

Decision and reasons for decision

In the matter of an amended application under section 11 of the *Liquor Control Reform Act 1998* by Camberwell Developments Pty Ltd for a packaged liquor licence for the premises located at G16-G17 of 1-11 Greenvale Drive, Greenvale described as Bottlemart at Greenvale

Commission: Mr John Larkins, Deputy Chair

Appearances: Mr Martin Towey, Counsel for the Applicant
Mr Dominic Scally, Counsel for the Objectors
Ms Caitlin McAlister, Counsel Assisting the Commission

Date of Hearing: 30 August 2023

Date of Decision: 1 December 2023

Date of Reasons: 29 July 2024

Decision: The Commission has determined to grant the amended application for a packaged liquor licence subject to the conditions set out in Appendix A

Signed:



John Larkins, Acting Chair

Background

1. Bottlemart at Greenvale is located on the ground floor of Greenvale Shopping Centre at site G16-G17 of 1-11 Greenvale Drive, Greenvale (**Premises**). The shop was yet to be fitted out at the time of the hearing.
2. On 5 December 2022, the Victorian Liquor Commission (**Commission**) received an application for a packaged liquor licence (**Application**) under section 11 of the *Liquor Control Reform Act 1998* (**LCR Act**)¹ from Camberwell Developments Pty Ltd (**Applicant**) for the Premises.
3. Specifically, the Applicant sought to sell packaged liquor on the Premises for consumption off the Premises between the trading hours of:

Sunday	Between 10am and 8pm
ANZAC Day	Between 12pm and 10pm
Any other day (other than Good Friday and Christmas Day)	Between 9am and 10pm
4. In accordance with section 33, a copy of the Application was served on Victoria Police and the Hume City Council (**Council**). Victoria Police did not object to the Application, whilst the Council did not respond.
5. A planning permit for use of the Premises as a packaged liquor outlet had been issued by the Council on 27 October 2022 (**Planning Permit**).
6. In accordance with section 34 and section 35, the Applicant displayed a public notice of the Application on the Premises and advertised the Application in a newspaper.
7. On 6 January 2023, the Commission received one objection to the grant of the Application (**Objection**) under section 38, made jointly by the Roman Catholic Trusts Corporation (**RCTC**) and Corpus Christi Community Greenvale Incorporated (**CCCGI**) (collectively, the **Objectors**). A further submission was received from the Objectors on 3 March 2023. The Objection was made on the basis of the Objectors' expressed concerns regarding (in summary) a detraction from or detriment to the amenity of the area in which the Premises are situated and a contribution to harm arising from misuse and abuse of alcohol.
8. Specifically, the Objection was made on the basis of the proximity of the Premises to a residential care facility run by CCCGI that provides accommodation and support to older men with a history of homelessness, substance addiction, or complex health needs. As was put by Mr Scally in his submissions of 12 September 2023, it is beyond argument that this objection raises considerations within the definition of harm in section 3(1)(a) given that harm is now defined to include [inter alia] 'harm to...vulnerable persons or communities'. It is abundantly clear that the CCCGI facility falls within that part of the definition, and this has therefore informed the Commission's approach in this proceeding. It is acknowledged also that the introduction of alcohol at this site potentially impacts the amenity of the area for the purposes of section 3A and section 3AA.
9. RCTC is the landlord of CCCGI's facility.
10. The Objectors asserted that by the Premises being within walking distance of the CCCGI facility, a 'dry site', presented a risk that residents would purchase at the Premises and drink in public spaces, such as within the local shopping centre.
11. The Objectors claimed that such a risk would affect the viability of CCCGI's facility to provide the care that CCCGI is mandated to provide subject to commonwealth, state and local government grant funding and would expose members of the public to negative behaviours associated with intoxication.
12. CCCGI referred the Objection to its local Member for Greenvale, Iwan Walters MP, who wrote to the Commission in support of the Objection on 23 March 2023.
13. The Applicant contested the Objectors' concerns in its response submissions lodged with the Commission on 27 January 2023 and 21 March 2023. The Applicant informed the Commission (in

¹ All references to legislation are references to the *Liquor Control Reform Act 1998* (Vic).

summary) that the Planning Permit supported the proposed use of the Premises and that appropriate controls would be put in place in any event. The Applicant also noted that a previous packaged liquor licence application had been made by a different applicant approximately ten years ago which received approximately 700 objections, whilst this Application received only one. The Applicant considered this was telling of a local appetite for the Applicant's proposed use of the Premises.

14. A hearing was held in relation to the Application on 30 August 2023 (**Hearing**).
15. Mr Martin Towey, solicitor and director of LGS Legal, appeared on behalf of the Applicant.
16. Mr Dominic Scally, solicitor and principal of Best Hooper Lawyers, appeared on behalf of the Objectors. At the commencement of the Hearing, he advised that the parties mutually proposed special conditions, were the Commission to grant a licence.
17. Mr Towey indicated that, after discussions with Mr Scally, the mutually proposed special conditions formed the basis for an amended application for a packaged liquor licence for the Applicant (**Amended Application**).
18. The Objectors confirmed in the Hearing that they did not object to the granting of the Amended Application.
19. At the end of the Hearing, the parties lodged further submissions with the Commission.
20. On 13 September 2023, the Commission received Mr Towey's submissions, in which he stated (in summary):
 - a. the mutually proposed special conditions are designed to counter alcohol-related harm; and
 - b. overall, the proposed use of the Premises will involve a family operation that has well-trained and motivated staff who want to do the right thing.
21. The Commission also received Mr Scally's submissions, in which he stated (in summary):
 - a. the mutually proposed licence conditions will minimise risks of residents of CCCGI's facility engaging in harmful or antisocial behaviour or from inflicting violence on themselves, other residents, staff, volunteers, or the public;
 - b. it is not necessary for the Commission to refuse the Amended Application to minimise alcohol-related harm; and
 - c. it is recognised by the Objectors that Greenvale is not well serviced with packaged liquor outlets.

Legislation and the Commission's task

22. As discussed above, the Amended Application is uncontested.
23. The Commission must either:
 - a. grant the Amended Application, and if so, determine whether to do so subject to conditions;
or
 - b. refuse to grant the Amended Application.
24. The Commission is not bound to accept any proposed licence conditions made by way of agreement with respect to an application under section 11; nor is there a power vested in the relevant parties to resolve such a matter by consent. However, it is open to the Commission to consider a possible outcome proposed by the parties and give it appropriate weight when exercising its discretion to grant or refuse the Amended Application.
25. In deciding whether to grant or refuse the Amended Application under section 44(1), the Commission must have regard to the objects of the LCR Act and, in particular, harm minimisation,

which is the primary object.

26. The Commission may also refuse to grant the Amended Application on the basis of any of the matters listed in section 44(2)(b), which relevantly include:
- a. the granting of the application would detract from or be detrimental to the amenity of the area in which the Premises to which the application relates are situated; or
 - b. the granting of the application would be conducive to or encourage harm.
27. Under section 49, the Commission may impose any condition it thinks fit on the grant of an application.

Material before the Commission

28. The Commission received and considered the following materials:
- a. New Entrant Training, Confirmation of Completion, Mr Farid Sawan, dated 24 February 2012;
 - b. Applicant's report entitled, Greenvale Shopping Centre – Market Profile Report, dated 18 August 2022;
 - c. Certificate of Completion – Responsible Service of Alcohol (**RSA**) Program, Mr Farid Sawan, dated 5 October 2022;
 - d. Planning Permit, issued by the Council on 27 October 2022;
 - e. ASIC Extract regarding Camberwell Developments Pty Ltd, dated 3 December 2022;
 - f. Declaration of Associates, dated 4 December 2022;
 - g. Application – Packaged Liquor Licence, dated 4 December 2022;
 - h. Questionnaire, dated 4 December 2022;
 - i. Declaration – Right to Occupy, dated 4 December 2022;
 - j. Newspaper advertisement of the Application, dated 12 December 2022;
 - k. Confirmation of no objection by Victoria Police to the Application, dated 12 December 2022;
 - l. Objectors' submissions, dated 6 January 2023;
 - m. Statement of display, received 9 January 2023;
 - n. Applicant's report entitled, Trade Area Overview and Centre Update, dated 17 January 2023;
 - o. Letter from Iwan Walters MP, dated 23 March 2023;
 - p. Applicant's submissions, received 27 January 2023
 - q. Objectors' submissions, dated 2 February 2023;
 - r. Applicant's submissions, received 21 March 2023;
 - s. Evidence presented at the Hearing on 30 August 2023;
 - t. Applicant's submissions, received 13 September 2023;

- u. Mutually proposed licence conditions; received 13 September 2023; and
- v. Objectors' submissions received 13 September 2023.

Hearing

29. At the request of the Commission, the Applicant's director, Mr Farid Sawan, gave oral evidence in support of the Amended Application to the effect that:

- a. he has extensive experience as a proprietor of bottle shops and supermarkets. He has been involved in the liquor industry for the past 28 years;
- b. the Applicant's proposed use of the Premises will solely be a family business, at least for the first year. He will make sure that his wife, son, daughter, and himself get to know the Applicant's customers and the Applicant will ensure that it cooperates with CCCGI;
- c. Mr Sawan's family have experience working in bottle shops because of other venues that Mr Sawan owns; and
- d. high-risk spirits will be on display from behind the counter. That has always been Mr Sawan's practice in his other venues.

30. In the Hearing, again at the request of the Commission, the Chair of CCCGI, Mr Tom Barry, gave evidence to the effect that:

- a. many of CCCGI's residents experience mental health challenges and some experience substance abuse challenges and subsequently behavioural challenges;
- b. it is a condition of entry by CCCGI that no alcohol be consumed at the facility and that residents do not consume alcohol altogether;
- c. CCCGI do have residents that do get access to alcohol from time to time and cause harm to themselves, other residents, or towards staff. From time to time, police are required;
- d. because the facility is an aged care one, CCCGI is required to report incidents to the Aged Care Quality and Safety Commission and from time to time WorkSafe become involved;
- e. the mutually proposed special conditions, were the Commission to grant a licence, provide for dialogue between CCCGI and the Applicant particularly in respect to vulnerable people of the facility and would assist in minimising harm;
- f. if the Applicant were to be granted the licence and were to later seek to transfer the licence, CCCGI would want to be told in advance and the mutually proposed special conditions oblige the Applicant to notify CCCGI accordingly; and
- g. CCCGI considers that a sensible set of controls would be in place were the Applicant to use the Premises as a bottle shop.

Reasons for decision

Whether to exercise discretion to grant or refuse the Amended Application having regard to the objects of the LCR Act

31. The Commission has considered the mutually proposed licence conditions contained in the Amended Application which, in effect, provide an outcome that the parties submit is appropriate.

32. Having regard to the objects of the LCR Act in considering the Amended Application, the Commission is satisfied that there are no grounds for refusal under section 44(2).

33. The Commission considers that the mutually proposed licence conditions as set out in Appendix A will assist in addressing any concerns arising out of the proposed operation of the licence, including by reducing the risk of alcohol-related harm.
34. In order to explicate the Commission’s decision, it is necessary to consider the parties’ submissions as to amenity and harm, with particular emphasis on harm minimisation.
35. Both the Applicant’s and the Objectors’ submissions referred to the definition of harm in section 3(1):

harm means harm arising from the misuse and abuse of alcohol, including—
(a) harm to minors, vulnerable persons or communities, including groups within communities; and
(b) family violence; and
(c) anti-social behaviour, including behaviour that causes personal injury or property damage[.]

36. This definition was recently inserted into the LCR Act by section 4 of the *Liquor Control Reform Amendment Act 2021* (Vic). However, previous case law on harm minimisation retains its relevance to the Commission’s task.
37. The Applicant relied on *Kordister Pty Ltd v Director of Liquor Licensing* [2012] VSCA 325; (2012) 39 VR 92, in which the majority of Warren CJ and Osborn JA held that “harm minimisation is a fundamental principle of the Act and can properly be regarded as ‘the primary regulatory object and therefore the primary consideration in liquor licensing decisions’”.² Tate JA further noted that “[t]his is not to say ... that it is to be taken into account, or given such weight, to the exclusion of the other objects.”³
38. The Applicant concluded its submissions by quoting from the decision of Kellam J, sitting as President of the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal, with Member Angell in *Re Black & Liquor Licensing Victoria* [2000] VCAT 459; (2000) 17 VAR 17:

There may well be, in the future, applications for packaged liquor licences in circumstances where the object of harm minimisation stands out as being poorly served by reason of particular local, social, demographic and geographic circumstances. We do not think it appropriate in the course of this decision to confine the circumstances under which the object of harm minimisation may be achieved by the refusal of a grant of a packaged liquor licence by stating examples of when such a course would be appropriate. ...

We consider that harm minimisation as an objective of the Act cannot be relied upon in a general sense only to defeat any application for a liquor licence. If this were so, it may well be arguable that few licences of any description, other than for the consumption of alcohol in cafes and restaurants, should ever be granted in the future.⁴

39. The Objectors likewise relied on this passage in their submissions.
40. The Objectors in their post-hearing submissions dated 13 September 2023 relied on their earlier submissions dated 6 January 2023, in which they set out their objections to the Application. Certain parts of the objections expressed in the earlier submissions can be separated into categories according to whether they relate to amenity, harm or both.
41. As to amenity, the Objectors submitted that

The grant of the proposed packaged liquor licence would detract from and be detrimental to the amenity of the area in which the proposed licensed premises is situated. The presence of a

² *Kordister Pty Ltd v Director of Liquor Licensing* [2012] VSCA 325; (2012) 39 VR 92 at [19] (Warren CJ and Osborn JA), citing *Director of Liquor Licensing v Kordister Pty Ltd* [2011] VSC 207; (2011) 34 VAR 293 at [173]. See also [188] (Tate JA).

³ *Kordister Pty Ltd v Director of Liquor Licensing* [2012] VSCA 325; (2012) 39 VR 92 at [188] (Tate JA), citing *Lodhi v The Queen* [2007] NSWCCA 360; (2007) 179 A Crim R 470 at [19]-[39].

⁴ *Re Black & Liquor Licensing Victoria* [2000] VCAT 459; (2000) 17 VAR 17 at [32]-[33].

bottleshop within 100m walking distance of CCCGI poses an unacceptable risk of residents who have a history of alcohol and other substance abuse and are receiving support while residing in a dry location, obtaining and misusing alcohol. Access to alcohol poses a risk of compromising the recovery and treatment of many residents recovering from alcohol and substance abuse. Access within 100m will significantly increase the proportion of residents of CCCGI who are physically able to access liquor.

42. The Commission finds that this objection is probably more appropriately considered as one relating to harm, rather than amenity. As to harm, the Objectors submitted that

... the grant of a packaged liquor licence would be conducive to or encourage harm. Misuse of alcohol and intoxication poses an unacceptable risk of exacerbating instances of negative behaviour, aggression and violence by residents against other residents and staff members. The cohort of residents of CCCGI already pose significant occupational health and safety risks. The risk of harm to residents and staff will likely increase significantly.

43. Two of the objections were related to both amenity and harm:

Residents who obtain alcohol are likely to seek to consume it outside CCCGI's site to avoid the restrictions on alcohol possession, consumption and intoxication on site. Alcohol will likely be consumed by Residents in the Greenvale Shopping Centre, in surrounding streets and other public areas. This creates an unacceptable risk of negative behaviour, aggression and violence by residents against members of the local community, posing risks of harm, and negatively affecting the amenity of those areas.

Residents who are refused service of alcohol pose a significant risk of negative behaviour, aggression and violence towards staff and patrons of the bottleshop and Greenvale Shopping Centre, risking harm and negatively affecting the amenity of the Shopping Centre and surrounding areas.

44. These objections appear to condense to a risk of harm to vulnerable persons – residents of CCCGI's facility – and a risk of harm to residents and staff as a result of anti-social behaviour. The risk of anti-social behaviour further enlivens amenity concerns.

45. None of the Objectors' objections related to minors.

46. The Objectors in their post-hearing submissions further submitted that "family violence" included incidents between residents of CCCGI's facility or incidents by residents against staff members, having regard to the meaning of "family member" in section 8(3) of the *Family Violence Protection Act 2008* (Vic) (**Family Violence Act**). Section 8(3) and (4) provide:

(3) For the purposes of this Act, a family member of a person (the relevant person) also includes any other person whom the relevant person regards or regarded as being like a family member if it is or was reasonable to regard the other person as being like a family member having regard to the circumstances of the relationship, including the following—

(a) the nature of the social and emotional ties between the relevant person and the other person;
(b) whether the relevant person and the other person live together or relate together in a home environment;

(c) the reputation of the relationship as being like family in the relevant person's and the other person's community;

(d) the cultural recognition of the relationship as being like family in the relevant person's or other person's community;

(e) the duration of the relationship between the relevant person and the other person and the frequency of contact;

(f) any financial dependence or interdependence between the relevant person or other person;

(g) any other form of dependence or interdependence between the relevant person and the other person;

(h) the provision of any responsibility or care, whether paid or unpaid, between the relevant

person and the other person;

(i) the provision of sustenance or support between the relevant person and the other person.

Example

A relationship between a person with a disability and the person's carer may over time have come to approximate the type of relationship that would exist between family members.

(4) For the purposes of subsection (3), in deciding whether a person is a family member of a relevant person the relationship between the persons must be considered in its entirety.

47. The Objectors relied in particular on subparagraphs (b) and (h). While accepting that the definition of "family member" is broad, the Commission does not have before it evidence as to the relationships between residents, or between residents and staff, such as to permit a finding that they are family members for the purposes of the Family Violence Act (and consequently the LCR Act). It follows that, on the evidence, family violence is not engaged. However, this finding does not affect the overall assessment that the establishment of a packaged liquor facility on the relevant site potentially impacts the community of the CCCGI in material ways which must be considered under the LCR Act.
48. The Applicant made submissions as to the matters identified in s 3(1), including minors, vulnerable persons or communities, family violence and anti-social behaviour. In view of the scope of the objections and the Commission's finding that family violence is not engaged, the Commission's focus is on vulnerable persons or communities, and anti-social behaviour.
49. The issues for decision raised by the submissions are whether:
- a. the granting of the application would be conducive to or encourage harm to vulnerable persons, specifically residents or staff of CCCGI's facility; or
 - b. the granting of the application would be conducive to or encourage harm and/or would detract from or be detrimental to the amenity of the area, through potential anti-social behaviour in the Greenvale Shopping Centre and surrounding streets and other public areas; and
 - c. the mutually proposed special conditions to mitigate these harm and amenity issues are adequate to permit the granting of the application.
50. The Applicant accepted in its submissions that the residents of CCCGI's facility are vulnerable on account of some of them having had problems with alcohol and the prohibition of alcohol at the site. The Applicant referred in this context to the range of measures agreed between the Applicant and the Objectors, including:
- a. an agreed exclusion protocol to ensure the exclusion of identified residents of CCCGI's facility who choose to self-exclude from the Premises;
 - b. an open line of communication between the Applicant and the Objectors, allowing them to exchange information about issues that may arise from time to time at the Premises, or involving CCCGI's facility and its residents;
 - c. the Applicant is taking the lead in proposing to establish an accord that will comprise member invitations to various entities.
51. The Applicant submitted that these measures would go some way to counter anti-social behaviour. It also relied in this context on potential refusal of service, as well as the security staff in place at all times at the Greenvale Shopping Centre monitoring any issues that may arise with residents of CCCGI's facility.
52. The Objectors likewise submitted that

... the following special conditions will ensure harm, including the risk of harm, is minimised through open communication channels, risk management and collaboration between the Applicant and Objectors throughout the period of the licence:

- The requirement to enter into an Accord
- The community hotline
- The prohibition on deliveries to CCCG
- The self-exclusion prohibition
- The requirement that written notice of any application to transfer the licence be given to the operator of Corpus Christi

It is further submitted that the special conditions noted on the licence will provide clear notice of the particular risks of harm associated with the group within a community residing at Corpus Christi to relevant stakeholders, including the local licensing inspector, Liquor Control Victoria, and any potential transferee of the licence in future. Clear notice of the risks associated with residents of Corpus Christi will ensure the risk of harm is taken seriously and the conditions on the licence are complied with and enforced, thereby providing an effective means of minimising harm while the licence remains on foot.

53. The Commission finds that there is a potential risk of harm to residents or staff of CCCGI's facility posed by the proximity of the Premises, in that it increases the opportunity for residents to obtain, and seek to obtain, liquor. This could also conceivably have the consequence identified by the Objectors of anti-social behaviour by residents drinking in and around the Greenvale Shopping Centre to avoid detection at CCCGI's facility, and, further, the risk of such behaviour arising from refusal of service at the Premises. Given that an 'appreciable risk of harm is identified', the Commission has approached the resolution of this proceeding as one to be approached with caution and with the 'conservative approach' referred to by Judge Bowman in *Nardi v Director of Liquor Licensing* [2005] VCAT 323 at [51].⁵
54. However, the Commission accepts, consistently with the parties' submissions, that the mutually proposed special conditions would adequately mitigate these risks and therefore has determined to grant the Amended Application. In those circumstances, the Commission does not have to 'positively justify ...avoiding such potential risk on harm minimisation grounds'. Without such a detailed agreement as to a number of practical and to a considerable extent, unique measures to minimise the potential for harm, the total absence of any alcohol service whatever in and within a five kilometre radius of the major shopping centre in Greenvale may have had to be considered and weighed in the balance in the process of the Commission exercising its discretion. The Objectors in their submissions and at my invitation adverted to considerations in the planning jurisdiction whereby strong evidence of need can become an important and even a central consideration in the assessment of net community benefit despite 'need' being left to the market in almost all cases in that jurisdiction. In the present proceeding, section 38(3) applies so that absence of need can never constitute a ground of objection under the Act. Given the efforts of the parties before me and the proposed outcome accepted by the Commission, it is not necessary to resolve the question of whether in balancing all relevant liquor related considerations in assessing net community benefit the absence of any liquor facilities in the populous Greenvale area may be relevant. In *Kordister* at [17]-[18] Warren CJ and Osborn JA stated:
- '[T]he objectives recognise that the manner of supply and consumption of liquor may positively contribute to the amenity of community life and may encourage a culture of responsible consumption of alcohol. It follows that the notion of harm minimisation is not simply one of limiting the supply of alcohol. Rather, it is concerned with regulating supply of alcohol so as to ensure, so far as practicable, net community benefit...Ultimately, the Tribunal was required to balance each of the objects and arrive at an appropriate synthesis in the particular circumstances of the case by way of discretionary judgement'.
55. In all the circumstances, the parties are to be commended for engaging so constructively and ultimately reaching agreement on sensible mitigatory measures to minimise the risk of harm and amenity issues. In so doing, they have provided a sound basis for the Commission to reach an 'appropriate synthesis' in the present proceeding.

⁵ The Commission notes that the comments of Judge Bowman in *Nardi v Director of Liquor Licensing* [2005] VCAT 323 at [51] were endorsed in *Kordister* at (2012) 39 VR at [34]. See also *Tulcahy Pty Ltd v Knox CC* [2003] VCAT 1627.

Decision

56. Based on the reasons set out above, the Commission is satisfied that granting the Amended Application is appropriate in the circumstances.
57. The Commission has determined to grant the Amended Application subject to the conditions set out in **Appendix A**.
58. The Commission notes that, while there has undoubtedly been delay in the delivery of these reasons for a combination of reasons, the decision as specified in paragraph 57 above was handed down on 1 December 2023 and a packaged liquor licence issued with the specified conditions so as to prevent, insofar as was reasonably possible, any commercial impairment for the Applicant in commencement of its business operations at the Premises.

The preceding 58 paragraphs are a true copy of the Reasons for the Decision of Mr John Larkins (Acting Chairperson)

Appendix A

Type of licence

This licence is a packaged liquor licence and authorises the licensee to supply liquor in sealed containers, bottles or cans on the licensed premises for consumption off the licensed premises during the trading hours specified below.

Trading hours

Sunday	Between 10am and 8pm
ANZAC Day	Between 12 noon and 10pm
Good Friday & Christmas Day	No trade
On any other day	Between 10am and 10pm

Special Conditions

Premises Management Plan

The licensee must take all reasonable steps to conduct and supervise all aspects of the management of the premises in accordance with the Premises Management Plan, as amended from time to time to the satisfaction of Liquor Control Victoria. Notice of any application to amend the Premises Management Plan must be given to Corpus Christi Community Greenvale Incorporated and the Roman Catholic Trusts Corporation.

The Premises Management Plan must be retained on the premises in the possession of the licensee, nominee, manager or other person in charge. The Premises Management Plan must be available to an authorised member of Victoria Police or a Liquor Inspector if requested.

Liquor Accord

The licensee must participate in the Greenvale Liquor Accord as established and confirmed by the Licensing Inspector - Victoria Police, which will include the operator of Corpus Christi Community Greenvale as a party.

Hotline

A community mobile phone hotline must be provided and maintained 24 hours 7 days a week to allow for direct communication by the public with the licensee and/or its manager. This contact number must be given to the operator of Corpus Christi Community Greenvale.

Security Cameras

The licensee must install and maintain a surveillance recording system that is able to clearly identify individuals, display time and date, and provide continuous images of all areas where patrons are permitted, including entrances and exits. The position of the cameras must be to the satisfaction of the Licensing Inspector or a Liquor Inspector (as the case may be). The surveillance recording system must operate at all times the venue is open. A copy of the recorded images must be retained for at least one month and must be available upon request for immediate viewing and/or removal by Victoria Police or Liquor Control Victoria.

Notice of Transfer

Written notice of any application to transfer this licence must be given in writing personally or by post to the operator of Corpus Christi Community Greenvale.

Patron Access to the Premises after 9pm

Between the hours of 9 pm and closure of the premises, patrons must only enter and exit the licensed premises directly via the shopping centre entry from the southern car park located immediately to the west of the nearby supermarket as identified on the shopping centre floor plan.

No Deliveries of Liquor to Corpus Christi Community Greenvale

Liquor must not be delivered to Corpus Christi Community Greenvale.

Self-Exclusion

If the licensee is notified and provided identification details of any Corpus Christi Community Greenvale members who agree to prohibit themselves from liquor purchase, the licensee must not serve such persons liquor. If such persons present on the licensed premises, staff must record this in an Incident Register and must promptly notify and provide this information to Corpus Christi Community Greenvale management.