

Decision Number: 60F [2021] 8671

IN THE MATTER OF the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012

AND

IN THE MATTER OF an application by **PROGRESSIVE RETAILS LIMITED** for a new Off-Licence in respect of premises situated at **436 Prestons Road, Christchurch** to be known as **'The Bottle-O Prestons'**

BEFORE THE CHRISTCHURCH DISTRICT LICENSING COMMITTEE

Hearing: 14 October 2021 (at Christchurch)

Committee

Chairperson: Mrs M S Redstone, JP

Members: Mr D Blackwell, QSM
Ms A Keir

Appearances: Mr J Stringer, Counsel for the Applicant
Ms Manpreet Kaur, Director of the Applicant
Mr Lovepreet Singh Minhas, Operations Manager of the Applicant
Mr Craig Tarres, Objector
Mr Martin Fergusson, Licensing Inspector, to assist
Sergeant Dave Robertson, New Zealand Police, to assist
Mr Kelly Barber and Ms Linda Stewart, Community Board Delegates (leave to appear under s 204(2)(b))

Decision: 18 October 2021

RESERVED DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE

Contents

Introduction	2
Submissions and Evidence	3
Ms Manpreet Kaur and Mr Lovepreet Singh Minhas.....	3
Inspector Martin Ferguson	5
Sgt Dave Robertson.....	5

Mr Kelly Barber & Ms Linda Stewart on behalf of the Waitai Coastal-Burwood Community Board	5
Mr Craig Tarres - Objector	6
Other Objections	7
Closing Submissions.....	7
Considerations of the Committee	9
Evaluation and findings under s.105 and s.106 of the Act.....	10
Decision.....	14

Introduction

[1] This is an application by Progressive Retails Limited (the Applicant) for a new Off-Licence. The premises is situated at 436 Prestons Road, Christchurch, and to be known as ‘The Bottle-O Prestons’. The application was received on 3 June 2021.

[2] The Applicant seeks to establish a new premises in a shopping development in the subdivision of Prestons Park. The Applicant has sought the following trading hours:

Monday to Sunday, between the hours of 9:00am and 10:00pm

These hours are shorter than the default maximum trading hours for Off-Licences.¹

[3] The application was publicly notified on the Council’s website on 4 June 2021 and remained on the website for a minimum period of 15 working days.

[4] A total of fifty-four public objections were received within the required timeframe, with four of these not establishing standing. A further two late objections were received though not considered due to lateness.²

[5] The application was not opposed by the District Licensing Inspector,³ the New Zealand Police⁴ or the Medical Officer of Health (MOH)⁵

[6] The District Licensing Committee (DLC) members each undertook a site visit on an individual basis.

¹ Section 43 of the Act.

² DLC Minute (No.5) in this matter, dated 6 August 2021.

³ Inspector’s report 06/07/2021

⁴ Police notification of non-opposition 29/06/2021

⁵ MoH Report 21/06/2021 and 12/08/2021.

[7] A hearing of the application took place on 14 October 2021. We heard evidence and submissions on behalf of the applicant, from Mr C Tarres, one of the Objectors, and a submission from Mr K Barber and Ms L Stewart (Community Board Delegates).

Submissions and Evidence

[8] Mr Stringer opened on behalf of the Applicant. All briefs of evidence were taken as read, with a correction on behalf of the Applicant that the store in Lincoln Road mentioned in the brief of evidence of Manpreet Kaur was not yet open. Mr Singh Minhas then answered questions on behalf of the Applicant Company.

Ms Manpreet Kaur and Mr Lovepreet Singh Minhas

[9] In response to questions from the Committee, Mr Singh Minhas advised as follows:

- a) **Signage and Advertising** - There would be a Bottle O sign on the fascia above the store. The windows would be clear on the top half and have Bottle O pictures at the bottom as shown on a photo of another Bottle O premises produced at the hearing by Mr Singh Minhas as Exhibit LSM1. There would be no product signage on the windows and no sandwich board outside the premises. There may be a flag but only if that was allowed by the Developer.
- b) **Deliveries** - most deliveries would be through the front of the store where drivers and staff could assist each other. Deliveries were on demand, usually on a weekly basis and during the day.
- c) **Packaging and other Rubbish** - there were to be two communal bins at the back of the building. These would be emptied in the afternoon to avoid any noise nuisance at night. There may be communal bins for the entire complex.
- d) **Sale of Single Bottles of Beer and RTDs** - Mr Singh Minhas advised that when packs were broken in transit the Distributor provided packaging which allowed for re-packaging into packs of either 4 or 6. Mr Singh Minhas undertook on behalf of the company that there would be no single bottle/can sales (except of craft beer).
- e) **Specials** - There were monthly Bottle O specials which would be advertised inside the store. There would also be "Manager's specials" when products could be purchased from Distributors at a cheaper price. However these specials were never more than a maximum of \$2 cheaper than the normal retail price.
- f) **Communication with local community** - Mr Singh Minhas advised that they had talked with the Broker who said neighbours had been contacted and expressed no objection. They had also spoken to friends and colleagues who live in the area. Mr Singh Minhas commented further that this was a new community with a

deprivation level of 2 on the City Council Suburban Deprivation Scale, a copy of which was provided with the application.

- g) **Minimisation of Harm and Refusal to Supply** - Mr Singh Minhas said their other two stores refused to sell alcohol for various reasons several times a week. He said they would be promoting low and alcohol free alternative products by making these very visible within the store.
- h) **Sale of Tobacco** - Mr Singh Minhas advised that they would be keeping only a small amount of tobacco and vaping products which would be hidden under the counter and would only be made available on request. He referred to the fact that in their other stores it was only regular customers who knew tobacco and vaping products were available and other customers seldom asked. In answer to a question from Sgt Robertson about possible burglaries, he advised that they would not use "fog cannons" because of the possibility of tripping over product but would have a panic alarm together with security cameras both inside and outside the premises.
- i) **Opening Hours** - Mr Singh Minhas advised that they had sought opening hours of 9:00am to 10:00pm but would mostly open at a later time of 10:00am and close early when there were no customers. However they wanted the flexibility to open earlier and close later at busy times, for example pre-Christmas and other holiday periods.
- j) **Staffing** - the Applicant, if this licence was granted, would be appointing and training new staff to work alongside Mr Singh Minhas in the new store. In answer to a question from Sgt Robertson he outlined the present staffing across the two stores the company presently operates and said the building of the Prestons complex would not be completed for six months and more staff would be hired prior to opening. He was hoping to be able to hire experienced staff. In answer to a question around observing statutory breaks for staff he said if only one staff member was present they would close the store to allow for their breaks.
- k) **Staff Training** - the Applicant had attached a comprehensive staff training document to the application.
- l) **Competition & Viability** - in response to a question about the viability of the business and a concern about competition causing price cutting, Mr Singh Minhas said that Bottle stores do not tend to compete because their margins are low. They sell on convenience and service. He said the company was an experienced operator and knew how to make money by giving good service.

Inspector Martin Ferguson

[10] Mr Tarres put to the Inspector that he felt the 50 voices of objectors meant nothing. The Inspector responded that it was not a question of being worth nothing but more the weight put on evidence that cannot be tested when objectors do not choose to appear at a hearing. The Inspector further commented that the Committee is restricted in their deliberations by the fact that there is no Local Alcohol Policy (LAP) in force in Christchurch.

Sgt Dave Robertson

[11] Mr Tarres asked the Sergeant if there was any concern on the part of Police as to the number of stores in the area and proliferation generally across the City. In response the Sergeant advised that there was increasing concern about numbers of bottle stores but in the absence of a LAP the Committee is limited to considerations contained in sections 105 and 106 of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012 ('the Act'). He said further that proliferation was more of a problem for Police in low decile areas.

Mr Kelly Barber & Ms Linda Stewart on behalf of the Waitai Coastal-Burwood Community Board

[12] Mr Barber and Ms Stewart elaborated on the submission circulated. Mr Barber said that most often the Board does not comment on applications for new licences or renewals but in this case there was "surprise and concern". They were concerned firstly about the number of alcohol outlets within a five kilometre radius of the proposed site.

[13] Ms Stewart advised that there were closed Facebook Pages for Prestons and Prestons Park, and open Facebook pages for Waitikiri and Tumara Park. She said that following the advertising of this application they noticed quite a considerable response on these pages, predominantly negative. In response, Mr Barber and Ms Stewart had engaged with people in the area and reported that residents they spoke to were overwhelmingly against a Bottle Store within the commercial block. They said the residents of Alpine View Retirement Village expressed concern about the trading hours together with delivery and bin emptying/collection times together with possible criminal activity and/or antisocial behaviour.

[14] Mr Barber informed the Committee that there was a large plot of land directly opposite the new commercial area where the Applicant's store would be located. He advised he was a member of the Marshland Hall Committee who were negotiating with the

developer to buy that piece of land with the intention to build a substantial Community facility, including possibly a pre-school.

[15] Through the Chair Ms Stewart asked the applicant what interaction they proposed to have to support the local community. Mr Singh Minhas advised that his other stores assisted cricket teams and local BBQs to give something back. He would be happy to discuss the needs of the local community.

[16] The Community Board drew the Committee's attention to both the School and several pre-schools being within the vicinity of the proposed store. In response to a question from a Committee member he advised that the nearest High School was Mairehau (once the roading was completed through to Mairehau Road) but said there was high interest in the area being included in the Shirley Boys High and Avonside Girls High zone.

[17] Mr Barber advised that overall the Board felt this was a residential community looking for local businesses that would support that community by both taking and giving back and they felt that an alcohol outlet was not a good fit and was not wanted.

Mr Craig Tarres - Objector

[18] Mr Tarres referred to his submission and elaborated on it. He said he lived in Waitikiri and worked in the Marshland area. His children attended the Marshland School. In the course of his work he brokered and sold houses in the Prestons area so was in a position to talk to a lot of parents and residents in the area.

[19] Mr Tarres presented to the hearing some well researched information on the number of alcohol outlets per population in various Christchurch suburbs and noted the high proportion of outlets to residents in the Marshland/Prestons area. He said his main objection was the number of stores and felt the Committee had a responsibility when considering applications to keep communities safe from harm caused by alcohol by limiting the number of Licences. He also questioned the viability of the store.

[20] Mr Tarres was concerned that the proposed store would be within walking distance of Concord Place which contained some 38 Council Housing Units. He said there was already a Bottle Store on Burwood Road, a distance of approximately 300m from Concord Place and the proposed outlet would be only about 800m distant.

[21] When questioned by Ms Keir, a Committee Member, Mr Tarres advised that he had witnessed harm and problems with alcohol with some residents of Concord Place. He said it was not a safe street to walk down as residents could be aggressive and abusive. He expressed concern that with the proposed outlet, if it opened at 9:00am, alcohol would be accessible for some of these residents earlier than it was now. Ms Keir asked if the fact that the Applicant had said they would mostly open later than 9:00am changed his concern about harm with that particular group of people. He responded that he did not believe the applicant would open at a later time than 9:00am as Mr Singh Minhas had said they were in the business of convenience and would open if there were customers.

[22] In response to questions from the Chair Mr Tarres advised that he had lived in the area for over five years and before the New World Supermarket, the Rowdy Kitchen Restaurant and Bar and Liquorland Bottle Store existed. He said he was unable to point to any harm or nuisance that had arisen within the community following the opening of those outlets.

[23] In response to questions from Mr Stringer, Mr Tarres was unable to point to any evidence of harm or nuisance but his concern was about possible harm from proliferation of premises selling alcohol and he focused on the number of outlets in Prestons and surrounding suburbs.

Other Objections

[24] As noted previously there were 50 objections received to this application. They all focused on proliferation of bottle stores opening, together with possible alcohol related harm, noise and nuisance if this application was granted. Many also focused on the Marshland School, pre-schools and the Alpine View Retirement Village being in close proximity to the proposed outlet. While many noted perceived harm and nuisance that could arise within the community by the granting of the application, they did not point to any evidence of harm or nuisance from existing outlets to support their claims.

Closing Submissions

[25] On behalf of the Applicant, Mr Stringer said much had been made about proliferation, concentration and the number of alcohol stores in the area. He said in terms of proliferation, it was not a criteria to be considered under the Act. He said it may have a bearing in terms of specific criteria, for instance if there was evidence produced that demonstrates that proliferation generally contributes to a rise in alcohol abuse. However

there was no evidence today that had supported that. With the exception of the one block of flats mentioned, he noted that Prestons and Prestons Park was a reasonably wealthy area, being rated at Level 2 on the Deprivation Scale. He said this was an area experiencing a rapid expansion and would be one of the largest residential communities in Christchurch. He noted that there is no Local Alcohol Policy in place here so the number of outlets relevant to the number of people residing in the area did not apply under the section 105 criteria.

[26] Mr Stringer said groundswell was considered in relation to an application in Amberley by Townnill Limited where there was significant opposition within the Community along similar lines to what was heard today that the Community did not want another liquor store in the area. In that instance the argument was accepted by the Hurunui DLC⁶ which found that there was harm that would be created by the addition of another store but fundamentally that conclusion rested upon the popular view of the community and was reflected in the number of objections. However on Appeal, ARLA⁷ accepted that popular opinion alone is insufficient to form the basis for the refusal of that application. There was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the criteria under section 105 had not been satisfied.

[27] Mr Stringer noted that while it was legitimate for objectors to voice their concerns, what is ultimately the important material that the Committee must consider is the evidential foundation that has been laid about the criteria under section 105 and, in particular, the effect on the local amenity of the community. He said on the material heard this morning there was no direct, cogent, compelling evidence of such harm being created. He said there was speculation about potential consequences and concerns about the supply of alcohol generally. However, he said, there was nothing to demonstrate that this particular application would likely contribute to a harm in the community or an increase in alcohol related harm generally.

[28] Mr Stringer said the same could be said in respect to nuisance created by vandalism, crime, noise and nuisance. There was no evidence that a bottle store caused more noise than any other business.

[29] Mr Stringer said the object of the Act was to ensure that use of alcohol in the community was safe and responsible and that alcohol-related harm was minimised to the

⁶ Hurunui DLC Decision No. 57/OFF/478/2020.

⁷ *Townnill Limited* [2021] NZARLA 50.

greatest extent possible. The scheme of the Act did not prohibit further licences being granted but if a Committee receives evidence of harm that would arise if it were to grant the application then the application must be refused. He said there was no evidential foundation of risk if this particular application was granted.

[30] The Police and the Inspector had nothing further to add except to say that viability was not a consideration for this Committee.

[31] Mr Tarres submitted that he felt the law was against the community in respect to this type of application. He said there were sufficient outlets in the community and felt that proliferation should be considered in the future.

Considerations of the Committee

[32] Having considered the Application together with Agency Reports and Objections placed before it, together with the oral evidence and submissions received today, the Committee must now stand back and determine whether the application for a new Licence should issue.

[33] The Committee notes the comments of the Police, the Inspector and the Objectors in their frustrations at the lack of a Local Alcohol Plan (LAP) which, if available, could assist in shaping licensing decisions.

[34] We have listened to the Applicant and note the concerns of the Objectors and, in particular, that of Mr Tarres who appeared at the hearing to present his objection in person and we acknowledge the research he had done to present facts and figures to the Committee.

[35] The Committee notes that there were no objections raised as to the suitability of the Applicant to hold a Licence.

[36] The Committee cannot ignore public objections simply because the Agencies have not raised any opposition to the granting of the licence. We have to be able to identify facts that are directly relevant from the material presented. As the Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority said in *Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board v Level Eighteen Ltd* [2014] NZARLA PH 627-228:

“The decision of the DLC must be based upon some material that tends logically to show the existence of facts consistent with the finding and that the reasoning is supportive of the finding. The reasoning of the DLC and the inferences drawn from the facts, need to be logically available to the DLC.”

[37] We therefore proceed to evaluate the evidence presented using the approach outlined by the High Court in *Otara-Papatoetoe Local Board v Joban Enterprises Limited CIV 2011-404-007930 [2012] NZHC 1406*:

“the Authority is required to undertake an evaluative exercise. An appropriate framework would involve, in no particular order, consideration of:
(a) the criteria set out in s35 (1);
(b) the reports presented by the Police and Inspector...,
(c) Public objections...”

Evaluation and findings under s.105 and s.106 of the Act

[38] The role of section 105 and how it is to be approached in relation to applications has received plenty of judicial attention.⁸ The approach, when considering the licence application, is succinctly summarised as follows:⁹

“Is the decision-maker satisfied, having regard to all the relevant factors set out in s 105(1)(b)–(k) that the grant of the licence is consistent with the object of the Act?”

[39] The duty to “have regard to” requires that we turn our mind to the listed criteria. We are required to give them “genuine attention and thought”. The weight to be attached to each is a matter for us to decide.¹⁰ In *Medical Officer of Health (Wellington Region) v Lion Liquor Retail Limited [2018] NZHC 1123*, Clark J summarised the applicable principles in respect of the renewal of a licence, however, they apply equally to a new licence.

[40] Further, the evaluative function is an assessment of risk.¹¹ Clark J said at [43]

“The factors to be considered in the course of assessing an application for a licence or for renewal, as the appellants submitted, stand to be assessed in terms of their potential impact upon the prospective risk of alcohol-related harm”.

⁸ *Re Venus NZ Ltd [2015] NZHC 1377*, [2015] NZAR 1315 per Heath J; *Auckland Medical Officer of Health v Birthcare Auckland Ltd [2015] NZHC 2689* per Moore J; and *Christchurch Medical Officer of Health v J & G Vaudrey Ltd [2015] NZHC 2749*, [2016] 2 NZLR 382 per Gendall J.

⁹ *Re Venus NZ Limited* at [20] and *Auckland Medical Officer of Health* at [60] see Westlaw NZ, SA 105.02

¹⁰ *Foodstuffs (South Island) Ltd v Christchurch City Council* (1999) 5 ELRNZ 308, [1999] NZRMA 481 (HC).

¹¹ *Medical Officer of Health (Wellington Region) v Lion Liquor Retail Limited [2018] NZHC 1123*.

▪ ***The object of the Act***

[41] The object of the Act is that -

- a) The sale, supply, and consumption of alcohol should be undertaken safely and responsibly; and
- b) The harm caused by the excessive or inappropriate consumption of alcohol should be minimized.

The Act further states that the harm caused by the excessive or inappropriate consumption of alcohol includes -

- a) Any crime, damage, death, disease, disorderly behavior, illness, or injury, directly or indirectly caused, or directly or indirectly contributed to, by the excessive or inappropriate consumption of alcohol; and
- b) Any harm to society generally or the community, directly or indirectly caused, or directly or indirectly contributed to, by any crime, damage, death, disease, disorderly behavior, illness, or injury of a kind described in a) above.

We keep those objects to the forefront of our minds in considering the application.

[42] There are two arms to the Object of the Act and both must be met. In terms of the first arm we need to be satisfied that the sale and supply of alcohol by the applicant should be undertaken safely and responsibly. The second arm requires that harm caused by excessive or inappropriate consumption of alcohol should be minimised. 'Minimised' means reduced to the smallest amount, extent or degree. It does not mean eliminate altogether.¹² In *Lion Liquor Retail Limited*, Clark J held that "the legislative framework enacted by the 2012 Act was intended to restrict rather than relax drinking laws. The legislative measure proceeded on the basis of clear evidence showing a link between availability of alcohol and alcohol-related harm."

[43] Our role is an evaluative one, and we need to have regard to the extent to which granting a licence with conditions should minimise alcohol related harm.¹³ There is a presumption built in to the Object of the Act that excessive and inappropriate consumption of alcohol causes harm i.e. harm caused by *excessive or inappropriate* consumption of alcohol.

¹² See Shorter Oxford Dictionary; *Re Peony Spirits Limited* [2014] NZARLA 696 at [19]; *Linwood Food Bar Ltd v Davison* [2014] NZHC 2980 at [18] and *Auckland Medical Officer of Health v Birthcare Auckland Limited* [2015] NZHC 2689 at [115].

¹³ Alcohol related harm is defined in s5 to mirror that in s4(2) of the Act.

[44] 'Harm caused by excessive and inappropriate consumption' is defined broadly in section 4(2) of the Act to include harm in the form of crime, damage, disorderly behavior, illness or injury to individuals and to society generally and includes direct and indirect cause or contribution to harm.

[45] We now make assessments, based on the evidence before us and the various reports received, on each of the criteria contained in section 105 of the Act.

- ***The suitability of the applicant***

[46] We find that the Applicant is a suitable entity to hold a Licence and has considerable experience in holding Licences for three other locations, two of which are presently in operation with the other expected to open prior to Christmas. Neither the Inspector nor the Police could point to any problems that had arisen in respect to the operation of those premises.

- ***Any relevant local alcohol policy***

[47] There is no relevant local alcohol policy. Christchurch has the Christchurch Alcohol Action Plan (CAAP), a non-regulatory document. However it is not a substitute for a LAP prepared under sub part 2 of the Act.

- ***The days on which and the hours during which the applicant proposes to sell alcohol***

[48] The Applicant seeks hours of 9:00am to 10:00pm 7 days a week. Those hours are within the national default hours for an Off-Licence of 7:00am to 11:00pm. Mr Singh Minhas explained that the hours sought were longer than what would be required for the usual operation of the premises. He agreed that they were longer than the hours advertised for the other two premises operated by the Applicant. He said as a general rule the premises would open later and close earlier on less busy nights of the week. However, the longer hours would provide flexibility during busy periods such as over the Christmas holiday period.

- ***The design and layout of any proposed premises***

[49] No plan was provided showing the layout of the premises as the complex is still under construction. However the layout would be similar to the other Bottle O Stores operated by the Applicant.

- ***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 and services:***

[50] The Applicant proposes to sell a limited quantity of tobacco and vaping products which will be hidden from view and will only be made available on specific request.

- ***Whether (in its opinion) the amenity and good order of the locality would be likely to be reduced, to more than a minor extent, by the effects of the issue of the licence:***

[51] Amenity and good order is defined in section 5 of the Act as:

“in relation to an application for or for the renewal of a licence, means the extent to which, and ways in which, the locality in which the premises concerned are situated is (or, in the case of a conveyance, the localities where the conveyance is likely to travel are) pleasant and agreeable.”

[52] Section 106 requires the Committee to consider whether the amenity and good order of the locality would be likely to be reduced, by more than a minor extent, by the effects of the issue of this licence:

- (a) The following matters (as they relate to the locality):
 - (i) Current, and possible future, noise levels;
 - (ii) Current, and possible future, levels of nuisance and vandalism;

[53] The locality was described as a pleasant area in which to live and is noted as Level 2 on the Deprivation Scale. Objectors did not produce any significant evidence specific to this application to support that amenity and good order of the locality would be likely to be reduced, by more than a minor extent, by the effects of the issue of this Licence.

- ***Whether the applicant has appropriate systems, staff, and training to comply with the law:***

[54] The Applicant has appropriate systems, and will employ sufficient staff and provide training to comply with the law. The Applicant provided a comprehensive training plan and a Host Responsibility Plan attached to its application.

Decision

[55] Accordingly, having regard to the matters in sections 105 and 106 of the Act together with the evidence and submissions of the Applicant, the Agencies and the Objectors we are satisfied that the issue of a licence for a period of **12 months** subject to the following conditions is consistent with the object of the Act.

The Licensed Premises

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

Restricted and Supervised Areas - section 147(2)

- (b) The licensed area is designated as a supervised area.

Discretionary conditions – section 116 (1)

- (c) 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:
 - (i) 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.
- (d) The following steps must be taken to ensure that the provisions of the Act relating to the management of the premises concerned are observed:
 - (i) Alcohol must only be sold and supplied within the area marked on the plan submitted with the application.

Compulsory conditions – section 116 (2)

- (e) No alcohol is to be sold or supplied on the premises on Good Friday, Easter Sunday, Christmas Day, or before 1pm on Anzac Day.
- (f) Alcohol may only be sold or delivered the following days and during the following hours:

(i) Monday to Sunday, between the hours 9:00am and 10:00pm.

- (g) Drinking water is to be freely available to customers, while alcohol is being supplied free as a sample on the premises.

Section 117 – Other Discretionary conditions

- (h) The licensee must implement and maintain the steps proposed in The Bottle O Prestons Host Responsibility Policy¹⁴ aimed at promoting the responsible consumption of alcohol.
- (i) There shall be low alcohol and alcohol free products prominently displayed to promote responsible consumption of alcohol.
- (j) There will be no sales of single-serve RTDs (or Beers from broken cartons).
- (k) No sales will be made to young persons in school uniform regardless of their ability to produce ID.
- (l) There shall be no advertising of alcohol products attached to the exterior of, or visible from outside, the premises.
- (m) No sandwich boards shall be used to advertise the premises or goods for sale. One flag may be used, dependant on the approval of the Developer.

Conditions applying to all remote sales and supply of alcohol

- (n) The following information must be displayed on the internet site in a prominent place, in any catalogue used by the licence holder and on every receipt issued for any alcohol sold via the internet site.
- (i) The licence holders name, the licence number, and the date on which the licence expires.

¹⁴ Attached to the application

- (ii) A copy of the licence or a clearly identified link to such image must be displayed in a prominent place on the internet site.
- (o) The following steps must be taken to verify that people are over the purchase age:
 - (i) In the case of an order made using an internet site, telephone order, or physical order –The prospective buyer must declare that he is she is 18 years of age or over (and where the prospective receiver is involved that the prospective receiver is also 18 years of age or over)-
 1. Once, when the prospective buyer first commences the order process; and
 2. Again, immediately before the sale of alcohol is completed

Other restrictions and requirements

- (p) Section 56 – Display of signs
- (q) Section 57 – Display of licences
- (r) Section 59 – Requirements relating to remote sales by holders of off-licences.
- (s) Section 214 – Manager to be on duty at all times and responsible for compliance

[56] The licence shall be issued for 12 months.

[57] The Applicant's attention is drawn to section 259 of the Act which makes it an offence not to comply with certain requirements and restrictions imposed by or under the Act. Specifically, sections 46 to 63 and 231(1). The Applicant must comply with all conditions specified on a licence.

DATED at CHRISTCHURCH this 18th day of October 2021



Merelyn Redstone
Chairperson
Christchurch District Licensing Committee