

IN THE MATTER

of the Sale and Supply of
Alcohol Act 2012

AND

IN THE MATTER

of an application by Chadha
Hospitality Limited for renewal
of an on-licence pursuant to
s.127 of the Act in respect of
premises situated at 151 Main
Street HUNTLY known as "Essex
Arms".

BEFORE THE WAIKATO DISTRICT LICENSING COMMITTEE

Commissioner: Dr M Cameron
Members: Dr P Davies
Mr B Smedts

HELD at NGAARUAWAAHIA at 10.00am Thursday 23 April 2026.

APPEARANCES:

Ms H Singh, Director of the applicant company
Mr J Young, Counsel for the applicant company
Ms C Sturzaker, Licensing inspector
Mr B Wipa, Medical Officer of Health delegate (MOH)
Snr Sgt David Hall, NZ Police, to assist the Committee
Ms M Peka, Objector
Dr G Hewison, Counsel for the Objector

SITE VISIT:

The District Licensing Committee (the Committee) made a site visit on the afternoon of Wednesday 22 April 2026. The director and counsel of the applicant company were present.

DECISION

The application for renewal of an on-licence for the premises situated at 151 Main Street, HUNTLY known as "Essex Arms" is granted, for a period of one year from the date of this

decision. The licence may issue once the applicant provides a signed undertaking to the Committee Secretary as noted in paragraph [165] of this decision.

INTRODUCTION:

[1] Chadha Hospitality Limited has applied for renewal of an on-licence for the premises situated at 151 Main Street, HUNTLY and known as “Essex Arms”. The application was filed with the Waikato District Council on 13 February 2025.

[2] The general nature of the business was at issue, and subject to a variation proposed by the inspector, but as noted later in this decision the Committee has determined that the general nature of the business is that of a tavern.

[3] The application was advertised in accordance with section 101. Two public objections were received. Reports on the application were received from an inspector, the Medical Officer of Health, and the Police. The Medical Officer of Health opposed the renewal application. The inspector opposed a renewal for three years, but was not opposed to a truncated renewal of one year from the date of the Committee’s decision. The Police were not opposed. Given the public objection and opposition from two of the reporting agencies, the application was set down to be determined at a public hearing.

HEARING:

Preliminary Matters:

[4] At the commencement of the hearing, the Committee raised several potential conflicts of interest: (1) between the Commissioner Dr Michael Cameron and Counsel for the objector, Dr Grant Hewison; (2) between Committee Member Mr Barry Smedts and Dr Hewison; and (3) between the Commissioner and Counsel for the applicant Mr John Young. The first two potential conflicts related to historic professional relationships which occurred ten or more years prior to the current matter. The third potential conflict related to legal opinion that Mr Young had previously provided to the Licensing Committee on other matters, where the Commissioner was one of the members of the Committee. No parties raised objections, and the hearing proceeded with the original Committee members.

Opening Submissions – Applicant:

[5] Mr Young summarised his opening submissions. Mr Young asserted that none of the reporting agencies had opposed the application on the basis of suitability or amenity and good order. He drew the Committee’s attention to the Authority’s decisions in Ponda Holdings Limited [2014] NZARLA 558 and Hendry v Tanishanaya Holding Limited [2025] NZARLA 181 (Hendry). Mr Young accepted that extended suitability applied in assessing this application, but argued that on the basis of the case law he cited, as there was no reporting agency opposition on the basis of suitability, the extended suitability approach was significantly diminished.

[6] Mr Young discussed several of the issues raised by the objectors in their pre-filed evidence and submissions. On the observance of principles of the Treaty of Waitangi, Mr Young referred the Committee to the Authority's decision in Hendry.

[7] On community engagement, Mr Young challenged the applicant's reliance on the High Court decision in Deol Enterprises 2012 Limited [2025] NZHC 2945, noting that the Deol decision related to a new application, not a renewal. Mr Young noted that the Authority has found that community engagement is not obligatory, referring to Hendry, as well as Huntly Grocer Limited v Waikato District Council [2025] NZARLA 167. Mr Young submitted that the combined effect of the Hendry and Huntly Grocer decisions is that: (1) community engagement or consultation is not obligatory; (2) practice experience is relevant, particularly when in similar communities; and (3) public notification of an application is the mechanism by which members of a community can express their views.

[8] On the issue of varying the licence such that the general nature of the business is a tavern, rather than a hotel, Mr Young submitted that the variation is uncontroversial, and that it "will rationalise a change to the operation of the premises".

[9] Mr Young argued that "[p]ursuing concerns about gaming in an alcohol licensing setting is an abuse of process", pointing the Committee to the Authority's decision in *Alicious v LNDLU & Co Ltd* [2021] NZARLA 36. He also questioned the relevance of two cases in counsel's submissions for the objectors. On *Police v Micmat Ltd & Ors* [2026] NZARLA 63, Mr Young noted that the case was an enforcement proceeding and not relevant to licence applications. On *Aashi Ventures* [2023] NZARLA 187, Mr Young noted that the renewal application had a different factual matrix, as it related to an off-licence renewal application where the applicant had been unwilling to accept various conditions.

[10] Mr Young submitted that the evidence for both the MOH and the objectors is "highly generalised and unformulated". He noted that the statements of three witnesses for the objectors were very similar and, in parts, identical.

[11] Mr Young noted that only a few incidents listed by the Police mentioned alcohol. He submitted that the carpark could be of higher risk without the Essex Arms, CCTV, and passive surveillance.

[12] Mr Young challenged the credibility of the objector, Ms Peka, questioning whether she is a Māori Warden. Mr Young stated that "it has been made known to her and her counsel (Mr Hewison) that she does not hold a warrant issued by Te Puni Kokiri under the Māori Community Development Act 1962".

[13] Finally, Mr Young said that the applicant would accept a truncated renewal. He submitted that "the application meets the requirements of the Act" and noted that "a truncated renewal provides added comfort".

[14] At the conclusion of Mr Young's submissions, the Committee asked both Mr Young and Dr Hewison whether the Authority or the High Court had ever referred to the *Ellis v R* Supreme Court decision in relation to licensing matters. Mr Young referred to the Hendry decision and said that it had come up in a recent case in Gisborne, while Dr Hewison also pointed to Hendry.

Witness for the applicant – Mr H Singh:

[15] Mr Harpreet Singh, director of the applicant company, read his brief of evidence. He introduced himself and outlined his background and experience. He and his brother bought their first on-licence premises in 2013, and currently own three on-licensed premises under different companies, including F Bar in Manurewa, Essex Arms in Huntly, and Aleways Inn Bar in Thames. Until December 2025, they also owned The Local in St Andrews, Hamilton. They have owned the Essex Arms since 2018.

[16] Mr Singh stated that he visits the "Essex Arms regularly (generally every two to three weeks) to meet with staff and duty managers and to discuss its operations". He noted that he was also at the premises whenever there is a large event.

[17] Mr Singh then explained that they had applied to vary the on-licence, as "[w]e have not been operating the full restaurant so I don't consider that we meet the definition of a hotel. As such, we have removed the accommodation from the licensed footprint". Mr Singh noted that they still offer food and have a bar menu, and that they will "continue to look for a restaurant operator".

[18] Mr Singh accepted that a truncated renewal, as sought by the Police and inspector, was appropriate "as we need to show that we are trading well given the two" controlled purchase operations (CPOs).

[19] Mr Singh then addressed the opposition to the application. He noted that he did not think he had ever met Mr Wipa (the MOH delegate), or that Mr Wipa had ever spoken with any staff at the premises. Mr Singh also noted that he had never met the objectors, Ms Peka or Ms Matenga.

[20] On the failed CPOs, Mr Singh acknowledge that they failed a CPO on 23 September 2023, and that the on-licence was suspended for 48 hours. He also acknowledged failing a CPO on 8 March 2025, and that the on-licence was suspended for 72 hours.

[21] On the latter CPO, Mr Singh provided a copy of evidence put before the Authority noting that the duty manager, Kevin Walker, has tried to immediately rescind the sale. They continue to employ him as a duty manager.

[22] Mr Singh noted that they had identified the manager handover as the primary reason for the failed CPO, and "we have implemented a policy and briefed our staff about duty manager handovers in which the out-going duty manager and the oncoming duty manager spend about 10 minutes going through a brief overview of their shift, incidents, updating name on the board, and other operational matters".

[23] Mr Singh noted that "I am acutely aware that we have two strikes and I'm committed to ensuring there are no more".

[24] Mr Singh acknowledged that "there have been occasional issues at other bars" that he operates. He noted a sale to an intoxicated person at Rocker Box in Thames on 12 June 2024, where they accepted a licence suspension. He also noted a sale to a minor at F Bar Manurewa in 2019. He suggested that these were "isolated incidents in over 13 years of trading across multiple venues", but noted that "[w]e do, however, take them very seriously".

[25] Mr Singh also acknowledged that his brother has an active charge for excess breath alcohol, but noted that his brother had been removed as a company director.

[26] Mr Singh then addressed the objections, noting that they “have traded in this community for many years so I considered that I know that community well. So do my staff. Kevin has worked at the premises for 15 years. We engage with members of the community every day”. Mr Singh also noted that “[n]one of the sensitive sites identified by the objectors have objected”.

[27] On gaming, Mr Singh said that “[w]e comply with the Gambling Act and our Class 4 licence. There are no issues with the DIA”.

[28] On the list of incidents provided by the Police, Mr Singh noted that he had not been able to locate his incident books for 2022 or 2023, but that they had records of almost all incidents from 2024 onwards, and that he considered that they had dealt with them appropriately.

[29] Mr Singh closed his evidence by stating that the company “has good staff, systems and training that will ensure we meet the Act’s object” and reiterated that they would also accept a truncated renewal. He said that he was also “open to discussing conditions but it is difficult to connect the conditions sought by the objectors to the evidence they have written”.

[30] Mr Singh then answered questions from the Committee. Asked how he decided to sponsor the speedway and pool club, Mr Singh responded that the pool club was an in-house club, and they wanted uniforms, and that a lot of people stay at the hotel when the speedway is on.

[31] Asked to explain his understanding of the demographics of Huntly, Mr Singh mentioned Huntly College, a couple of churches, the rugby league club, and the Sikh temple. He noted that there was a library opposite the premises, and a council office. He said the majority of people are of Maaori descent, and that there are 7000 to 8000 people in Huntly.

[32] Asked how he engages with members of the community, Mr Singh responded that he knows his regulars and local businesspeople. Their engagement with the community is in-house. He referred to Kevin and Gael, saying that they “know everything about Huntly”.

[33] In relation to the busiest night at the premises, Mr Singh said that it was Thursday or sometimes Friday, and that there were 20 to 25 people at the premises.

[34] Responding to questions from the Committee, Mr Singh said that he had not talked with any of the sensitive sites, or the objectors. He had not spoken with the local marae recently, but had maybe done so two years ago. He was not a member of the local business association, but said that he would love to join. He had not talked to any of the nearby shops. Mr Singh could not name the local district councillor.

[35] When asked whether he accepted that Huntly was a vulnerable community, Mr Singh said that “it might be true, but our clientele is business owners or tradies”. Asked what his understanding of the term vulnerable is, Mr Singh responded that there was less money in the family, and mentioned drug abuse.

[36] Asked how often he was at the premises, Mr Singh responded that he was there every two weeks. He lives in Karaka, 40 minutes away from the premises. He has a WhatsApp group to keep in contact with his staff.

[37] Asked whether he had seen examples of alcohol-related harm, Mr Singh responded that he had not, and that he does not “go into town much”.

[38] Responding to a question about what is different about Huntly compared with his other premises, Mr Singh responded that it has the “same sort of clientele”, and that it was more blue collar, and more Maaori. The age range of patrons was 30 years and over.

[39] Asked how often there were large events or functions at the premises, Mr Singh responded that these occurred three or four times each year, and offered the examples of birthdays or unveilings.

[40] Asked why he didn’t engage with the community, given the failed CPOs, Mr Singh responded that he wasn’t aware that he had to if there was a variation.

[41] Asked whether he changed processes at all after the first failed CPO in 2023, Mr Singh said that they used to allow minors on the premises, but now restrict it to “18-plus”. They also started doing training more often, and now do training six-monthly.

[42] In response to a similar question about the second failed CPO in 2025, Mr Singh responded that they now use Servewise as part of training, and added in-person training by Hospitality NZ as well, and that they will be further adding Typsy training. Mr Singh also explained the handover process between managers.

[43] Asked whether the staff training was tailored to this premises, Mr Singh responded that there was nothing specific.

[44] In response to a question about whether any incidents were not reported to Police, Mr Singh said that they usually call the Police. Asked about surveillance of the carpark, Mr Singh noted that they have CCTV cameras already.

[45] The Committee then asked Mr Singh if he would be open to developing a forward-looking Training Plan for the premises, including the proposed Hospitality NZ and Typsy training. Mr Singh indicated that he would be open to producing such a plan.

[46] When asked why the inspector had such trouble getting training records from him, Mr Singh responded that he had been busy with the birth of his second child in September 2024, and it had been a difficult pregnancy. Mr Singh said that he “had a terrible 2024”.

[47] Asked whether he would be open to having an Alcohol Management Plan and a Security Plan at the premises, Mr Singh indicated that he would.

[48] In response to a question about what training he did as a director, Mr Singh responded by referring to Servewise and Hospitality NZ training, and that he would start doing Typsy training as well. He confirmed that he had done no specific training as a director.

[49] Asked why he had removed his brother as a director, Mr Singh responded that his brother was not a responsible director, and that he had been removed as a director from the other companies as well, as of 1 April 2026.

[50] Responding to questions about his intentions for the restaurant area, Mr Singh said that he wanted to run it as a restaurant again. However, it needs some capital, and a tidy up. He is looking at running the restaurant himself now, rather than outsourcing.

[51] Asked whether he was open to a requirement to clean the carpark, Mr Singh responded that they clean the carpark already.

[52] Asked whether the Hospitality NZ training template had been updated since 2018, Mr Singh responded that it had not been up until two weeks ago, but he could check.

[53] Responding to redirect questions from his Counsel, Mr Singh noted that you have to be a Hospitality NZ member in order to access Typsy training. Asked about what forward planning for training he had in his mind, Mr Singh reiterated Servewise, Hospitality NZ, and Typsy. Asked whether documenting that would be useful, Mr Singh agreed.

Witness for the objector – Mr T Maipi:

[54] Mr Taitimu Maipi's brief of evidence was taken as read. Mr Maipi lives in Huntly and appeared in support of the objectors. His brief of evidence discussed the issues that Maaori face in relation to alcohol-related harm, noting that those issues stemmed from our history of colonisation. Mr Maipi noted that "the confiscation of land and resultant saturation of Paakehaa customs and culture continues to negatively impact Maaori communities, including those in the Waikato and Raahui Pookeka" (Huntly).

[55] Mr Maipi noted that the premises "is located in a very deprived area" that has "significant issues with crime, drug abuse and alcohol related harm". He urged the Committee to protect our rangatahi and whaanau, and "to ensure that their wellbeing is prioritised over the interests of the alcohol industry".

[56] Mr Maipi provided the Committee with his views of the application and the licensing process. Mr Maipi expressed his frustration with the process, and with the number of alcohol outlets in the area.

[57] Asked by the Committee about the impacts he had seen, Mr Maipi referred to alcohol and drink driving, just about every weekend. He noted that alcohol is a part of sports. He also referred to "beating up wives".

[58] Asked whether he had ever been to the Essex Arms, Mr Maipi responded that he had been many times, but most recently ten years ago.

[59] Asked whether he had seen alcohol-related harm in the area of the premises, Mr Maipi noted that he had heard loud noises and swearing, but conceded that this was "not often".

Objector – Ms S Matenga:

[60] Ms Sheryl Matenga's brief of evidence was taken as read. Ms Matenga lives in Huntly.

[61] Ms Matenga noted that "[t]here are already many licensed premises in Raahui Pookeka. In my view, there is too much alcohol available, and this contributes to problems such as violence, disorder, and harm in our neighbourhoods. Renewing this licence will add to these issues rather than reduce them".

[62] Ms Matenga noted the proximity of the premises to sensitive sites, including "the awa, schools, churches, community facilities, health services, and support services for people dealing with addiction". She noted that "[t]his makes the location particularly sensitive and unsuitable for continued alcohol supply".

[63] Ms Matenga challenged whether the applicant had "a proper understanding of our community", and noted that there was "no clear evidence of engagement with local residents, Maaori, or organisations working to reduce harm".

[64] Ms Matenga noted her concern about the adequacy of staff training and systems, raising the issue of the failed CPOs. She further noted that "[f]rom a tikanga Māori perspective, our rangatahi are precious and deserve protection", noting that the failed CPOs reflect "a failure of responsibility and undermines the role of businesses as kaitiaki in keeping our young people safe".

[65] Asked by the Committee about harm in and around the premises, Ms Matenga noted that the bus stop outside the hotel was a "public gathering spot", and that the area "is a starting point for parties that go through the night".

[66] Asked whether she had ever been to the Essex Arms, Ms Matenga admitted that she had not, but noted that she goes past it daily.

[67] Asked what kinds of harms she had seen in the neighbourhood, Ms Matenga noted that rangatahi (young people) were carrying deep trauma. She mentioned young families misusing alcohol, and said that within five months there had been twelve suicides, with 70 percent involved alcohol. One of those was aged over 50, one over age 30, and the rest were young.

[68] Asked what things the Essex Arms needed to do to minimise alcohol-related harm, Ms Matenga responded that they could stop selling alcohol, and stop gambling. They could reduce hours, and be less enticing for the community to come out and drink, and socialise.

[69] Asked to clarify why each of the sensitive sites she named were sensitive, Ms Matenga responded that the Waikato awa is a place of healing, and "is part of who we are". She pointed to her opening, where she referred to "Waikato te awa", and said that "it is our identity". In relation to schools, students from Huntly College must go past the premises, and there is a youth hub (InspireHub) across the road from the premises. For community facilities, there is a foodbank across the road. It is always full of whaanau, and with "kaumaatua of all races". The foodbank is open from 10am until late in the afternoon. Also, the library is a hub for young people with free WiFi. On addiction support services, Ms Matenga noted that vulnerable families that are already shy to reach out for help become more vulnerable.

[70] Asked what would have satisfied her in relation to training, Ms Matenga responded “not having a history of selling to minors”, and “being credible and responsible”. Regarding tikanga, Ms Matenga said it was ‘absolutely’ her position that rangatahi are to be protected.

Objector – Ms M Peka:

[71] Ms Mereana Peka’s brief of evidence was taken as read. She is a warranted Maaori Warden. Her warrant number is 5155, and she is a life member of the Maaori Wardens. The details in her brief of evidence were substantively the same as those in Ms Matenga’s brief of evidence.

[72] Ms Peka made a further oral statement, where she noted that she was “really disappointed at what is happening to their families”. However, she noted that she was “not blaming anybody”. Ms Peka stated that “[w]e should not be coming to hearings all the time to look for solutions”, and “[w]e have to look at something different to what we have been doing”.

[73] Asked what should be done differently, Ms Peka responded that they used to go into bars and talk to patrons, especially Maaori. Asked if she had ever been to the Essex Arms, Ms Peka responded that she had, but it had been closed. She noted that she comes to Huntly two to three times per month.

[74] In response to a question about what alcohol-related harm she had observed around the premises, Ms Peka said that she had seen broken bottles, crushed cans, and people intoxicated. She noted that this “is the training ground for the Maaori Wardens”.

[75] Asked how the applicant should engage with the community, Ms Peka responded that the applicant should “go out and talk to the community” and asked “why can we not work together?”.

[76] Asked if she had changed her view, having heard from the applicant, Ms Peka responded that she “doesn’t seem to see a positive outcome”.

Opening Submissions – Objectors:

[77] Dr Hewison summarised his opening submissions, after the objectors had presented their evidence. He started by summarising the statutory framework, drawing the Committee’s attention to the High Court decision in *Deol Enterprises 2012 Limited* [2025] NZHC 2945.

[78] Dr Hewison also noted the significance of tikanga to the objectors, and pointed the Committee to the Supreme Court’s decision in *Ellis v R* [2022] NZSC 115, where the Supreme Court “recognised that tikanga was the first law of Aotearoa/New Zealand and that it continues to shape and regulate the lives of Maaori”. He asserted that “tikanga must inform the DLC’s discretionary decision-making under the Act”, and that “objections grounded in the protection of rangatahi and Tamariki engage the tikanga principles”.

[79] On the variation application, Dr Hewison submitted that “this is a very different proposition with very different risks of alcohol related harm to a hotel with accommodation and a restaurant”. He noted that the objectors “oppose this proposition and application”.

[80] On suitability, Dr Hewison noted the vulnerability and deprivation of the community, and submitted that “the higher threshold of ‘extended suitability’ applies to this application”.

[81] Dr Hewison noted the number of negative holdings for the applicant company and associated companies, and submitted that “ARLA has lifted the corporate veil in situations like this and it is submitted that the DLC should do so here”. Dr Hewison also pointed the Committee to the Authority’s decisions in *Police v Micmat Ltd & Ors* [2026] NZARLA 63 and *Aashi Ventures* [2023] NZARLA 187.

[82] On the absence of meaningful engagement with the community, Dr Hewison pointed the Committee again to the High Court’s *Deol* decision. Dr Hewison submitted that “the practices of the applicant fall well short of the standard that applies in a vulnerable community, such as *Raahui Pookeka / Huntly*” and that “the applicant is not suitable to hold this licence”.

[83] On design and layout, Dr Hewison submitted that “the gambling machines will be a prominent feature of the premises if the variation is granted with half of the premises used for gambling machines”. He submitted that “the premises will not meet the criteria in section 105(1)(e) of the Act”, and that “the premises will not meet the criteria in section 105(1)(g) of the Act”.

[84] On amenity and good order, Dr Hewison submitted that “the variation of the premises from a hotel to a tavern (with police gambling services being a prominent feature) carries with it heightened and different risks for amenity and good order compared with a hotel with accommodation and restaurant food”.

[85] On systems, staff, and training, Dr Hewison noted the negative holdings against the applicant company and associated companies, and submitted that “the applicant does not have appropriate systems, staff, and training to comply with the law”. Dr Hewison also noted that the objectors were concerned about the systems in light of the limited changes in response to the failed CPOs.

[86] Finally, Dr Hewison noted that the Object of the Act is to be read as a standalone criterion, and submitted that “the applicant fails to meet the object of the Act of minimising alcohol-related harm due to: repeated compliance breaches, including failed CPOs; inadequate systems and training; as well as poor host responsibility practices and that the premises is located in a highly vulnerable, deprived community already experiencing significant alcohol-related harm, with numerous sensitive sites nearby”. He further submitted that “granting this application would be contrary to the object of the Act”. He noted that the objectors believed that a truncated period would be appropriate if the Committee were minded to grant the renewal and variation.

Witness for the Objector – Ms C Healey:

[87] The Committee received a written brief of evidence from Ms Cath Healey. However, Ms Healey did not appear in support of her submitted brief, and the Committee have therefore attached minimal weight to her evidence.

Licensing Inspector – Ms C Sturzaker – in opposition:

[88] Ms Sturzaker's report was taken as read. In response to questions from the Committee, Ms Sturzaker confirmed that she was not opposed to the renewal or variation, but recommended a truncated renewal period of one year. She noted that her recommendation was a joint decision based on conversation with counsel for the applicant company, and that there were "a lot of little things", none of which were enough to oppose the renewal outright. Asked whether one of the little things was suitability, Ms Sturzaker responded that it was, based on the training. She questioned what training staff are getting on the conditions of the licence.

[89] Asked whether there was anything missing from the staff training, which was quite generic, Ms Sturzaker noted that training "doesn't have to be arduous" and that it "should be very regular".

[90] Asked to clarify about what kinds of litter she had observed on visits to the premises, Ms Sturzaker mentioned RTD cans, which were "the same kinds of RTDs sold at the premises".

[91] Asked for her views about the forecourt area being part of the licensed footprint, Ms Sturzaker said that she "didn't understand why it was there", and that she had never seen the restaurant open.

[92] Questioned as to whether the applicant had been breaching their licence conditions, as asserted by Dr Hewison, Ms Sturzaker responded that the applicant had taken steps to rectify this through the licence variation that has been sought.

[93] Asked whether a tavern licence is necessarily higher risk than a hotel, Ms Sturzaker responded that "the fee structure has them both as medium risk". Asked to clarify whether that was true for this particular premises, Ms Sturzaker noted that the premises hasn't had a full menu since 2023, so they had already been operating as a tavern.

Medical Officer of Health – in opposition:

[94] Mr Wipa's submissions and brief of evidence were taken as read. In his submissions, Mr Wipa noted that the premises is in a high deprivation area, and he submitted that "[a]gainst that background... the applicant had not demonstrated appropriate systems, staff or training to comply with the law as required by section 105(1)(j).

[95] Mr Wipa noted the pattern of breaches across associated entities operated by the same directors, and submitted that "repeated breaches of the Act involving prohibited persons, particularly minors, weigh heavily against the section 4 object".

[96] Mr Wipa then noted the generic nature of the documentation, and submitted that "these deficiencies must be assessed in light of the applicant's repeated failures to prevent sales to

minors". Mr Wipa submitted that the evidence "demonstrates that systems and training have not been effective in practice". He also submitted that "governance and operational control have been insufficient to meet the elevated standard required in vulnerable locations".

[97] Mr Wipa noted that "the continued operation of a premises with a record of repeated sales to minors, inadequate training systems, and weak oversight presents a real risk of further harm". He submitted that "granting the renewal would be inconsistent with the object" and asked that the applicant be declined.

[98] In his evidence, Mr Wipa outlined the demographics of Huntly, drawing particular attention to the high level of social deprivation, noting that "[t]he premises are situated in a decile 8 meshblock and surrounded by decile 9 and 10 meshblocks. This indicates that the premises are located within, and serve, a community experiencing high levels of socioeconomic deprivation".

[99] Mr Wipa also presented evidence that between January 2020 and May 2025, "there were 401 alcohol related Emergency Department presentations to Waikato Hospital for patients who reside in the Huntly East and Huntly West domiciles".

[100] Mr Wipa then noted that the applicant has "a limited range of food available rather than a reasonable range of food available", and that none of the food appears to be "substantial meals" as required by the Act.

[101] Mr Wipa listed a number of premises associated with the applicant director and his brother, noting that all premises "are located in deprivation 9 or 10 areas". Mr Wipa noted that all premises have Mr Singh listed as a duty manager, and Mr Wipa questioned how much time Mr Singh spends working at each premises.

[102] Mr Wipa then listed various appearances before the Authority of the applicant company and related companies, including: (1) Rocker Box Limited trading as Imperial Hotel (Thames), which received a 48-hour licence suspension in 2024 for selling to an intoxicated person; (2) Chadha 2014 Limited trading as F Bar (Manurewa), which received a 48-hour licence suspension in 2019 for selling to a minor; and (3) the applicant company Chadha Hospitality Limited trading as Essex Arms Hotel (Huntly), which received a 48-hour suspension in 2023 and a 72-hour suspension in 2025, both for selling to minors. Mr Wipa also noted opposition to an application to renew the licence held by Chadha 2018 Limited trading as Frankton Hotel (Hamilton), due to an active excess breath alcohol charge against the director Gagan Singh.

[103] Asked whether he had visited the premises, Mr Wipa responded that he had visited in March 2025, a couple of days before his report.

[104] Asked what a licensee has to do, in a place like Huntly, Mr Wipa responded that the licensee should "have it at the forefront of everything they do", and "should be on the top of their game".

[105] Asked if he remained opposed to the renewal application, Mr Wipa responded that he was. He said that maybe if they come through with their training plan and everything, then the opposition might be withdrawn.

NZ Police:

[106] Snr Sgt Hall's submissions were taken as read. In it, he provided a summary of Police records held in the National Intelligence Application that relate to the Essex Arms for the period from 2022 to January 2026. This included 23 incidents of wilful damage, theft, burglary, and violence. It also included controlled purchase operations (CPOs) on 23 September 2023, 8 March 2025, and 15 November 2025, where the latter two CPOs were failed. It also included hotel compliance checks on 18 July 2023 and 20 March 2025, both of which found the premises to be compliant.

[107] Asked why Police were not opposed to the renewal, Snr Sgt Hall noted that the original report was in February 2025.

[108] In response to a question about whether the list represented a lot of incidents, Snr Sgt Hall reiterated that it highlighted that "you really need crack systems in place".

[109] Asked what would happen if the premises were not there, Snr Sgt Hall responded that "things could still happen". He noted that "the premises could be an attractor, but the premises would not be there". He concluded that it was not conclusive and that you could argue either way.

[110] Asked what should be in a security plan, Snr Sgt Hall provided an example of a template that could be adopted. For an alcohol management plan, Snr Sgt Hall noted that it should be "all-encompassing", tying in the host responsibility plan, security plan, noise management, and training plan. Asked whether it was good practice to have a security plan, Snr Sgt Hall responded that it was, in order "to keep their own place safe".

CLOSING SUBMISSIONS:

[111] At the close of the hearing, the Committee noted that it would accept written closing submissions. The Committee also noted that it expected the applicant to document the handover between managers in the future. In Directions dated 28 April 2026, the Committee noted that they were particularly interested in receiving submissions on whether the forecourt area in front of the accommodation and restaurant area and outside the building should be part of the licensed area.

[112] The Committee also requested that the applicant provide:

1. an updated Training Plan covering a period of not less than twelve months, specifying when training is planned to be conducted, by whom, and what the training will cover;
2. A Security Plan for the premises;
3. An updated Host Responsibility Policy;
4. Confirmation of the change of directors of the applicant company;
5. Confirmation that a trial fire evacuation has been conducted and/or that Fire and Emergency New Zealand are no longer opposed to the renewal of the license; and
6. An updated site plan for the premises, that clearly shows the licensed area, with measurements.

[113] The applicant provided most of the requested materials and confirmations, including confirmation of a process for documenting manager handovers, on 8 May 2026. However,

this did not include the confirmation of the change of directors, and the updated site plan, which initially still included the forecourt area. Confirmation of the change of directors was provided on 12 May 2026. A final site plan, excluding the forecourt area from the licensed footprint, was provided by the applicant on 27 May 2026.

[114] On 4 May 2026, the Committee received a request from Counsel for the applicant, that the Committee “issue a direction that a copy of Ms Peka’s Māori Warden warrant which she produced and relied on at the hearing be provided to all parties”.

[115] In a Minute of the Committee dated 6 May 2026, the Committee determined that we would not direct that a copy of Ms Peka’s Māori Warden warrant be produced, as we believed that it would have minimal impact on the weight attached to Ms Peka’s evidence. However, the Committee noted that it might be in the interests of Ms Peka to nevertheless produce a copy of the warrant, to avoid unnecessary questions about it in future hearings. The Committee offered the option of a non-publication order in relation to the details of the warrant.

Applicant:

[116] In written closing submissions, Mr Young again drew the Committee’s attention to the Authority’s decisions in Ponda Holdings and Hendry, submitting that “tikanga cannot be incorporated into the substantive decision making in this matter”.

[117] Mr Young also challenged whether Ms Peka was a Māori Warden, noting that his attempts to engage with Ms Peka’s counsel had not been replied to. In relation to the Committee’s Minute noting that production of the warrant would have minimal impact on the weight attached to Ms Peka’s evidence, Mr Young submitted that “the Committee must approach the credibility of any witness before it in a principled way with the same expectations on all that give evidence before it”. He noted that the Committee “might reasonably infer that something is amiss due to Ms Peka’s unwillingness to properly produce her warrant, particularly when the offer of a non-publication order is made”.

[118] Mr Young then drew attention to the similarity between the evidence of Ms Peka and Ms Matenga, submitting that this cannot be a coincidence, and submitting that this “should cause the Committee considerable concern” and that it is “relevant to the weight to be given to the evidence”.

[119] Mr Young summarised the evidence before the Committee from the applicant, objectors, and reporting agencies. On the variation of the licence from a hotel to a tavern, Mr Young noted that “Counsel for the objectors asserted that the change from a hotel to a tavern increased risk. It is difficult to see how that can be the case when the bar area has operated in the same or similar manner for many years and the change to a tavern will not alter that”.

[120] Finally, Mr Young submitted that “the application meets the criteria in section 131 of the Act and a truncated renewal of one year from the date of the decision provides time for the new policies to bed in and for the parties to monitor the Premises”.

Objectors:

[121] In his written closing submissions, Dr Hewison repeated and relied upon many of his opening submissions.

[122] In relation to the forecourt area, Dr Hewison submitted that “the forecourt area in front of the accommodation and restaurant area and outside the building should not be part of the licensed area”. He noted that “the applicant’s own evidence confirmed that the premises was no longer genuinely operating as a hotel with integrated accommodation and restaurant functions”, and that “the forecourt area is inherently more difficult to supervise and managed than an internal licensed area”. He also noted that “the forecourt appears to operate as a transitional and circulation space associated with accommodation, public entry, and pedestrian movement”, and that “the outdoor area will generate greater amenity and good order effects, including the likelihood of noise, smoking congregation, possible intimidation, and visibility of alcohol consumption from the street”. Dr Hewison then noted that “the variation application “appears intended to ‘rationalise’ operations following the removal of accommodation from the licensed footprint”, and that in those circumstances, there was no necessity for retaining the outdoor licensed forecourt.

Medical Officer of Health:

[123] The closing submissions, Mr Wipa began by summarising the relevant law.

[124] Mr Wipa then asserted that the Committee had “requested evidence that showed that harm had occurred directly from these premises”, and pointed to case law that showed this was inappropriate. He also pointed to the High Court’s decision in *Alcohol Licensing Inspector of Auckland Council v Singh 13 Investments Ltd* [2025] NZHC 2868, where Gardiner J “made it clear that alcohol related harm must be assessed as a standalone consideration under the object of the Act, and that it is sufficient for there to be an evidential foundation establishing a real risk of harm arising from the grant or renewal of a licence”.

[125] Mr Wipa noted that his evidence had “highlighted the harm that is currently occurring within the Huntly community”, and submitted that “two previous failed controlled purchase operations are evidence of harm directly occurring from these premises”.

[126] Mr Wipa also noted that “[t]he applicant has a history of repeated Controlled Purchase Operation failures at various premises that he is the director of”, and submitted that, because all the applicant’s premises are located within highly deprived communities, “this shows a pattern of behaviour which should be raised as a suitability concern”.

[127] On suitability, Mr Wipa submitted that in his opinion, “the applicant’s knowledge fell short of what a licensee operating a premises in a highly deprived community should know”, and that “the applicant has not provided sufficient evidence that addresses the vulnerable nature of the community”. Mr Wipa further submitted that “suitability cannot be established through discretionary conditions given that the applicant has already failed controlled purchase operations”.

[128] On the licensed area, Mr Wipa noted that “[t]he forecourt area cannot be appropriately managed by one duty manager who is based in the public bar area as it is out of sight, close to the road and is not clearly delineated. Patrons have the ability to remove alcohol from the licensed area without staff on the premises being aware”. He submitted that should the

Committee be minded to grant the licence, the forecourt, café, and dining areas should be excluded.

[129] Mr Wipa concluded by submitted that the application does not meet the object of the Act and should be declined.

Final matters:

[130] On 22 May 2026, the Committee received a memorandum from Counsel for the Objectors about the conflicts of interests raised at the hearing on 23 May 2026.

[131] The memorandum was referred to the Waikato District Council Regulatory Services Manager and is being processed by the Waikato District Council under the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.

[132] Through the Secretary, the Committee raised with the applicant whether they would be willing to agree to an undertaking to make reasonable efforts to engage in community consultation before the submission of the next renewal application. The Committee then released a Minute dated 5 June 2026, that recorded our decision to grant the variation to the licence, and to grant the licence renewal for a truncated period. In the Minute, we asked for comments from all parties on the draft wording of the undertaking.

[133] The inspector and Police responded that they had no comments on the wording of the undertaking.

[134] Counsel for the objectors responded that “[w]hile the objectors support structured engagement between the applicant and the community, they have concerns that direct engagement between the applicant and community without facilitation may create difficulties for both and may discourage frank discussion”. He noted the importance of tikanga in engaging with a predominantly Māori community, and asked that the engagement process be facilitated by an independent person, identifying as possibilities “a member of the DLC not involved in future determination of the application or the Waikato District Council Māori Liaison Officer”. He also suggested amended wording to reflect that facilitation.

CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING THE APPLICATION:

[135] In deciding whether to renew an on-licence the committee must have regard to the matters detailed in s 131(1) of the Act. These are:

- (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.

[136] The relevant matters in section 105(1) are:

- (a) the object of the 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;
- ...
- (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.

[137] In the Committee's view, s 131(1)(b), (c), and (d), and s 105(1)(a), (b), (e), (g), (j), and (k), along with s 106(2) are most relevant when considering the renewal application. The Committee has considered the other criteria in s 105(1)(c), (d), and (f), and is satisfied regarding those criteria.

[138] In considering an application for a variation of licence conditions, s 120(7) states that the Committee "must have regard to any relevant matter that is specified in section 105".

[139] In the Committee's view, s 105(1)(a), (b), (e), (j), and (k), are most relevant when considering the variation application. The Committee has considered the other criteria in s 105(1)(c), (d), (f), (g), (h), and (i), and is satisfied regarding those criteria.

REASONS AND DECISION:

S131(1)(a) Matters related to S105(1)

[140] Matters related to s 105(1) of the Act are dealt with in their own sections below.

S105(1)(b) Suitability

[141] The Committee received two objections based on suitability, and the inspector also raised suitability as an issue. While the inspector did not oppose the application, she recommended a truncated renewal period based in part on suitability concerns.

[142] In relation to suitability, in *Nishchay's Enterprises Limited* [2013] NZARLA PH 837, the Authority summarised the previous case law at [53–54]:

[53] The applicant sought to establish its suitability by adopting a narrow assessment of the meaning of that term. This approach was criticised in *New Zealand Police v Casino Bar No 3 Ltd* (CIV 2012-485-1491; [2013] NZHC 44). The High Court rejected the proposition that it was the manner in which the business would be operated as the determinate factor. Rather, suitability is a broad concept and the assessment of it includes the character and reputation of the applicant, its previous operation of premises, its proposals as to how the premises will operate, its honesty, its previous convictions and other matters. It also includes matters raised in reports filed under s.33 of the Act and those reports may raise issues pertaining to the object of the Act as set out in s.4. Thus, whether or not the grant of the licence will result in the reduction or an increase in liquor abuse is a relevant issue.

[54] *Casino Bar No 3 Ltd* did not specifically refer to the test for suitability contained in Sheard [1996] 1 NZLR 751 where Holland J said at 758: "The real test is whether the character of the applicant has been shown to be such that he is not likely to carry out properly the responsibilities that go with the holding of a licence." However, the judgement inferred that the test applied when the learned Judge referred with approval to Holland J's statement in Sheard: "Suitability is a relatively broad concept and, in the context of an assessment of an application under s 13 of the Act, it relates to the suitability of the applicant to be granted the privilege of an on-licence to dispense liquor". Traditionally, that test has been interpreted as meaning whether or not an applicant will comply with the penal provisions of the Act. In fact, the test is much wider. To carry out the responsibilities that go with the holding of a licence includes whether or not liquor abuse issues are likely to arise. Thus, it includes the object of the Act as set out in s 4. The Sheard test is not simply about how a business is likely to operate in the future. It is dependent on an assessment of the more generalised factors referred to in the previous paragraph. It includes how a licensee will deal with liquor abuse issues that may arise from the establishment of the business. The usefulness of the Sheard test is that it gives a focus to the wider exercise contemplated in the *Casino Bar No 3 Ltd* decision by reminding one of the reason for the exercise.

[143] In *New Zealand Police v Casino Bar No 3 Ltd* (CIV 2012-485-1491; [2013] NZHC 44, Dobson J wrote in relation to assessing suitability:

[34] In criticising this approach as unduly narrow, submissions for the Police cited a checklist of matters likely to be relevant to an assessment of suitability from the text *Dormer & Sheriff Sale of Liquor...* The list is as follows:

- (a) previous convictions, especially those involving liquor or those raising questions as to honesty or propensity for violence;
- (b) character, reputation;
- (c) matters raised in reports filed under s 11;
- (d) previous unlawful operation of premises;
- (e) any of the above in relation to a person other than the applicant who is involved in the application (as a director, manager, etc) or is intended to be employed by the applicant;
- (f) breach of an undertaking; and
- (g) misleading information in an application and/or misleading public notice.

[35] Not all of the criteria from *Dormer & Sheriff* will be relevant in every application where objection is raised to the suitability of an applicant. However, it is an appropriate starting point for the range of matters that the LLA would need to traverse in assessing

whether the onus on an applicant to establish suitability, where it is challenged, has been discharged. These matters are significantly wider than the applicant's proposal as to how the business will operate.

[144] Although the case law cited above relates to the Sale of Liquor Act 1989, it remains current, and was recently affirmed by the Authority in *Two Brothers Wholesale Limited v Medical Officer of Health Waikato District Health Board* [2021] NZARLA 32 at [103]:

[103] While *Two Brothers* is correct in saying that suitability is not to be considered in a vacuum, it is not correct that suitability must only be considered in the context of the operation of licensed premises as regards the safe and responsible sale and supply and consumption of alcohol. As is clear from *Nishchay's* an assessment of suitability is much wider and includes considerations of the character and reputation of the applicant and its honesty as well as considerations of the operation of premises. Whether or not the grant of the licence will result in the reduction or an increase in liquor abuse is a relevant issue as are considerations about how a licensee will deal with liquor abuse issues that may arise from the establishment of the business, but suitability is not restricted to these matters.

[145] As the Authority noted in *Shady Lady Lighting Limited v Lower Hutt Liquormart Limited - Blackbull Liquor* [2018] NZARLA 198 at [127]:

[127] The vulnerability of the area, in effect, raises the threshold of suitability in terms of whether the grant of the licence will result in a reduction or an increase in alcohol-related harm.

[146] Where the threshold of suitability is raised, additional aspects must be assessed in relation to suitability. In *Re Dhillon* [2013] NZARLA 920, the Authority wrote:

[49] The fact that the applicant seemed to have no knowledge of the locality or the potential problems associated with it goes to its lack of suitability. If the applicant had indicated some knowledge of the environment in which it proposes to set up a bottle store, then it follows that it would have discussed the measures necessary to assist in the minimisation of harm caused by excessive or inappropriate consumption of alcohol purchased at its premises. Those measures it did discuss were the ineffectual external camera and the discarded suggestion that a staff member would patrol the Reserve at night from time to time: a totally impractical suggestion for a business employing only two staff. More sensibly, it would have given greater thought to the hours it wishes to be open for the sale of alcohol in this area.

[147] The importance of vulnerability of the area in establishing whether a higher threshold for suitability is needed, was subsequently affirmed *Churchman J* in *Lower Hutt Liquormart v Shady Lady Lighting Limited* [2018] NZHC 3100. A first step for the Committee, then, is to determine the vulnerability of the area, and whether the threshold of suitability is consequently raised.

[148] The Committee received little evidence about which area comprises the relevant locality. The MOH provided data related to the Huntly urban area, and this was not challenged by any parties to the hearing, and nor was any alternative proffered. The Committee considers that the relevant locality is the Huntly urban area.

[149] The Committee heard evidence from the MOH about the social deprivation of the community. Mr Wipa told the Committee that “[t]he premises are situated in a decile 8 meshblock and surrounded by decile 9 and 10 meshblocks”. Social deprivation was also referred to by the objectors, Ms Peka and Ms Matenga, as well as Mr Maipi, who all noted that the community was vulnerable.

[150] The Committee accepts that the area is decile 8, that it is a vulnerable area and a deprived socio-economic area where people tend to experience more alcohol related problems. The premises is situated in this area and is therefore operating in a higher risk environment that requires the applicant to operate to a higher standard, as outlined in Shady Lady Lighting Limited. The applicant is expected to know and engage with the local community, ascertain any alcohol-related concerns, indicate how it plans to address concerns.

[151] In his opening submissions, Mr Young accepted that extended suitability applied in assessing this application, but argued that the extended suitability approach was significantly diminished in the absence of reporting agency opposition. Mr Young’s argument relied on the Authority’s decisions in Ponda Holdings and Hendry.

[152] In Ponda Holdings, the Authority wrote:

[11] British Isles Inn Limited NZLLA PH 406/2006 is applicable. At paragraph [39] the Authority stated:

“Although the onus is on the company to establish its suitability, there is a reasonably high threshold to be met by the objectors in order to displace the absence of concerns by the reporting agencies. We are on record as stating that in the absence of unfavourable comments from the reporting agencies, we are unlikely to be persuaded that an applicant is unsuitable.”

[153] This was affirmed in Hendry, where the Authority wrote:

[103] We consider the approach reflected in Ponda remains good law so far as no opposition is raised by the Tri-agencies...

[154] In the present case, the inspector had provided unfavourable comments in her report, and was explicitly opposed to the grant of the renewal for the full three years. Responding to questions from the Committee, Mr Sturzaker confirmed that her recommendation of a truncated renewal period was partially based on suitability grounds. Thus, the facts here differ materially from the Ponda Holdings and Hendry cases. The Committee proceeded to consider extended suitability.

[155] In Patels Superette 2000 Ltd [2019] NZARLA 75, the Authority, citing Shady Lady Lighting, wrote:

[212] The Authority agrees with the DLC that Mr Hira has made little effort to research and understand the make-up of the community and how they might be impacted by alcohol or how his application might address those concerns. It was only when at the hearing before the DLC that Mr Hira indicated that the appellant would be willing to close the store when children are likely to walk by, particularly around 9.00am and 3.00pm weekdays to allay any concerns of the community. Further, it is only when

appearing before the Authority that the proposed hours were modified to 9.00am to 9.00pm. Rather than this demonstrating a sensitivity toward the needs of the community, this demonstrates a failure to take steps to understand the concerns of the community in advance, and is 'too little, too late'. This lack of engagement is a factor to which the DLC was properly entitled to have regard when assessing the applicant's suitability to hold an off-licence.

[156] Drawing on Patels Superette, the Committee infers that the extended suitability test requires the applicant to make an effort to research and understand the make-up of the community and how they might be impacted by alcohol or how this application might address those concerns.

[157] Mr Young argued that the Authority's decision in Huntly Grocer showed that community engagement was not obligatory. In that decision, the Authority wrote:

[28] Furthermore, we do not accept the specific complaint made by Mr Hewison that Ms Martelli had made no attempt to engage with the community before the application was made needs. There is no requirement, or even an expectation, that an intending applicant for a licence engage with the local community before the application is made. The purpose of the requirement to give public notification of the application is to provide the local community with the opportunity to respond to it including by way of formal objection. In this case, Ms Martelli convened an in-person meeting at the store to enable members of the community to voice any concerns that they might have. Indeed, Ms Martelli also provided the option, to those not able to make the meeting in person, of attending that meeting virtually.

[158] However, later in the Huntly Grocer decision, the Authority draws a distinction between supermarkets (as in the case of Huntly Grocer), and taverns or bottle stores (as is the case here):

[30] When dealing with the need to consult the community, there must also be a distinction drawn between an applicant for a licence to operate say a tavern or bottle store as against a supermarket as is the case here. The sale and supply of alcohol from a supermarket is, of course, only a small part of the product available for purchase.

[159] The Committee notes that the Authority has more recently addressed the same point, in Sethi Group of Companies Ltd [2026] NZARLA 161, where it wrote (footnote omitted):

[189] The Authority also takes this opportunity to clarify the dicta in Huntly Grocer with regards to the engagement with the local community. When a proposed bottle store is in a locality that is highly deprived and presents particular vulnerabilities to alcohol related harm, there is a stronger expectation, as part of meeting the extended suitability test, that community engagement especially with mana whenua is undertaken before the application for a licence is made. That engagement has to be undertaken in a demonstrably meaningful manner so as to ascertain the extent of alcohol related harm in the locality and to avail itself any opportunity to address community concerns.

[160] The Committee concludes that, as the local community is highly deprived and vulnerable to alcohol-related harm, there is a strong expectation that the applicant engages with the community.

[161] Mr Singh had some knowledge of the locality and the demographics of Huntly, as well as who his regular patrons were. However, aside from his own patrons, it is clear that he had made no attempt at consultation or engagement with the community. Despite this, Mr Singh considered himself to “know that community well”.

[162] Mr Singh also pointed to the knowledge and experience of his staff, and that they “engage with members of the community every day”. Unfortunately, the Committee was unable to question Mr Singh’s staff to ascertain their engagement and experience.

[163] Mr Singh demonstrated limited knowledge of alcohol-related harm concerns for the community. When asked about vulnerability more generally, he only mentioned having less money in the family, and drug abuse.

[164] The Committee is concerned at Mr Singh’s lack of engagement with the community, and his limited knowledge of alcohol-related concerns within the community where the premises is located. He has considerable experience operating premises in this community and in similar high deprivation communities elsewhere, and the Committee is satisfied that he barely meets the expected knowledge of a suitable licensee under the test of extended suitability. The Committee believes that Mr Singh would benefit from further understanding the community’s concerns. In her evidence, Ms Peka asked “why can we not work together?”.

[165] According, the Committee proposed, and Mr Singh accepted, that he would sign the following undertaking:

That the applicant will extend an invitation, and make reasonable efforts, to meet with the Waahi Whaanui Trust and the Maaori Wardens (and any other persons or organisations suggested by them) to discuss alcohol related harm and its minimisation in the community, during the period leading up to the submission of their next renewal application to the Waikato District Licensing Committee.

[166] The premises has failed two Controlled Purchase Operations, in September 2023 and in March 2025. As the objectors noted, these failures do not respect tikanga due to the failure to protect rangatahi from alcohol-related harm. The second failed CPO is mitigated somewhat because the duty manager realised his mistake and took steps to remove the drinks and rescind the sale. Nevertheless, the CPO was failed. In its decision in the enforcement application, the Authority discounted the penalty that would usually apply to a second failure. This suggests that the offence was not considered as serious as the first failure.

[167] Counsel for the objectors asked the Committee to lift the corporate veil and consider the pattern of failures at other premises associated with the applicant company’s director. These include a sale to an intoxicated person at Imperial Hotel (Thames) in 2024, and selling to a minor at F Bar in 2019. Across the several premises operated by Mr Singh under various related companies, there have therefore been four enforcement proceedings in the past seven years.

[168] Dr Hewison raised the example of Smugglers Liquor Nawton, addressed in the Authority’s decision Aashi Enterprises [2023] NZARLA 187. In that case, the applicant had six failed CPOs over a period of 13 years across their various licensed premises, as well as an

additional suspension for not having a certificated manager on the premises. The facts in Aashi are different from this case and Aashi does not assist the Committee.

[169] In spite of failed CPOs, the renewal application was not opposed by the Police. However, as Snr Sgt Hall noted, the second failed CPO occurred after Police reported on the application in February 2025.

[170] The inspector also did not oppose the renewal application in its entirety, preferring to recommend a truncated period. In contrast to the Police, the inspector did report on the application after the second failed CPO.

[171] The Committee considers failed CPOs seriously. As the objectors noted in their evidence, rangatahi are a taonga and are to be protected, and the failure to do so by serving them alcohol is a breach of tikanga. This has happened on two occasions within the last three years.

[172] The applicant is remorseful, and appears to have learned from both of the failed CPOs. After the first failed CPO, the applicant began restricting the premises to "18-plus", and increased their frequency of training to six-monthly. After the second failed CPO, the applicant has increased the intensity and formality of their training by requiring staff to regularly complete Servewise, and by adding in-person training by Hospitality NZ, as well as in future adopting Typsy training as well. They have also formalised the handover process between managers, and have agreed to document these handovers in future.

[173] When a licensee is presented with evidence of deficiencies in their systems and training, the Committee expects that they will consider what changes to make. In this case, the applicant has made changes to improve their systems and training. These changes, alongside the agreed update to the Host Responsibility Policy and the adoption of a new Security Plan, gives the Committee greater assurance on systems and training at the premises.

[174] The Committee has carefully considered the range of measures in place at the premises and concludes that they are appropriate to the premises and align with operating at a higher standard in the high-risk environment where the premises is situated.

[175] We next turn to the 'conventional' test of suitability, as outlined in *Re Sheard*, that is whether "the character of the applicant has been shown to be such that he is not likely to carry out properly the responsibilities that go with the holding of a licence".

[176] Considering the checklist provided in *New Zealand Police v Casino Bar No 3 Ltd*, the applicant has no previous convictions, has not breached any undertakings, and has not provided misleading information in their application.

[177] However, as noted above, the licensee has had two negative holdings for failing CPOs, as well as two other incidents at related premises. As noted at paragraph [166], the Committee has taken into account the positive response of the applicant to the incidents at this premises, and the steps that they have taken to improve systems and training. Moreover, the Police did not oppose the renewal application, and the inspector recommended a truncated renewal, while opposing a renewal for three years. The Committee considers that, while the failed CPOs are serious, they alone do not establish that the applicant is unsuitable to hold this licence.

[178] In the Committee's view, the applicant satisfies each element in the checklist in *New Zealand Police v Casino Bar No 3 Ltd*. Overall, the Committee is satisfied that the applicant is suitable to hold both this on-licence.

S105(1)(e) Design and Layout of the Premises

[179] At the time of the site visit, the Committee became concerned about the large outdoor forecourt area in front of the premises, which has been part of the licensed footprint. In the Committee's view, this area is difficult to manage from the bar area, and the Committee sought views from all parties on whether this area should be part of the licensed footprint.

[180] Mr Sturzaker said that she did not understand why the forecourt was part of the licensed footprint. Mr Wipa agreed with the Committee's view that it would be difficult to manage. Dr Hewison gave detailed submissions on the forecourt area, which essentially agreed with the Committee's view.

[181] After closing submissions, the applicant provided an updated site plan that excluded the forecourt area and the lobby area of the accommodation from the licensed footprint.

[182] Following submission of the updated site plan, the Committee is satisfied in relation to the design and layout of the premises.

S105(1)(g) Provision of services other than those directly related to the sale of alcohol

[183] Concern was raised by the objectors about the gambling area, and whether that would distract bar staff from their duties regarding the sale and supply of alcohol.

[184] The Committee received a written brief of evidence from Ms Healey in relation to this matter. However, Ms Healey was not available at the hearing to have her evidence tested, and the Committee have therefore attached minimal weight to her evidence.

[185] The Committee is satisfied in relation to the provision of services other than those directly related to the sale of alcohol.

S105(1)(j) Systems, Staff, and Training

[186] Two failed CPOs at the premises raises questions about the quality of systems, staff, and training at the premises. Training was discussed in detail at the hearing. As noted at paragraph [172-173], the applicant has made changes to the systems and training at the premises. In addition, they have developed a clear Training Plan that will guide future training.

[187] This Committee is now satisfied that there are adequate systems and training in place at the premises, and that the applicant has appropriate systems, staff, and training to comply with the law.

S102(1)(k) and S131(1)(c) Reports from the Police, Medical Officer of Health, and Inspector

[188] The report of the Police did not raise matters in opposition to the application. The inspector and the Medical Officer of Health did raise matters in opposition to the application in their reports. These issues have been discussed earlier in this decision.

S131(1)(b) and S106(2) Amenity and Good Order

[189] The objectors raised issues of amenity and good order in their objections. However, the evidence that was provided to the Committee to support effects on amenity and good order was mostly general and non-specific.

[190] Ms Peka said that she had seen broken bottles, crushed cans, and people intoxicated around the premises. In her report, the inspector noted instances of alcohol-related litter in the carpark. The Committee also observed alcohol-related litter in the carpark at the site visit.

[191] There have been no noise complaints, and no reports of graffiti. The Police evidence notes a few instances of wilful damage around the premises. In relation to what would happen if the premises were no longer operating, Snr Sgt Hall said that the premises could be an attractor, but could not be conclusive.

[192] In opening submissions, Dr Hewison argued that “tikanga may inform how “amenity and good order” is assessed.”, and that “[a]menity extends beyond crime statistics to include collective wellbeing, mana of the locality, safety of tamariki, and the dignity of public spaces”. To support this, Dr Hewison relied on the Supreme Court’s decision in *Ellis v R*, which Dr Hewison said “recognised that tikanga was the first law of Aotearoa/New Zealand and that it continues to shape and regulate the lives of Maaori”.

[193] In his opening submissions, Dr Hewison referred to the Supreme Court’s decision in *Trans-Tasman Resources Ltd v Taranaki-Whanganui Conservation Board and others* (2021) NZSC 127, where they wrote at [151]:

The courts will not easily read statutory language as excluding consideration of Treaty principles if a statute is silent on the question. It ought to follow therefore that Treaty clauses should not be narrowly construed. Rather, they must be given a broad and generous construction. An intention to constrain the ability of statutory decision-makers to respect Treaty principles should not be ascribed to Parliament unless that intention is made quite clear.

[194] The Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act is silent about Treaty of Waitangi principles. Tikanga, however, is raised in Section 203A in relation to DLC procedures. The Authority and higher courts have not, to our knowledge at the time of writing this decision, applied tikanga in alcohol licensing decision making or in assessing amenity and good order. When asked for caselaw where the Authority or the higher courts have raised *Ellis v R* in relation to the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012, counsel for both the applicant and objectors said they were unaware of any and referred to the Committee to Hendry, where the Authority wrote:

[102] We take the same view in response to the appellant’s argument that the Amendment Act introduced new or different obligations under the Treaty. The

appellant again suggested that the Amendment Act changed the landscape as reflected in such provisions as the requirement to observe tikanga in the DLC process. Again, had the intention of the legislature been to alter the approach under the Act in this context, it would have been straight forward to include a specific provision to that effect. The opportunity to do so was obvious and a provision comparable to provisions in other Acts such as the Resource Management Act requiring observation of the principles of the Treaty could have been included. It is also relevant and significant in our view that the LAP mechanism is developed under provisions which enshrine Treaty principles which are thereby recognised namely through s.4 of the Local Government Act.

[195] Thus in relation to matters contained in a local alcohol policy, the Authority's position appears to be that the Treaty principles are engaged through Section 4 of the Local Government Act. The Hendry decision does not specifically address tikanga in DLC decision-making related to amenity and good order.

[196] Amenity and good order are defined in Section 5(1) of the Act:

amenity and good order of the locality, 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.

[197] Section 106(2) outlines matters that the Committee must have regard to:

106 Considering effects of issue or renewal of licence on amenity and good order of locality

...

- (2) In forming for the purposes of section 131(1)(b) an opinion on whether the amenity and good order of a locality would be likely to be increased, by more than a minor extent, by the effects of a refusal to renew a licence, the licensing authority or a licensing committee must have regard to the following matters (as they relate to the locality):
- (a) current, and possible future, noise levels:
 - (b) current, and possible future, levels of nuisance and vandalism.

[198] Importantly, Section 106(2) does not specify that it is only those matters that the Committee may have regard to. It simply makes clear that the Committee must have regard to current, and possible future, noise, nuisance, and vandalism.

[199] Dr Hewison submitted that "tikanga may inform how amenity and good order is assessed", and proposed that amenity includes collective wellbeing, mana of the locality, safety of tamariki, and the dignity of public places. Amenity and good order requires the Committee to consider whether the relevant locality is pleasant and agreeable with reference to noise, nuisance and vandalism.

[200] The Committee accepts that there are occasional instances of litter and property damage in the vicinity of the premises. What the committee must determine is whether the amenity and good order would be likely to be increased, by more than a minor extent, by the effects of a refusal to renew the licence (Section 131(b) of the Act).

[201] Given the limited specific evidence of negative effects on amenity and good order, we are not convinced that 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.

S131(1)(d) The manner in which the applicant has sold, displayed, advertised, or promoted alcohol

[202] The applicant failed two CPOs. The Committee views such failures as serious in nature, although as noted at paragraph [166], the second failed CPO was somewhat mitigated by the subsequent actions of the manager at the time.

[203] As the objectors noted in their evidence, rangatahi are a taonga and are to be protected. The applicant has breached tikanga by failing to do this on two occasions over the last three years.

[204] Overall, the Committee is not satisfied with the manner in which the applicant has sold, displayed, advertised, or promoted alcohol.

Section 105(1)(a) The Object of the Act

[205] The Committee is required to undertake the evaluative exercise as outlined in *Christchurch Medical Officer of Health v J & G Vaudrey Limited* [2015] NZHC 2749. The steps in this exercise are outlined in paragraph [56] of Vaudrey:

“[56] So, in my view, the position can be summarised as follows:

- (a) The role of the relevant body upon receipt of an application for licensing or re-licensing is an evaluative one, requiring the decision maker to make a merits-based determination on the application.
- (b) In considering an application, the relevant body is fundamentally required to assess whether a licence ought to issue. In so doing, it must:
 - (i) consider any objections made by persons who have a greater interest in the application than the public generally;
 - (ii) consider any opposition filed by the constable in charge of the Police station nearest to where the application is filed, a Licensing Inspector, and the Medical Officer of Health;
 - (iii) have regard to the criteria stipulated in s 105 of the Act (for present purposes including the design and layout of the premises); and
- (c) The relevant body must finally cross-check whether the application is capable of meeting the object of the Act.
- (d) It must impose the conditions required by s 116(2) and in the case of a supermarket or grocery store, the single area condition (which I discuss in more detail below).
- (e) It may impose further conditions in accordance with ss 116(1) and 117 (which I discuss in more detail below).”

[206] In a recent High Court decision, *Alcohol Licensing Inspector, Auckland Council v Singh 13 Investments Ltd* [2025] NZHC 2868, Gardiner J made clear that the object of the Act is its own criterion:

[135] In my view, ARLA did not engage with these broader concerns as it was required to do pursuant to s 105(1)(a). ARLA failed to consider the two limbs of the object as a standalone criterion. It failed to ask the essential question of whether issuing a licence to the premises was consistent with the object of minimising alcohol-related harm, considering the location of the off-licence opposite two schools and adjacent to a third, the low socioeconomic status of the area, the intensity of existing off-licences in the locality, and the evidence of alcohol-related harm in the community presented to it. Instead, it considered the object of the Act met on the narrow basis that the applicant would comply with its legal obligations and not sell alcohol to minors. Mere compliance by the applicant will not achieve the object of minimising alcohol-related harms of the kind identified by the agencies and objectors.

[207] Thus, the Committee's task is not simply to cross-check whether the application is capable of meeting the object of the Act by reference to the other criteria in S105(1) and S131(1), but to consider the two limbs of the object of the Act as their own standalone criterion.

[208] The object of the Act is that the sale, supply, and consumption of alcohol should be undertaken safely and responsibly, and the harm caused by the excessive or inappropriate consumption of alcohol should be minimised.

[209] As noted by the Authority in *Rockaway Beach Limited* [2017] NZARLA 445:

[94] The purpose of the Act is designed so that its effect and administration help to achieve the object of the Act which is that the sale, supply and consumption of alcohol should be undertaken safely and responsibly, and that the harm caused by the excessive or inappropriate consumption of alcohol should be minimised. The object of the Act has two limbs. The first limb, that the sale, supply and consumption of alcohol should be undertaken safely and responsibly, is wide and is not constrained by the definition of harm caused by the excessive or inappropriate consumption of alcohol.

[210] Importantly, no causative link needs to be established between the operation of the premises and alcohol-related harm. As Gardiner J affirmed in *Alcohol Licensing Inspector, Auckland Council v Singh* 13 Investments Ltd [2025] NZHC 2868:

[7] ...The legislation does not require such a causative link. It is sufficient for there to be an evidential foundation to suggest that there is a real risk of harm from the grant of the licence. If there is a real risk of harm from the grant of the licence, the object of minimising harm is engaged, meaning reduced to the smallest possible degree.

[211] The Committee is tasked with evaluating whether risk will occur in the future, and any such assessment of future risk comes with some uncertainty. The Supreme Court's decision in *Woolworths v Auckland Council* [2023] NZSC 45 provides for a precautionary approach to be taken:

[84] We agree with the Court of Appeal (and with the Licensing Authority) that a precautionary approach is open and that, in any event, a restriction may be justified on the basis of there being a reasonable likelihood that it will reduce alcohol-related harm, a point that we discuss in greater depth shortly. This is consistent with a line of cases that starts with the judgment of the Court of Appeal in *My Noodle Ltd v Queenstown Lakes District Council* under the 1989 Act and carries on through

decisions issued under the 2012 Act... It is, as well, consistent with our reading of ss 3 and 4.

[212] In terms of harm, Mr Maipi referred to drink driving occurring “just about every weekend”, as well as domestic violence (“beating up wives”). He also referred to loud noises and swearing around the premises, but conceded that this was “not often”.

[213] Ms Matenga referred to violence, disorder, and harm in our neighbourhoods, and referred to the bus stop outside the premises as a “public gathering spot”. She also mentioned young families misusing alcohol, youth trauma, and suicide, particularly among young people.

[214] Ms Peka’s brief of evidence was similar to Ms Matenga’s. In addition, Ms Peka said that she had seen broken bottles, crushed cans, and people intoxicated around the premises.

[215] Mr Wipa’s evidence documented a substantial number (401) of alcohol related Emergency Department presentations to Waikato Hospital from Huntly over a period of little more than five years. While this seems like a lot to the Committee, it is difficult to know how this compares to other areas and whether this is an abnormal number of presentations for an area such as Huntly.

[216] In closing submissions, Mr Wipa asserted that the Committee had “requested evidence that showed that harm had occurred directly from these premises”. We believe that Mr Wipa misunderstood the questions that the Committee was asking. The Committee was interested in specific instances of alcohol-related harm occurring around the premises, and not limiting such evidence to that directly attributable to the premises.

[217] In opening submissions, Dr Hewison argued that “tikanga informs how the object of the Act is to be applied”, and that “a Te Tiriti-consistent approach supports precaution and active protection, supporting the DLC to weigh social, cultural, and long-term wellbeing alongside measurable crime or injury”. To support this, Dr Hewison relied on the Supreme Court’s decision in *Ellis v R*, which Dr Hewison said “recognised that tikanga was the first law of Aotearoa/New Zealand and that it continues to shape and regulate the lives of Maaori”.

[218] As we noted at paragraphs [193-195], the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act is silent about Treaty of Waitangi principles. Tikanga, however, is raised in Section 203A in relation to DLC procedures. The Authority and higher courts have not, to our knowledge at the time of writing this decision, applied tikanga in alcohol licensing decision making or in assessing alcohol-related harm.

[219] The Supreme Court’s decision in *Trans-Tasman Resources* makes it clear that, where the intent of the law to constrain the ability of statutory decision-makers to respect Treaty principles is not made clear, then Treaty principles can be applied. We conclude that *Ellis v R* applies, and tikanga is an important consideration in assessing alcohol-related harm.

[220] Alcohol-related harm is defined in Section 5(1) of the Act:

alcohol-related harm—

- (a) means the harm caused by the excessive or inappropriate consumption of alcohol; and
- (b) includes—

- (i) any crime, damage, death, disease, disorderly behaviour, illness, or injury, directly or indirectly caused, or directly or indirectly contributed to, by the excessive or inappropriate consumption of alcohol; and
- (ii) 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 behaviour, illness, or injury of a kind described in subparagraph (i)

[221] The definition seems sufficiently broad to encompass a wide range of alcohol-related harms. We agree with Dr Hewison that tikanga is an important consideration as part of how evidence of alcohol-related harm, and the significance of that harm in the context of a predominantly-Maori community, is to be interpreted.

[222] As noted at paragraph [203], the Committee accepts the Objectors' concerns that the two failed CPOs are a breach of tikanga. Rangatahi are taonga to be protected and the applicant, who has duty to comply with the Act, has undermined their role as a kaitiaki to keep young people safe.

[223] While the Committee received specific evidence regarding the failed CPOs and the implications for tikanga, we note that generalised assertions of alcohol-related harm were largely unhelpful in this case.

[224] In *Medical Officer of Health (Wellington Region) v Lion Liquor Retail Limited* [2018] NZHC 1123, Clark J wrote at [67]:

The Act looks to minimise alcohol-related harm. Where there is an evidential foundation enabling a link to be drawn between a real risk of alcohol-related harm and the grant or renewal of a licence, the harm must be minimised not ignored or condoned.

[225] In this case, while there is some evidence of alcohol-related harm in the vicinity of the premises, the Committee is not persuaded that there is a sufficient link between a real risk of alcohol-related harm and the renewal of this licence.

[226] Having inquired into the application, and received evidence and submissions from all parties, the Committee has evaluated the application against the criteria in s 105 and s 131 of the Act. As outlined earlier in the decision, the Committee has determined that the application satisfies all the criteria.

[227] Overall, and as outlined in paragraphs [135] to [226] above, the Committee is satisfied that the renewal application is capable of meeting the object of the Act. As recommended by the inspector and accepted by the applicant, the renewal will be for one year from the date of this decision.

S120 Variation of conditions

[228] During her enquiries into the application, the inspector identified that the general nature of the business was that of a tavern. The principal nature of the business was previously that of a hotel. After discussions between the inspector and the applicant, the

applicant agreed to seek a variation to the licence such that the principal nature of the business would be a tavern, rather than a hotel.

[229] This variation was notified as required by section 101 and 120(3) of the Act. The inspector and Police were not opposed to the variation. The MOH did not report on their position related to the variation, but opposed the renewal application. The objectors objected to the variation, in addition to objecting to the renewal of the licence.

[230] The objectors argued that the variation would likely lead to an increase in alcohol-related harm. Dr Hewison submitted that “this is a very different proposition with very different risks of alcohol related harm to a hotel with accommodation and a restaurant”. However, the inspector noted that the risk category of a tavern is the same as that of a hotel, which would seem to weigh against an increase in risk from this change.

[231] In any case, the restaurant at the premises has not been operating for some time, so as noted by the inspector, this variation would embed the current status of the premises as a tavern, as well as removing the accommodation area, the accommodation lobby, and the forecourt area, from the licensed footprint. In the Committee’s view, if anything this variation may have the effect of reducing alcohol-related harm.

[232] The Committee has considered the criteria in s 105(1)(a), (b), (e), (j), and (k), and is satisfied with those criteria. The reasons and discussion related to the variation are substantively the same as for the renewal application, so we do not repeat those here. The variation is granted.

[233] Overall, and as outlined in paragraphs [135] to [232] above, the Committee is satisfied that the renewal application is capable of meeting the object of the Act.

Conclusion:

[234] The applications for renewal and variation of an off-licence, for the premises situated at 151 Main Street, HUNTLY known as “Essex Arms” are granted, subject to conditions.

Conditions:

[235] Sections 110 and 111 of the Act detail compulsory and discretionary conditions that may be imposed on the licence. Section 133 also provides that particular conditions may be imposed if any relevant local alcohol policy is in force and that the renewal of the licence without those conditions would be inconsistent with the policy.

[236] Section 135 provides that, subject to s 133, the licence may be renewed on the conditions presently attaching to it or on any different conditions, relating to any matter, that the committee thinks fit.

[237] The Committee notes that the previous condition (a) on the licence, which related to the sale and supply of alcohol on sacrosanct days, has been removed. Such conditions have been overridden by Section 45A of the Act, as of 3 April 2026, following the passage of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol (Sales on Anzac Day Morning, Good Friday, Easter Sunday, and Christmas Day) Amendment Act 2026.

The licence will be subject to the following conditions:

- (a) Alcohol may be sold under the licence only on the following days and during the following hours:

On such days and during such hours as the premises are being operated as a tavern, but not other than on the following days and hours:

Monday to Sunday 8.00 am to 1.00 am the following day

- (b) Food must be available for consumption on the premises as follows:
A range of food choices must always be readily available when the premises are open. Menus must be visible, and food should be actively promoted. A minimum of three types of food should be available.
- (c) The licensee must have available for consumption on the premises, always when alcohol may be sold under the licence, a reasonable range of non-alcoholic and low-alcohol beverages.
- (d) Drinking water must be freely available at the following places while the premises are open for business:
From the bar
- (e) The public bar area of the premises is designated as a supervised area while the remaining areas of the premises are un-designated.
- (f) The licensee must take the following steps to ensure that the provisions of the Act relating to the management of the premises are observed:
 - (i) All staff will be trained in their responsibilities under the Act.
 - (ii) A sign shall be prominently displayed inside the premises, which identifies by name the manager on duty or of the person responsible for the management of the sale and supply of alcohol under the licence.
 - (iii) Ensure that no intoxicated persons are allowed to enter or to remain on the premises.
 - (iv) Ensure that signs are prominently displayed detailing the statutory restrictions on the supply of alcohol to minors and intoxicated persons.
 - (v) Ensure that appropriate signs are prominently displayed detailing information about alternative forms of transport from the premises.
 - (vi) The licensee must ensure that all staff comply with a host responsibility plan detailing the steps to be taken by the licensee to ensure a safe drinking environment.
- (g) The sale, supply and consumption of alcohol is authorised on the premises generally. The premises situated at 151 Main Street, Huntly, are more precisely identified in a plan dated and stamped as received by the Waikato District Licensing Committee on 27 May 2026.

DATED at Ngaaruawaahia on 12 August 2026



Michael Cameron
Commissioner
Waikato District Licensing Committee