of the premises concerned are observed:

- Alcohol must only be sold, supplied and consumed within the area marked on the plan submitted with the application.

Section 117 – Other discretionary conditions.

- (1) the following steps must be taken to promote the responsible consumption of alcohol:
- (a) The licensee must implement and maintain the steps proposed in their host responsibility policy aimed at promoting the reasonable consumption of alcohol.
 - (b) Water will be available by way of reticulated water stations in every bar area.
- (2) A One Way Door shall apply to the premises from 1.00am on every day.

Section 119 – Restricted or Supervised areas

- The whole of the premises shall be designated as supervised until 10.00pm when it shall be designated as restricted, apart from the function room which shall be undesignated at all times.

Other restrictions and requirements

Section 50 – One Way Door restrictions in Local Alcohol Policies to be complied with.

Section 51 - Non-alcoholic drinks to be available

Section 52 – Low alcoholic drinks to be available

Section 53 – Food to be available

Section 54 – Help with information about transport to be available

Section 56 – Display of signs

Section 57 – Display of licences

Section 214 – Manager to be on duty at all times and responsible for compliance

A copy of the licence setting out the conditions to which it is subject is attached to this decision.

THE LICENSED PREMISES

The premises are identified on the plan provided with the application for a licence.

DATED at ASHBURTON this 18th day of March 2018.



Chairperson
Ashburton District Licensing Committee