

ABN 77 237 576 146

Telephone 08 8232 4525
Toll Free 1800 814 525
Facsimile 08 8232 4979
Email information@ahasa.asn.au
Web www.ahasa.asn.au

4th Floor, AHA (SA) House
60 Hindmarsh Square
Adelaide SA 5000

PO Box 3092
Rundle Mall SA 5000

6 January 2017

Legislative Services
Attorney-General's Department
GPO Box 464
ADELAIDE SA 5001

LLPSubmissions@sa.gov.au

Dear Sir /Madam

AHA|SA Response to the:

- 1. Liquor Licensing (Liquor Review) Amendment Bill 2016**
- 2. Community Impact Assessment (AG Department Guideline)**

Following the June 2016 release of the Tim Anderson Final Report on the Liquor Licensing Act (LLA) Review and the State Government's September 2016 formal response, the AHA|SA now welcomes this opportunity to comment on the Draft Amendment Bill and associated documents (listed above).

Firstly, the AHA|SA is appreciative of the review process which has been generally a collegiate and collaborative one.

Many of the recommendations which remove red tape and modernise the legislative liquor framework are positive measures and are welcomed.

The AHA|SA is pleased that the State Government has chosen not to adopt many of the more draconian measures recommended by The Hon. Tim Anderson including; imposition of additional licence fees based on breaches relating to minors or to serving intoxicated persons, the creation of an offence if an intoxicated person enters or remains on premises and the liability on landlords if a licensee is found guilty of an offence.

The AHA|SA welcomes also the Government's position in respect to alcohol sales in supermarkets.

However some significant issues remain. These include; the detail of the proposed Community Impact Assessment (CIA), the proposal to impose significant additional liquor licence fees on licensees and the intention to introduce alcohol and drug testing of Responsible Persons (RPs). More detail follows in the body of this document however make no mistake the AHA|SA will oppose the last two of these recommendations in the strongest possible terms.

SA is faced with an economic climate of high unemployment, high and rapidly escalating electricity costs, power insecurity and a stagnant population growth. An additional imposition of massive and baseless liquor licence fees will further restrict businesses' ability to survive, to financially support related industries such as premium wine and food and live music, and will simply send them the message that they are seen by Government as nothing more than cash cows.

All references in the body of this response refer to the amendment number in the Draft Amendment Bill, the relevant section/s of the LLA and the page number in the Draft Amendment Bill.

1. [Amendment 5 – Section 4 – Interpretation \(page 6\)](#)

Tim Anderson in his report said:

Recommendation 55

Approval of crowd controllers to work in licenced premises should only be administered under the Security and Investigations Industry Act 1995.

Recommendation 56

Amend the definition of ‘controlling crowds’ in section 3(1) of the Security and Investigation Industry Act 1995 to exclude the functions of responsible persons and licensees.

The amendment to Section 4 of the LLA to delete the definition of approved crowd controller is included in the Draft Bill (page 6) at 5 (1), however the corresponding amendment to the Security and Investigation Act which would be expected to appear in *Schedule 1 – Related Amendments* seems to be missing (refer also Recommendation 56 of the State Government’s “Summary of Proposed Changes to the Liquor Licensing Act” November 2016, page 15).

2. [Amendment 5 – Section 4, clause \(8\) \(page 7\) Definition of designated application.](#)

Discussion surrounding designated applications will be amalgamated with **discussion on Amendments to Section 53B** of the LLA and the SA Attorney General’s Department “Community Impact Assessment” Guidelines.

3. [Amendment 5 – Section 4 – Interpretation \(page 8\) – Definition of records](#)

The AHA|SA acknowledges this change in the definition of record in the LLA which clarifies that the definition of ‘record’ includes a ‘document’ which, under the Acts Interpretation Act, also includes “information stored or recorded by computer or other process”, i.e. CCTV etc.

The AHA|SA notes that under the current *LLA Part 9—Special powers and enforcement Division 1—Powers of entry etc.*, authorised officers may enter licenced premises and require production of records, examine them or remove them.

Part 6 of the Late Night Trading Code of Practice also deals with the obligations and rights of licensees with respect to CCTV systems.

As well as requiring licensees to ensure they have operational CCTV, Clause 8 states that “

“The licensee must ensure that the visual recordings and any information relating to the visual recordings is made available as soon as practicable upon the request of an authorised officer acting in the course of his or her official duties (noting that the authorised officer must identify the date, time and location of the premises to which the request relates as well as the reason for the request)”

Given the inclusion of CCTV in the definition of records through this proposed amendment, the AHA|SA contends that corresponding obligations such as those currently imposed on an authorised officer through 14(8) of the Late Night Trading Code of Practice should also apply here. In other words the authorised officer must be similarly required to identify the date, time and location of the premises to which the request relates as well as the reason for the request. This should be added to the Amendment.

For serious breaches of the law outside the LLA then a general search warrant would be available which has its own requirements which would not be impinged by the addition of this obligation.

4. [Amendment 20 – Part 3 Division 2 – Licences \(page 13\)](#)

Section 31 establishes the new categories of liquor licence.

Detailed discussion about the CIA and how it applies to the differing licence categories will be amalgamated into comments provided in Section 53B. Other general comments about licence categories are in this section.

As the AHA|SA has previously stated there is no logical or bureaucratic rationale for changing, amalgamating or simply renaming the licence classes.

Under the proposed Bill there are slightly fewer classes (12 to 8) however this in reality represents no real reduction in red tape or benefit to either Government or licensees.

5. **Amendment 20 – Part 3 Division 2 Section 32 (page 14)**

The proposed amendment to Section 32 changes the name of the historic 'Hotel' licence to a rather more bland 'General liquor licence'.

This change not only has no practical benefit but in fact provides less clarity as to what the business is expected to be, or to do. It also holds none of the historic value or appeal of the Hotel licence.

Given that it is only the holders of current Hotel licences that would be transitioned to a General licence (with the addition of the four current Special Circumstance licences would could be treated as exceptions) it does no damage to simply leave the Hotel licence category as it is, in the same way that Restaurants and Clubs remain the same.

The AHA|SA does however welcome the decision to ensure that existing trading rights held by licensees with current Hotel licences will not be lost and will be grandfathered should a name change to a General licence proceed. This includes those Hotel licences with off-premise trading rights which currently extend beyond the new closure at 10pm off-premise regulation.

6. **Amendment 20 – Part 3 Division 2 Section 33 On Premise Licence (page 14)**

There are no specific concerns with the on-premise licence category excepting those which relate to the application of the proposed Community Impact Assessment - discussed in later section. However as with the Hotel licence, the AHA|SA's position is that it is much clearer to name this licence exactly what it is, a Bar Licence, that is, a licence to be able to sell alcohol for consumption on the licensed premises without a requirement for either food or to be seated.

7. **Amendment 20 – Part 3 Division 2 Section 36 – Club licence (page 15)**

The AHA|SA does not have concerns about the on-premise rights for existing clubs which currently have the right to sell liquor to their members.

Currently some clubs have demonstrated to the Authority that their members cannot without great inconvenience purchase liquor elsewhere for off-premise consumption. The AHA|SA presumes that the transition provisions will preserve all current trading rights for holders of Club licenses including the right to sell to their members for take away where that right currently exists.

The AHA|SA is concerned however that any applicant for a new Club licence that does not seek the right to sell liquor for consumption off licensed premises is currently not a 'designated' licence under the definition in the Amendment Bill and therefore not subject to the full CIA.

Note that under the South Australian legislation, a Club licence is not required to have its members, their guests or members of the general public sign in. While this may create a potential income tax liability for clubs, they are by the design of this licence, a public house. The ability to sell on-premise is not different to a hotel or on-licence and therefore all new applications should be subject to the CIA.

It should also be noted that as there is no capacity under the current LLA to identify or record sales to members or/and non-members, a requirement to do so should be a consideration should an applicant for a Club licence in the future seek off-premise rights for members only. Not to do this would be to undermine the Government's concerns regarding the proliferation and availability of packaged liquor in the community.

In addition if the applicant for a new Club licence includes the right to sell off-premise to the public at large (rather than simply to its members) the AHA|SA contends that the application should be subject to the same test as an application for a General licence, as their trading rights and presumably their potential impact would be the same as a General licence trading as a hotel.

AHA|SA Recommendation re: Section 36

The AHA|SA recommends that any existing Club licence holder who wishes to vary its trading conditions to trade to the general public for consumption off-premise should also meet the same CIA test as a licence for packaged liquor.

Further that if the applicant for a new Club licence whether for sales on or both on and off-premise to the public at large (rather than simply to its members) the AHA|SA contends that the application should be subject to the same CIA test as an application for a General licence

8. [Amendment 20 – Part 3 Division 2 Section 38 – Packaged Liquor Sales Licence \(page 18\)](#)

As stated the AHA|SA is pleased that the State Government has preserved the physical separation of liquor sales from all other products.

Clause (3) captures this through retention of the clause stating that the licenced premise must be devoted entirely to the business conducted under the licence, i.e. it cannot also be selling any other general goods or products and must be physically separate from premises used for other commercial purposes.

The AHA|SA welcomes the clarification in the Draft Bill about what constitutes physical separation through the inclusion of Clauses (4) and (5) on page 19.

Through these additions the AHA|SA understands and supports the recommendation which will ensure that the holder of a Packaged Liquor Sales licence must operate out of physically separated premises which cannot be assessed from any other commercial premise (with the exception of the common area within a shopping centre/mall) and that physical separation must consist of a permanent and non-transparent barrier which is at least 2.5m high.

Diagrams below illustrate what is understood and agreed to be illustrative of acceptable separate entrances.





Given the additional legislation contained in the Draft Bill Section 112(1) prohibiting minors from being in packaged liquor outlets without an appropriate adult this separate entrance seems entirely appropriate and in keeping with the Objects of the LLA.

While recognising that both the existing LLA and the Draft Amendment Bill contain a clause which allows the licensing authority to grant an exemption with respect to Section (3), the proposed subsection (7) (page 19) also states that “a packaged liquor sales licence may only be granted in respect of premises of a prescribed kind if the licensing authority is satisfied that there is proper reason to do so.” **The AHA|SA takes that mean the current guidelines would continue.**

The AHA|SA also assumes the intention of this is to prescribe each of the prohibited businesses as set out in Section 5.7.42 of the Anderson report in Regulations. If that is not the case the AHA|SA would urge these excluded premises to be included into Section 38 of the LLA. These prohibited premises, as set out by Anderson are those:

- that are used primarily for the preparation and sale of food for immediate consumption away from the premises (whether or not food is also consumed on the premises)
- that are of a kind ordinarily known as or advertised as a convenience store or deli
- that are of a kind ordinarily known for the sale of non-consumable, domestic or commercial goods and merchandise
- connected directly with the sale of petrol, oil or other petroleum products (including the repair and servicing of motor vehicles)
- which primarily sell only tobacco products
- connected directly or indirectly with the sale of guns or ammunition
- considered to be non-retail type premises
- that are a conveyance
- that are a facility that the public can reach directly from premises where the primary business carried on is a business of a kind described in condition (a) to (g) above.

AHA|SA Recommendation re: Section 38 of the LLA

Of course the level of detail required in Section 38 of the Amendment Bill with respect to separated premises and barriers could be avoided should 'supermarket' also simply be included in the list of prohibited businesses. That inclusion would ensure that the intent of the Government's policy as reflected in their response and media releases of September 28th 2016 to ensure no sale of alcohol sales within supermarkets would be clear and unequivocal.

9. Amendment 23 - Section 44 Extending Trading Authorisation (page 25)

The AHA|SA welcomes the amendment to clause 44 to allow all licensees to extend trade for on-premise sales to 2am on New Year's Eve.

All holders of current Hotel licences and some Special Circumstances licence holders currently also have extended trading rates on New Year's Eve for liquor sales for off-premise consumption. Given the intent to preserve existing trading rights the AHA|SA would expect that these extended trading rights after midnight will be grandfathered and will remain.

Section 44A deals with the recommendation for a 3 hour break in trade for on-premise consumption. Anderson in his Report recommended that the break-in trade should be between the hours of 3am and 9am. (Recommendation 15).

While the AHA|SA does not support a break in trade in principle, it cannot see the need for the legislation to further narrow the time frames to between 3am and 8am as is proposed.

With no access to the submission by SAPOL to the review of the LLA there has simply been no evidence put forward to support this recommendation. The AHA|SA does however agree that regardless of the break in trade requirements premises should be allowed to stay open and not serve alcohol.

Regardless of specific hours, the AHA|SA opposes in the strongest terms the recommendation that the Adelaide Casino be exempt from this requirement, just as it is exempt from the lock-out provisions contained in the Late Night Trading Code of Practice. There remains simply no logical or risk-based explanation to exempt the Casino from either of these conditions. To further illustrate this absurdity, under the proposed new risk-based licensing regime while the Casino would presumably be deemed a high level of risk for fees calculation it would not be deemed risky enough for these provisions.

10. Amendment 34 – Section 53A – Community Impact Assessment (page 27)

Refer also Community Impact Assessment (AG Department Guidelines)

At the core of the changes to the LLA is the updating of the Objects of the Act to focus on; harm minimisation and responsibility, sale and supply being consistent with the expectations and aspiration of the public, and to facilitate the responsible development of the licenced liquor and associated industries.

The cornerstone of implementation of those Objects is the replacement of the current 'needs test' with a Community Impact Assessment (CIA) or Community Impact and Public Interest Assessment and this Amendment Bill makes provision in Section 53B for Guidelines on the CIA to be published in the Government Gazette.

The AHA|SA supports this Amendment based on the following understandings.

Firstly, that it is critical to get those Guidelines right.

It is proposed that the CIA assessments will only be required for applications deemed to be 'designated applications' or applications for 'designated licences'.

Under the proposed Amendment Bill designated licences are; General licences, On-premise licences, Club licences which include off-premise sales and Packaged Liquor Sales licences. The AHA|SA agrees with these inclusions.

However, consistent with the Government's "Summary of Proposed Changes to the Liquor Licensing Act" (page 18 recommendation 72) the AHA|SA seeks the inclusion in the Community Impact Assessment" Tier 2 Guidelines of all on-premise licences rather than only those which trade past 2am.

The Government response (page 18 rec no. 72) is clear as to their expectations of an orderly licensing regime.

Recommendation 72

*"The Government substantially accepts this recommendation (replacing the needs test) but notes that careful consideration will need to be given to framing this **test to protect against proliferation of liquor outlets** and alcohol-related harm. Under this new Community Impact and Public Interest Test (the new Test) an applicant will have to satisfy the Licensing Authority that granting the application will not detract from the safety and well-being of the community and is in the public interest.*

This position is further reinforced in Recommendations 11 and 77 which expresses concern over proliferation of licenses and also advocate a level of protection for the emerging Small Venue Licence category by rejecting their expansion beyond the designated CBD.

Recommendation 11 and 77

The Government does not support this recommendation. The existing small venue licence has proved successful in its limited application to the CBD, however consideration as to possible expansion to other areas will be deferred for later review in two to three years to allow consolidation and proper review of the impact of the existing program (see also recommendation 11).

In addition, the Government response goes to some length at Recommendation 9 (page 5) to again expresses concern over proliferation and the 'backdoor means to a restaurant being able to operate as a bar' to recommend that the Government rejects the capacity of a restaurant to allow consumption of liquor without food without need for authorisation.

Recommendation 9

However, with respect to the proposal to allow consumption of liquor without a meal without the need for an authorisation, there is concern to ensure that this cannot be a backdoor means to a restaurant being able to operate as a bar, for example ceasing to serve meals after a certain hour but being permitted under the licence to continue to provide a late night bar service. This aspect of recommendation 9 is not accepted.

In the context of the recommendations above it makes no sense to allow on-premise licence applications any less criteria than an application for a hotel with a similar capacity which also shuts before 2am.

Finally while the AGD Community Impact Assessment Guidelines state the CIA will apply to 'certain categories of high risk venues' it makes no logical sense to automatically exempt applications for small venue licences from any requirement for assessment.

While recognising that some applications for liquor licences are on the face of it 'riskier' than others, e.g. a venue of 50 people which shuts at 10pm versus a 500 person venue open until 3am, the AHA|SA also does not accept the need for a two-tiered system as proposed as there are a number of anomalies. Such a system simply has inherent unfairness built in.

AHA|SA Recommendation re: Amendment 34 – Section 53A – Community Impact Assessment

Instead, the AHA|SA recommends that the simplest guidelines would be a default to what is currently set out as Tier 2 in the draft Guidelines with the Commissioner having the discretion to waive some criteria based on the specific nature of the business to which the licence would apply.

Based on the draft Guidelines it would not appear terribly onerous but would be consistent with the ambitions of Government as expressed in Recommendations 9, 11, 72 and 77.

As stated in a previous section, the AHA|SA also contends that any current holder of a Club licence which wishes to change its trading rights to allow packaged liquor sales to the public, and not just to members, should also be required to complete a CIA. Without such a condition any club which only has the right to sell packaged liquor to members could in effect simply become a huge bottle shop with no assessment at all.

11. Amendment 35 – Section 55 – Fit and Proper Persons (page 29)

The AHA|SA does not support the provisions which would result in an individual being not deemed 'fit and proper' based on a body corporate being wound up or under office administration or in receivership. This provision has the potential to remove existing licensees based merely on one of their businesses experiencing financial difficulties, difficulties which may have been caused by reasons beyond their control, including simply as a result of government policy changes.

In addition, a situation may arise where an existing licensee may be involved in a not-for-profit organisation which is forced to call in an administrator because to keep trading would potentially create the offence of trading whilst insolvent. Under this Amendment this could result in the person having to dispose of other licensed businesses.

12. Amendment 76 Section 115 – Seizure of evidence of age document (page 50)

The AHA|SA would not support the introduction of a measure whereby a licensee, RP or crowd controller was obliged to seize a suspicious age document and would expose themselves to prosecution simply by trying to prevent minors from entering premises or by not complying with unnecessary red tape.

It is anticipated that licensees would rather simply refuse entry where there is a suspicion of use of false age documents and call the police.

The AHA|SA would be comfortable however should this provision not be mandatory and would give authorised persons the ability to seize a document should they choose to.

The AHA|SA would also support a provision that requires the Police to assist when requested, similar to Section 124 (2A) of the LLA which mandates police attendance when requested.

The AHA|SA also notes with a degree of scepticism that many provisions in the Amendment Bill relating to minors have been strengthened and the provision for penalties proposed for breaching the regulations by a prescribed person carries double the penalty than that proposed for the actual minor producing false document in the first place!

13. Amendment 84 – Section 125(B) – Licensing Barring Orders (page 54)

Subsection 3 of the Amendment refers to Section 125B (3)(b)(i) to (iii) inclusive and seeks to delete the word 'section' and replace with 'subdivision'. 'Section' should instead be replaced with 'division'.

The consequence of this proposed amendment would be that police would have the discretion (but no obligation) to rely on previous barring orders issued by licensees.

14. Amendment 88 – Insertion of Division 5 – Alcohol and drug testing of licensees and responsible persons. (page 56)

While not condoning any employee working while intoxicated the AHA|SA is fundamentally opposed to this Amendment which allows for the drug and alcohol testing of licensees and/or responsible persons.

This amendment inserts three pages of additional red tape into the legislation with no justification and no demonstrated need!

Legislative frameworks *already* exist which deal with work-related alcohol and drug use. Individual state legislation such as the South Australian Work Health and Safety Act 2012 *already* covers the duties and responsibilities of employers and employees more broadly.

There is *already* a responsibility AND a duty to be fit for work as well as mechanisms for employers to set their own policies with input from employees.

No other Australian jurisdiction currently has drug/alcohol testing legislation specific to hospitality workers.

There are no legislated maximum BAC limits for general employees or the public, other than that which exists regarding operation of a motor vehicle or as a crowd controller and the AHA|SA does not believe there is a case for treating hospitality workers including RP's any differently than any other employees in this regard.

It is also the AHA|SA's assertion that if an RP was under the influence of alcohol or a drug it would already be relatively easy for Police to mount a prosecution against a licensee under Section 119 (1) (viii) of The Liquor Licensing Act 1997 without the need to rely on a breath or drug test and without further amendments to the legislation.

The Draft Bill also recommends a zero BAC. Again the AHA|SA has seen absolutely no justification for this test and even less for a setting a zero BAC. It would seem overkill to impose this type of condition on a lone publican who wants to have a quiet drink with a patron or on a wine maker conducting tastings at their cellar door.

Within the parameters of the AHA|SA rejecting this amendment, it also offers the following specific comments.

The AHA|SA notes that alco-testing can only be performed by police whereas drug testing can be authorised by SAPOL and/or an inspector.

Clause 128D refers to a designated person meaning a licensee or RP in respect to the licenced premises.

Clause 128E(1) states that the police officer or authorised officer may direct a designated person 'while the person is performing the function of supervising and managing the business conducted under the licence' to undertake the test.

This is critical as it allows ONLY for the person performing the role of RP is eligible to be subject to this test. A licenced premise may have a number of RP's working on the premises at one time however only one of them may be performing the designated role of RP. The ability to direct that RP to undergo drug or alcohol testing must only apply to that RP performing the duty of RP and not to others who may be doing other duties, or may in fact be on the premise but may have finished work.

15. Amendment 89 – Part 9A Liquor Accords (page 63)

The AHA|SA welcomes this amendment as it stands, recognising that licences must be a party to the drafting of Liquor Accords which cannot be imposed upon them.

16. Amendment 93 – Sections 135A and 135B – Publication of names of certain licensees (page 67)

The AHA|SA does not support this amendment to allow the Commissioner to publish a "black list" of licensees for serving minors. This amendment has no restriction or limits on time since the offence, no duration for the notice to remain up, no minimum number of offences and simply no rationale to justify why this offence is more important than others. This is not to suggest that serving a minor is a trivial matter, simply that an indefinite black list serves no particular purpose except to impose more red tape.

17. Amendment 96 – Section 138 – Regulations (page 68)

This amendment allows for the setting of fees under Regulations under the LLA. The AHA|SA understands that it is the intention of the State Government to increase liquor licence fees.

In his report, Anderson recommended draconian and huge fee increases based on incorrect assumptions of what constituted a high risk venue, such as licenced capacity (regardless of patron numbers) and hours of licenced premises, regardless of actual risk or an individual premises' record of wrongdoing.

AHA|SA calculated that fee increases based on the these calculations and using the top 35 music venues alone would result in a massive \$150,000 being sucked out of the industry straight into the Government's coffers, money which could be used by venues to support local businesses and local music. And of course this is just a tip of the iceberg, with hundreds of other venues also be impacted.

Impact of Anderson proposed increase in Liquor Licence Fees on top music venues as per the Music SA 2016 Census (\$)				
	Venue	Fee 1 July 2016	Fee per LLA Review	Increase pa
1	The Lion	771	2,000	1,229
2	Gaslight Tavern	111	1,500	1,389
3	Royal Oak	771	2,000	1,229
4	Crown & Anchor	2,314	8,000	5,686
5	Grace Emily	771	2,000	1,229
6	The Duke	3,525	10,000	6,475
7	Warradale Hotel	771	2,000	1,229
8	Exeter	3,525	6,000	2,475
9	Hotel Metro	2,314	8,000	5,686
10	The Wheatsheaf	771	2,000	1,229
11	Governor Hindmarsh	3,525	7,000	3,475
12	Exchange Tavern	2,314	5,000	2,686
13	The Grand Bar, Glenelg	3,525	4,000	
14	Ramsgate	771	2,000	1,229
15	Norwood Hotel	3,525	12,000	8,475
16	Woodcroft Tavern	3,525	12,000	8,475
17	Tea Tree Gully Hotel	771	2,000	1,229
18	The Holdfast, Glenelg	771	2,000	1,229
19	The Village Tavern	3,525	7,000	3,475
20	Producers Bar	2,314	6,000	3,686
21	Gilbert Street	771	2,000	1,229
22	Saracens Head	2,314	5,000	2,686
23	Publishers	3,525	6,000	2,475
24	PJ O'Briens	3,525	6,000	2,475
25	Daniel O'Connell	771	2,000	1,229
26	Tonsley Hotel	771	2,000	1,229
27	The Jade Monkey	2,314	5,000	2,686
28	The Goody	771	2,000	1,229
29	Casablaba	771	6,050	5,279
30	Crown & Sceptre	771	4,000	3,229
31	HQ	9,033	38,000	28,967
32	The Palace/Red Square	9,033	38,000	28,967
33	Fat Stag	3,525	6,000	2,475
34	Austral	2,314	5,000	2,686
35	Nola	111	1,500	1,389
			\$150,045	\$87,001

Calculations using a range of existing licences reveals not only similar bad news but clear inconsistencies with fees in a venue such as Nola and Clever Little Tailor set to be charged an addition \$1,389 per annum whereas Peel Street fees will increase \$139pa.

Industry Impact of proposed increase in Liquor Licence Fees (\$)				
	Venue	Fee 1 July 2016	Fee per annum per LLA Review	Increase pa
	Udaberri	111	1,500	1,389
	Casablaba	771	6,050	5,279
	Strathmore Hotel	8,262	28,000	19,738
	Adelaide Casino	8,262	38,000	29,738
	Peel Street	111	250	139
	Parlamento	111	750	639
	Nola	111	1,500	1,389
	Intercontinental	771	2,000	1,229
	Clever Little Tailor	111	1,500	1,389
	Electra House	2,754	6,000	3,246
	Beck Bros Bottleshop (Streaky Bay)	771	4,000	3,229
	Franklin Harbor Cowell	771	2,000	1,229
	Blyth Hotel	111	1,500	1,389
	South Eastern Mt Gambier	2,754	7,000	4,246
	Port Victoria Hotel	111	1,500	1,389
	The Stag	3,525	6,000	2,475
	Austral	2,314	5,000	2,686

The SA hotel industry contributes enormously to the State's economic wellbeing. Any measure which impacts the industry by even as little as 5% will affect jobs. Pulling hundreds of thousands of dollars out of the hands of hoteliers will affect jobs and associated industries.

Hoteliers will view a huge fee increase cynically, even if they can afford to pay it, in a climate of economic uncertainty and massive increases in energy costs with no end in sight.

AHA|SA Recommendation re: Amendment 96 – Section 138 – Regulations (page 68)

The AHA|SA urges the State Government to not increase licence fees and at the very least to defer any increase for at least two more years.

While recognising the specific nature of the hotel industry in dealing with the complexities of the sale of a product such as alcohol, it must be remembered that the SA Hotel industry provides a significant economic contribution to SA and deserves the full support of the Government without unnecessarily burdensome regulation and unreasonable financial demands placed upon it.

To this end the AHA|SA would welcome the opportunity to meet with relevant SA Government representatives to discuss its comments on this Draft Amendment Bill in further detail.

Yours sincerely



IAN HORNE

General Manager