

## **Tudor Hotel Redfern**

### **Submission to the Office of Liquor, Gaming and Racing**

#### **Review of the Three Strikes Disciplinary Scheme**

We request that you considering the following

**The scheme does not take into consideration the capacity, size and patronage of the venue.** The criteria is the same for a venue which has a capacity of 50 people and has foot traffic of 1000-2000 people a week, compared to a venue that holds 3000+ people and experiences foot traffic of 25,000 people per week. Venues clocking hundreds of thousands of visitors through its doors each year should not be judged on the same scale as low traffic/small venues. The reality is that no matter how responsible the operator is, the likelihood of an incident is increased in these high patronage venues.

The financial consequences of incurring a strike or multiple strikes are far too extreme. From loss of income to unnecessary pressure from lenders and potential loss of livelihood, the consequences can be devastating. The hospitality industry has become too high risk for banks. We agree that negligent or unlawful operators should be punished; however it is ridiculous for that punishment to lie on the feet of the owners and the venue itself. **Why are the outcomes for hotels different to those of registered clubs?**

The scheme is not a long term solution. The issue it is trying to address is anti social behavior in licensed venues, however the approach is wrong. **Individuals no longer have to be responsible for their own actions.** Venue managers carry the burden of enforcement of these laws and dealing with people who partake in anti social behavior. **Consumers are so unaware of the laws surrounding responsible service of alcohol and the strict regulation placed on the hospitality industry.** There is minimal advertising, education programs are non existent and we the industry receives very little support from government to publicise the laws. The public may pick up dribs and drabs in the media, they probably realize it's not ok to 'coward punch' but they are oblivious to the rest.

Responsible venue operators and licensees are operating a 7 day week business that can potentially be open 24 hours a day. The industry relies heavily on a casual labor force, often younger people, school leavers, first timers to the industry, students & overseas visitors on holiday working visas. All hospitality employees complete an accredited RSA course and before being permitted to work and are signed off by the training provider as being competent in the responsible service of alcohol. If an employee then serves a customer who is considered to be intoxicated, who is underage or does something that breaches the venues licensing conditions why should the blame be directed to the licensee and the venue? The employee has been signed off as competent, they have been trained on an accredited course and the venue manager/licensee has done everything possible to prevent the situation. **If all reasonable steps have been taken to prevent a breach the venue should not be penalised with a strike.**

We are disappointed that this scheme has been implemented as a one size fits all approach. Responsible venue owners and operators can be harshly affected by the scheme and financial outcomes are extremely concerning.