

# NORTHERN TERRITORY LICENSING COMMISSION

## Decision on Whether Objections Will Proceed To Hearing

---

<b>PREMISES:</b>	Oyster Bar Darwin
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Europa (SA) Pty Ltd and JK (SA) Investments Pty Ltd
<b>NOMINEE:</b>	Mr Jarrad Carter
<b>LICENCE NUMBER:</b>	N/A
<b>OBJECTORS:</b>	27 Objectors (Refer Attachment A)
<b>LEGISLATION:</b>	Sections 47F to 47I of the <i>Liquor Act</i> and Section 28 of the <i>Interpretation Act</i>
<b>DECISION OF:</b>	Richard O’Sullivan (Chairman)
<b>DATE OF DECISION:</b>	1 April 2014

---

### BACKGROUND

- 1) The Directors of Europa (SA) Pty Ltd and JK (SA) Investments Pty Ltd applied pursuant to Section 26 of the *Liquor Act* (“the Act”) for the grant of an On Licence to sell alcohol at the proposed premises to be known as the Oyster Bar Darwin located at Tenancy E5 and E6 Wharf One Retail, 19 Kitchener Drive, Darwin. The location is sometimes referred to as being within Building Two of Wharf One.
- 2) The applicants operate The Oyster Bar – Holdfast Shores at Glenelg South Australia and The Oyster Bar at Mandurah Western Australia. A similar concept is envisaged for operation in Darwin should a liquor licence be granted. The concept is “*wine bar with oyster theme serving light foods, tapas and offering other beers and drinks*”.
- 3) The Application was advertised in the NT News on Wednesday 11 December 2013 and Friday 13 December 2013 pursuant to Section 32A(3)(a) of the Act.
- 4) The advertisement was as follows:

*Europa (SA) Pty Ltd and JK (SA) Investments Pty Ltd, HEREBY GIVE NOTICE that it has applied to the Northern Territory Licensing Commission for an “ON LICENCE” Liquor Licence with Alfresco Dining to sell liquor at the premises to be known as Oyster Bar Darwin, located at Tenancy E5 and E6, Wharf One Retail, 19 Kitchener Drive, Darwin NT.*

*PROPOSED TRADING DETAILS for the sale of liquor are as follows:*

- *This licence allows for one (1) quality restaurant and ancillary bar. The premises shall at all times have the predominant appearance of and shall trade principally as a restaurant where persons may consume alcohol without the requirement of consuming a meal.*
- *The consumption of liquor without a meal shall not be advertised or promoted.*
- *The premises shall portray a relaxed family friendly atmosphere where comfortable conversation can be achieved in a venue that provides quality food, beverages and service.*
- *The Licensee shall not permit or suffer the emanation of noise from the area of such nature or at such levels as to cause unreasonable disturbance to the ordinary comfort of lawful occupiers of any residential premises.*
- *This licence allows for patrons to stand at high tables and chairs. Service of liquor in the internal area need not be by wait staff. Bar stools are permitted in this area.*
- *Liquor may be sold from 10:00 hours until 24:00 hours, seven days a week.*

*This is the first notice of application. The notice will be published again on Friday, 13 December 2013.*

*The objection period is deemed to commence from Friday, 13 December 2013. (date of publication of second notice).*

*Pursuant to Section 47F(2) of the Liquor Act an objection may only be made on the ground that the grant of the licence may or will adversely affect:*

- (a) the amenity of the neighbourhood where the premises the subject of the application are or will be located; or*
- (b) the health, education, public safety or social conditions in the community.*

*Only those persons, organisations or groups described in Section 47F(3) of the Liquor Act may make an objection. Section 47G of the Liquor Act requires the Director of Licensing to inform the applicant of the substance of any objection. This will include the identity and where relevant the address of the objector.*

*For further information regarding this application contact the Director of Licensing on telephone 8999 1800. Objections to this application should be lodged in writing with the Director of Licensing, Gambling and Licensing Services, GPO Box 1154, Darwin, within thirty (30) days of the commencement date of the objection period.*

*Dated this Eleventh Day of December 2013.*

- 5) Pursuant to Section 47F(4)(d) an objection must be lodged within thirty days after the publication of the last notice, namely on or before Monday 13 January 2014.

- 6) Section 47F of the Act prescribes the circumstances in which an objection may be made, specifies the grounds for objection and identifies the persons entitled to object to a particular application -

**47F Person may object to certain applications**

- (1) *Subject to this Section, a person, organisation or group may make an objection to the following applications:*
- (a) *an application for the grant of a licence, as notified under Section 27;*
- (2) *The objection may only be made on the ground that the grant of the licence, variation of conditions, substitution of other premises or material alteration may or will adversely affect –*
- (a) *the amenity of the neighbourhood where the premises the subject of the application are or will be located; or*
- (b) *health, education, public safety or social conditions in the community.*
- (3) *Only the following persons, organisations or groups may make an objection under sub-Section (1):*
- (a) *a person residing or working in the neighbourhood where the premises the subject of the application are or will be located;*
- (b) *a person holding an estate in fee simple in land, or a lease over land, in the neighbourhood where the premises the subject of the application are or will be located;*
- (c) *a member or employee of the Police Force acting in that capacity;*
- (d) *a member or employee of the Fire and Rescue Service within the meaning of the Fire and Emergency Act acting in that capacity;*
- (e) *an Agency or public authority that performs functions relating to public amenities, including health, education and public safety;*
- (f) *a community-based organisation or group (for example, a local action group or a charity).*
- 7) Twenty-seven objections have been lodged in response to the application and the applicant has provided a response to those objections pursuant to Section 47G of the Act. Under Section 47I of the Act the Commission must determine whether objections received are to proceed to Hearing.
- 8) Section 47F(3) provides the categories of persons, organisation or group who may lodge an objection to an application for variation of licence conditions. Section 47F provides the grounds on which an objection can be made.

**Objection from Mr Mick Caldwell, Chairman, Darwin Waterfront Residents Body Corporate Committee**

- 9) The Committee comprises nine Darwin Waterfront property owners. Mr Caldwell has advised that a decision to object was discussed at a Committee meeting and supported by eight of its members with one

abstention due to a conflict of interest. The objection was received on 7 January 2014 and is therefore within time.

- 10) The Committee has standing under Section 47F(3) as a group or organisation eligible to make objection. The grounds of the objection include:
 

*“This Committee believes that there will be excessive noise caused by the operations of the Oyster Bar and that noise will affect the amenity of those residents directly above the bar.”*
- 11) The objection also raises the impact of increased alcohol availability and the number of licensed premises in the area and expresses concern that this will lead to drunkenness, property damage and assaults.
- 12) The grounds of objection qualify under Section 47F(2) in that it raises concerns, should the licence be granted, of neighbourhood amenity and public safety issues.

### **Objection from Ms Leonee Dixon and Mr Lionel Sleeman**

- 13) The objectors are owners of a unit in Kitchener Drive and therefore have standing to object. The objection was received on 11 January 2014 and is therefore within time.
- 14) The objection raises ongoing issues due to alcohol related behaviour and refers to the type of venue proposed as not required in a mainly residential complex. It does not specifically address issues which are grounds for objection under Section 47(2) and therefore does not meet the grounds required under the Act.

### **Objection from Mr Daniel Bacon**

- 15) Mr Bacon is an owner of a unit in the neighbourhood and qualifies therefore to object. The objection was received on 10 January 2014 and is therefore within time.
- 16) The objection refers to the licensed premises causing direct annoyance, disturbance and inconvenience and that the Oyster Bar proposal will have a negative impact to the amenity of the area.
- 17) The objection therefore meets the necessary grounds to qualify under the Act as an objection requiring a Hearing.

### **Objection from Ms Barb McInnes**

- 18) Ms McInnes is an owner of a unit in the neighbourhood and therefore qualifies as an objector. The objection was received on 9 January 2014 and is therefore within the required time.
- 19) The objection refers to the impact on the amenity of the neighbourhood should the licence be granted. It also raises the adverse effect on the health on those residing in the building at which the premises is to be located, including increased noise, stress levels and reduction of quality of life. It also refers to problems arising with public order should the licence be granted.

20) The objection therefore meets the grounds required under the Act.

### **Objection from Mr Fernando Di Toro**

- 21) Mr Di Toro is an owner of property within the neighbourhood and qualifies to be an objector. His objection was submitted within time.
- 22) The correspondence refers to there being an understanding that Building Two was not to contain food businesses. It refers to such premises below the office accommodation owned by him creating loss of outlook and loss of value.
- 23) While it refers to some of the venues at the Waterfront area at times generating noises, it does not meet the grounds of objection required under Section 47F(2). Mr Di Toro is therefore not a valid objector.

### **Objection from Ms Kay Withnall**

- 24) Ms Withnall is a resident living in the neighbourhood and qualifies to object. Ms Withnall's objection was made on 4 January 2014 and is therefore within time.
- 25) Her objection refers to the venue creating noise problems and expresses concern that smoke arising from the smokers' area will impact on residents in Building Two which qualify as grounds for objection.

### **Objection from Ms Carleen Dreghorn**

- 26) Ms Dreghorn provided an objection on 9 January 2014 and is therefore within time. She is a resident within the neighbourhood qualifying her to make objection.
- 27) The objection raises the issues of disorder, unruly behaviour and undue noise and in particular raises issues of noise from the servicing of garbage and deliveries to the proposed restaurant.
- 28) The objection meets the requirements under the Act.

### **Objection from Mr Mick Caldwell, Chairman, Principle and Residential Body Corporate**

- 29) The objection was lodged by Mr Caldwell on 8 January 2014 and is within time. Mr Caldwell has identified himself as Chairman of the Principle and Residential Body Corporate. He identifies the bodies he is representing as being two committees dealing with Waterfront Precinct matters and as such the objection has standing as an organisation or group with an interest in the area.
- 30) The objection addresses issues of the amenity of the neighbourhood and itemises concerns based on noise, potential smells of waste from the restaurant and pest and vermin. It also raises concerns over the potential of increased levels of anti-social behaviour with increases in drunkenness, assaults, property damage and sexual assaults as the result of the grant of a licence.

- 31) The objection meets the grounds required under the Act for the objection to be valid.

### **Objection from Mr Stuart Kenny**

- 32) Mr Kenny is an owner of a unit in the neighbourhood and qualifies to be an objector. The objection was submitted on 6 January 2014 and is within time.
- 33) The objection refers to *“any further outlets would increase the noise levels, smells, anti-social behaviour and detract from this beautiful outlook”*. It qualifies as an objection under the Act.

### **Objection from Ms Despina (Debbie) Kontziionis**

- 34) Ms Kontziionis is an owner of an apartment in the neighbourhood and qualifies to object. The objection was lodged on 7 January 2014 and is therefore within time.
- 35) The objection expresses concerns that *“the granting of liquor licences for venues in this building will cause significant disturbance to our living conditions and will be detrimental to our standard of living”*.
- 36) It also refers to noise emanating from the premises and provides the necessary grounds for qualifying as an objector.

### **Objection from Mr James Pegler**

- 37) Mr Pegler is a resident in the neighbourhood and is qualified to object. The objection was received on 8 January 2014 and is therefore within time.
- 38) Whilst the objection does not support any further licences in the area in the Wharf One Precinct, it does not provide an elaboration of the grounds or meet the requirements of Section 47F(2). It is therefore not a valid objection for the purposes of a Hearing.

### **Objection from Ms Rachel Lloyd**

- 39) Ms Lloyd resides in the neighbourhood and qualifies to make objection. The objection presented is dated 8 January 2014 and is therefore within time.
- 40) The objection raises concern that the bar will be directly below her apartment and *“will cause noise, inconvenience and disturbance to us and all other residents in the building”*. It refers to an additional licensed venue creating more noise and disturbance and anti-social behaviour. It qualifies as a valid objection under the Act.

### **Objection from Mr Duncan and Mrs Debbie Wilson**

- 41) Mr and Mrs Wilson own a unit within the neighbourhood and are able to object to the application. The objection was lodged on 7 January 2014 and is within the timeline required.
- 42) Correspondence refers to objecting to the granting of a liquor licence for the Oyster Bar and states *“this building was not built with this intention”*. The

nature of the objection does not meet the required grounds specified in Section 47F(2) of the Act.

### **Objection from Mr Paul and Mrs Erica Miles**

- 43) Mr and Mrs Miles reside at a unit in the neighbourhood of the application and therefore qualify as able to lodge an objection. The objection was lodged on 7 January 2014 and is within time.
- 44) The objection states "*I do not consent to a licensed premises in Building Two, 19 Kitchener Drive*". The objection does not amplify the grounds for objections required under Section 47F(2) of the Act and is therefore not a valid objection.

### **Objection from Ms Gloria Thomson**

- 45) Ms Thomson resides in a unit within the neighbourhood providing the necessary basis for lodging an objection. The objection was lodged on 7 January 2014 and is within time.
- 46) The objection refers to Building Two as not being suitable for licensed venues and adds that if granted a licence it would cause annoyance, disturbance and/or inconvenience to all residents. The reasons stated are grounds consistent with Section 47F(2) and the objection is therefore valid.

### **Objection from Ms Elizabeth Newcombe**

- 47) Ms Newcombe is the owner of an apartment in the neighbourhood and accordingly she is able to lodge an objection. The objection was lodged on 7 January 2014 and is within time.
- 48) Ms Newcombe strongly objects to the proposed liquor licence as in her view an additional liquor licence in the area will have negative impacts on the quality of life and the social and wellbeing of residents. The objection meets the requirements laid down in the Act and is therefore valid.

### **Objection from Ms Tammy Speck**

- 49) Ms Speck is the owner of a unit within the neighbourhood and qualifies to make objection. The objection was lodged on 7 January 2014 and is within time.
- 50) Her communication seeks assurance that the licence will not impact on residents. The objection does not raise issues as required under Section 47F(2) and is therefore not a valid objection under the Act.

### **Objection from Mr Bernie and Mrs June Kelly**

- 51) Mr and Mrs Kelly reside within the neighbourhood qualifying them to lodge an objection. The objection was submitted on 7 January 2014 and is within time.
- 52) The objection raises issues of existing noise levels and anti social behaviour in the area. While it objects to a further liquor licence it does not address the

adverse impacts likely to be generated if the applicant were to receive a licence.

- 53) Under Section 47F(2) the objection does not qualify as valid and requiring a Hearing.

### **Objection from Mr Duncan McKinstry**

- 54) Mr McKinstry is the owner of a unit within the neighbourhood providing entitlement to lodge an objection. The objection was submitted on 8 January 2014, within the time required.

- 55) The objection refers to purchasing a unit in Building Two in the expectation that there would be retail businesses below and expresses concern that a restaurant would create noise into the evening. While not detailing amenity of the neighbourhood or social conditions in the community, nonetheless potential noise issues are raised and hence qualifies the objection as valid under the Act.

### **Objection from Ms Carol Bolton**

- 56) Ms Bolton is the owner of an apartment in the neighbourhood qualifying her to lodge an objection. The objection was submitted on 8 January 2014 and is within time.

- 57) While objecting to the approval of a licensed premise, Ms Bolton's objection does not detail the grounds other than stating "*I believe it will have a huge impact on tenants of the apartment*". This does not qualify under Section 47F(2) as it does not amplify or provide the grounds for objection as required under the Act.

### **Objection from Mr Sam Satsangi**

- 58) Mr Satsangi is the owner of a unit within the neighbourhood and is therefore qualified to make objection. His objection was lodged on 8 January 2014 and is within time.

- 59) His objection refers to licensed venue in Building Two having a negative impact on the entire area and causing disruption to the amenity and good order of the neighbourhood. The grounds of his objection qualify under the Act.

### **Objection from Ms Barbara Hague**

- 60) Ms Hague is an owner and future resident in Building Two with the Waterfront Precinct and is therefore entitled to lodge an objection. Her objection was submitted on 8 January 2014, within the prescribed timeframe.

- 61) The objection refers to additional liquor licences promoting further alcohol related incidents, disturbances and bad behaviour. Its comments are inclusive of the current application. The grounds referred to qualify as valid under the Act.

### **Objection from Mr Christopher Carding**

- 62) Mr Carding is a resident in the neighbourhood and is therefore qualified to make objection. His objection was lodged on 9 January 2014 and is within the required timeframe.
- 63) Mr Carding lives directly above the proposed Oyster Bar and refers to concerns over the devaluation of his property and that there are already enough restaurants in the area. The objection does not particularise the impact of the application on the amenity of the neighbourhood or the health, education, public safety or social conditions in the community as required by the Act and therefore does not meet the conditions prescribed by the Act.

### **Objection from Ms Kate Carew**

- 64) Ms Carew is the owner and resident in the neighbourhood providing entitlement for her to lodge an objection. Ms Carew's objection is undated but the Commission has been advised by the Licensing Inspector handling this application that the objection was received prior to 13 January 2014, the closing date for objections to be lodged. The Commission accepts this advice by the relevant Licensing Inspector.
- 65) Ms Carew's objection refers to the Body Corporate Committee expressed concerns. She refers to the increase in anti social behaviour occurring within the Waterfront Precinct and states that the licence applied for in Building Two *"is not suitable for a licensed venue and the granting of a licence in Building Two will cause annoyance, disturbance and/or inconvenience to all residents"*. The grounds raised qualify the objection as valid under the Act.

### **Objection from Mr Robert Wilson**

- 66) The objection has been forwarded on behalf of Mr Wilson, an owner of a unit within the neighbourhood of the proposed licence. Therefore Mr Wilson is entitled to lodge an objection under Section 47F(3) of the Act. The objection was lodged on 9 January 2014 and was therefore submitted within time.
- 67) Mr Wilson refers to objecting to a licensed premises being located under Building Two which the objection states was to originally not to contain any licensed operations. The objection does not specify relevant grounds as required under Section 47F(2) of the Act and is therefore not a valid objection.

### **Objection from Ms Pasqualina Catalano**

- 68) Ms Catalano is an owner of a unit within the neighbourhood enabling her to lodge an objection pursuant to the Act. The objection was lodged on 10 January 2014 and is within time.
- 69) Ms Catalano refers to existing licensed premises impacting on the quality of life of residents. The objection does not address issues relating to the amenity of the neighbourhood or the health, education and public safety which could arise from the granting of the licence applied for. The objection does not qualify as requiring a Hearing.

## **Objection from Superintendent Kristopher Evans on behalf of the Northern Territory Police**

- 70) Section 47(3)(c) allows members of the Northern Territory Police to object to an Application. Superintendent Evans is a member of the Police Force acting in that capacity within the meaning of Section 47(3)(c) and stationed at the Darwin Metropolitan Police Station. As such Superintendent Evans is a valid objector. The objection was lodged on 10 January 2014 and was therefore lodged within the prescribed time limit.
- 71) The Police objection is on the grounds that a 10.00am opening would not encourage responsible alcohol consumption practices, leading to an increase in anti-social behaviour. It refers to the negative operational and social impacts of the creation of another tavern style premises and states that it *“cannot be justified from a community safety perspective”*. This objection meets the requirements of the Act in the issues it has raised relating to alcohol availability causing social harms and anti-social behaviour.
- 72) Subsequent to the objection, the Police through Superintendent Evans, submitted a qualifying letter dated 18 March 2014. It provides additional information in relation to the opening time of the proposed licence and expresses concern over the Waterfront Precinct changing complexion, particularly with the number of licences grated with the condition of not requiring a meal to be purchased in conjunction with consumption of liquor.
- 73) The Commission considers that the original objection can be relied upon and provides grounds for the objection to proceed to Hearing.

## **Applicant’s Response to Objections**

- 74) Cridlands MB, Lawyers, on behalf of the applicant, have been provided with the objections and pursuant to the requirements of the Act have been afforded the opportunity to respond. The applicant has queried the objection of the Darwin Waterfront Principle Body Corporate Committee dated 6 January 2014 (although submitted on 8 January 2014) on the grounds of the legality of its composition and procedures adopted, including minuting, in reaching a decision to lodge an objection.
- 75) The applicant also contests that the Darwin Waterfront Residents Body Corporate Committee has also undertaken proper procedures in reaching a resolution to object to the application. The claims made on behalf of the applicant in this regard have not been tested and are best evaluated at an Objections Hearing where the objectors have the opportunity to validate the processes undertaken and the legitimacy of the authorising body in determining to lodge an objection.
- 76) The applicant also points out that the submission of Mr Terry O’Neill of the Darwin Waterfront Corporation does not, in itself, make out an objection. The applicant points out that the matters raised by Police in the objection dated 10 January 2014, while valid, raises some issues that can be dealt with through consultation between parties. To the Commission’s knowledge this had occurred and has given rise to the Police issuing a qualifying letter to their original objection and referred to in paragraph 72 above.

- 77) The applicant also contends that many of the objections are proforma in nature and have been generated through activity of the Darwin Waterfront Residents Committee.
- 78) A number of objections have raised the issue of assurances given to them that Building Two, now proposed for the Oyster Bar operation, was initially described to them as a location that would not have licensed premises. The applicant has responded to these claims and has raised conditions in the Contract of Sale and other documents relating to the potential for variations or alterations in the size, location or permitted use of areas within the development.

### **Consideration of the Issues**

- 79) Building Two is the middle building of the Wharf One development on Kitchener Drive and hitherto has not included a licensed premises. A application has been made by Europa (SA) Pty Ltd and JK (SA) Investments Pty Ltd for a licence to be granted to Tenancy E5 and E6 of Building Two at Wharf One.
- 80) The applicant is an experienced operator of similar themed Oyster Bar restaurants at Glenelg, South Australia and Mandurah, Western Australia. The advertising of the application has drawn an unprecedented level of objection from people either owning property or residing in the area.
- 81) The concerns expressed relate to neighbourhood amenity, public safety and social conditions of the community. The general thrust of these objections is that the Waterfront Precinct Area was initially conceived as a family friendly multi use Precinct containing residential units, retail businesses, office space and hospitality outlets such as restaurants and bars.
- 82) The collective of the objectors' submissions is that the use of the Precinct is becoming increasingly focussed towards the hospitality industry, that being licensed venues, to the detriment of the amenity in the area, particularly to residents occupying units in the neighbourhood.
- 83) Each objection has been assessed according to the requirements of the Act to determine whether the objector has standing to lodge an objection, to determine whether the objections were lodged within the required time and to determine if the grounds specified in the objection meet the requirements of Section 47F(2) of the Act.
- 84) While most of the objections are of a similar nature a number do not address issues of whether, or how the grant of a licence, will impact on the amenity of the neighbourhood or how *"health, education, public safety or social conditions in the community"* will be impacted on.
- 85) The applicant has raised issues of the validity of the standing of the Darwin Waterfront Residents Body Corporate Committee and the Darwin Waterfront Principle Body Corporate Committee and whether lodgement of objections by those Bodies followed proper procedures and meets legal requirements.
- 86) There is an allegation that the procedures of these Bodies were not properly conducted or minuted. The Commission has determined to accept the objections as valid for the purposes of requiring a Hearing but expects to be

presented with submissions and evidence by both parties in relation to the matters in contention.

- 87) A number of objections have not been ruled to be valid. In ruling that the objections have not met the grounds required under the Act, the Commission is aware that a number of those accepted and deemed valid, objections are somewhat similar in nature. The accepted objections have amplified or specified the grounds for objection and thus they meet the prescribed requirements of the Act and they have been determined as requiring a Hearing.
- 88) The Commission concedes that there is not a great deal of difference in some of the objections which have not been accepted as valid and some of those that have been accepted as valid and that there is a fine line in divining between the two. The large number of accepted objections, ie those objections deemed to require a Hearing under the Act, would likely ensure that the interests and views of all who have lodged a valid or non valid objection are addressed through a Hearing.
- 89) Schedule 1 contains a listing of all objections deemed valid and which require a Hearing pursuant to Section 471(7) of the Act.
- 90) Schedule 2 contains a listing of all those objectors who have not been determined as valid through not meeting the requirements of the Act. These objectors, pursuant to Section 471(4) of the Act, are to be advised by the Director in writing of their right to seek a review of this Decision.
- 91) At Hearing the Commission does not anticipate evidence and submissions being presented by all valid objectors, but rather that a smaller number of representative residents and organisations will appear on their behalf.

## **DECISION**

- 92) The Commission has determined that the objections lodged and outlined in Schedule 1 are valid and require a Hearing pursuant to Section 471(7) of the Act and that the objections lodged and outlined in Schedule 2 are not valid in that they do not pursuant to Section 471(3)(c)(i)B of the Act “*describe circumstances that may or will adversely affect the amenity of the neighbourhood or health, education, public safety or social conditions in the community*”.

Richard O’Sullivan  
CHAIRMAN

1 April 2014

**ATTACHMENT A**

Mr Mick Caldwell, Chairman,  
 Darwin Waterfront Residents Body Corporate Committee

Ms Leonee Dixon and Mr Lionel Sleeman	Unit 338 Kitchener Drive
Mr Daniel Bacon	Unit 204 Kitchener Drive
Ms Barb McInnes	Unit 225 Building Two
Mr Fernando Di Toro	<a href="mailto:fernando@afaib.com.au">fernando@afaib.com.au</a>
Ms Kay Withnall	Unit 109 Building One
Ms Carleen Dreghorn	Unit 221 Kitchener Drive

Mr Mick Caldwell, Chairman,  
 Principle and Residential Body Corporate

Mr Stuart Kenny	Unit 212 Building Two
Ms Despina (Debbie) Kontziionis	Unit Building Two
Mr James Pegler	Unit 315 Kitchener Drive
Ms Rachel Lloyd	Unit 238 Kitchener Drive
Mr Duncan and Debbie Wilson	Unit 301 Building Three
Mr Paul and Mrs Erica Miles	Unit 334 Building Two
Ms Gloria Thomson	Unit 228 Kitchener Drive
Ms Elizabeth Newcombe	Unit Building Three
Ms Tammy Speck	Unit 208 Building Two
Mr Bernie and Mrs June Kelly	Unit 110 Kitchener Drive
Mr Duncan McKinstry	Unit 229 Kitchener Drive
Ms Carol Bolton	Unit 223 Building Two
Mr Sam Satsangi	Unit 226 Kitchener Drive
Ms Barbara Hague	Unit Building Two
Mr Christopher Carding	Unit 221 Building Two
Ms Kate Carew	Unit 127 Kitchener Drive
Mr Robert Wilson	Unit 326 Building One
Ms Pasqualina Catalano	Unit 216, Building Two

Superintendent Kristopher Evans  
 on behalf of Northern Territory Police

## **SCHEDULE 1**

Mr Mick Caldwell, Chairman, Darwin Waterfront Residents Body Corporate Committee

Mr Daniel Bacon

Ms Barb McInnes

Ms Kay Withnall

Ms Carleen Dreghorn

Mr Mick Caldwell, Chairman, Principle and Residential Body Corporate

Mr Stuart Kenny

Ms Despina (Debbie) Kontziionis

Ms Rachel Lloyd

Ms Gloria Thomson

Ms Elizabeth Newcombe

Mr Bernie and Mrs June Kelly

Mr Duncan McKinstry

Mr Sam Satsangi

Ms Barbara Hague

Ms Kate Carew

Superintendent Kristopher Evans on behalf of the Northern Territory Police

## **SCHEDULE 2**

Ms Leonee Dixon and Mr Lionel Sleeman

Mr Fernando Di Toro

Mr James Pegler

Mr Duncan and Mrs Debbie Wilson

Mr Paul and Mrs Erica Miles

Mss Tammy Speck

Ms Carol Bolton

Mr Christopher Carding

Mr Robert Wilson

Ms Pasqualina Catalano