
GAMBLING COMMISSION



REPORT OF THE GAMBLING COMMISSION FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30 JUNE 2015

Presented to the House of Representatives pursuant to section 229 of the Gambling Act 2003

CONTENTS

The Minister of Internal Affairs

I have the honour to forward the report of the Gambling Commission (the "Commission") for the year ended 30 June 2015.

Graeme Reeves
Chief Gambling Commissioner

Page 2	Introduction by the Chief Gambling Commissioner
Page 3	Report on activities
	Establishment of the Commission
	Casinos
	Appeals to the Commission
	– Re-hearing of an appeal by Pub Charity Inc
	– Appeal by Bluegrass Holdings Limited
	– Appeal by The Southern Trust
	– Appeal by Air Rescue Services Limited
	Miscellaneous
	Procedures
	Administration
	Commission Meetings
	Future Directions
Page 8	Commission Members
Page 8	Contact details for Commission
Page 9	Appendix 1
	Duties and Functions of the Commission under the Gambling Act 2003 (the "Act")
Page 10	Appendix 2
	Decisions of the Commission: 2014/2015 (including Delegated Approvals of the Commission)

INTRODUCTION

By the Chief Gambling Commissioner

I am pleased to present to you the Commission's annual report for the period 1 July 2014 to 30 June 2015, the Commission's tenth full year of operation.

The Commission has a mixture of regulatory, judicial and advisory functions in relation to gambling and the gambling sector. The functions most regularly exercised by the Commission involve determining applications for approval under casino licence conditions, amending casino licence conditions and considering appeals from gaming machine operators against decisions made by the Department of Internal Affairs (the "Department").

In the last year the Commission determined 130 applications to amend casino licence conditions or grant approvals under casino licence conditions, and eight appeals against decisions made by the Department.

Graeme Reeves

Chief Gambling Commissioner

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES

Establishment of the Commission

The Commission was established in March 2004 by section 220 of the Act. The Act provides that the Commission shall comprise up to five Commissioners.

The Chief Gambling Commissioner is Graeme Reeves, a barrister and solicitor based in Wellington. Graeme was a Gambling Commissioner from 2004 to December 2010, when he was appointed as the Chief Gambling Commissioner. The other Commissioners are:

- Lisa Hansen, who is a Wellington barrister;
- Russell Bell, who is a chartered accountant and business consultant with a background in corporate risk management and assurance. Russell lives in Whanganui;
- Donna Matahaere-Atariki, who is a consultant and lives in Dunedin;
- Wendie Harvey, who is a professional director and business consultant, and lives in Hawkes Bay.

Graeme Reeves, Russell Bell and Wendie Harvey have been reappointed until August 2018.

The Commission is serviced by an Auckland-based Secretariat.

The duties and functions of the Commission are set out in Appendix 1 to this report.

Casinos

The Commission is responsible for casino licensing, with the Department being responsible for operating and equipment standards, game rules and compliance. Casinos can appeal the Commission's decisions on licensing matters to the High Court.

In the year ending 30 June 2015, the Commission made 130 decisions on applications to amend licence conditions, or obtain approvals under licence conditions. Applications related mainly to approval of new signage around the casinos, revised floor layouts and new game mixes. This compares to 200 decisions made last year.

New Zealand has six casinos (new ones being prohibited under the Act), varying considerably in size, as shown below:

Casino	No. of tables	No. of gaming machines
Auckland	110	1,647
Christchurch	36	500
Hamilton	23	339
Dunedin	12	180
Queenstown (Beach Street)	12	86
Queenstown (Steamers Wharf)	6	74

SKYCITY is the dominant operator in New Zealand, operating four of the six casinos; one in Auckland, one in Hamilton and two in Queenstown.

Appeals to the Commission

The Department exercises primary licensing and enforcement functions in relation to non-casino gambling (gaming machines and large-scale lotteries). As at 30 June 2015, there were 309 licensed Class 4 gambling operators, 1,266 gaming machine venues and 16,579 gaming machines in New Zealand (down from 329, 1,321 and 17,130 respectively in 2014, and down significantly from the 25,221 gaming machines that were in place in June 2003).

Operators have rights of appeal to the Commission against decisions made by the Department in circumstances including loss of licence, enforcement action, and in relation to the imposition of licence conditions by the Department.

In the year ending 30 June 2015, Divisions of the Commission determined eight Class 4 appeals against decisions made by the Department. The Commission also made eight decisions last year.

An appeal is heard on a *de novo* basis, meaning that the Commission considers the matter afresh.

**Rehearing of an appeal by Pub Charity
– Decision GC09/14**

The Commission accepted the withdrawal of an appeal by Pub Charity in controversial circumstances which required the Commission to consider the extent of the Secretary for Internal Affairs' (the "Secretary") powers to re-set the date of a licence suspension, after an appeal lodged against the decision of the Secretary to suspend Pub Charity's Class 4 operator's licence had resulted in an automatic stay of the suspension (by operation of the Act), and the appellant gave notice withdrawing the appeal (after the original suspension date).

The circumstances of the withdrawal notice were further complicated by the fact that it was an appeal which the Court of Appeal had directed the Commission to rehear. After the Commission had upheld the Secretary's original suspension decision in March 2012, Pub Charity had successfully challenged both the decisions of both the Secretary and the Commission on the basis that the suspension power conferred by section 58(1)(b) could only be used remedially in respect of current continuing breaches and not punitively to punish past breaches of the Act or licence conditions. On appeal by the Secretary, the Court of Appeal held that the suspension power could be exercised to impose a sanction for a past breach, without any remedial action being possible or necessary. However, as Pub Charity had not had an adequate opportunity to be heard in the course of the Commission's earlier hearing, the Court of Appeal reinstated the Secretary's decision and remitted the matter to the Commission for rehearing Pub Charity's appeal.

When the Commission sought submissions from the parties for the rehearing, Pub Charity lodged a notice withdrawing the appeal. Under the Act, suspension orders made by the Secretary must state the date or dates of suspension and appeals against such orders operate as a stay of the order. Therefore, if the decision were confirmed on appeal, the Commission would set a new date for suspension, the original date inevitably having passed. The Commission had not previously considered the implications of withdrawal of an appeal by an appellant, who had received the benefit of the statutory stay, in similar circumstances. There is no statutory provision covering withdrawal of appeals.

The Commission held that the power to regulate its own procedure, conferred on it by the Act, and the inherent powers of inferior courts and tribunals enabled it to control its procedures to prevent abuse of process, including control over withdrawal of appeals. However, as it had given no prior notice of how it would do so, it would only decline to accept the withdrawal if necessary to prevent an abuse of process. Inability to re-set the suspension date following withdrawal of an appeal after expiry of the original date would create a serious risk of abuse of the statutory appeal provisions if withdrawal meant the penalty would never be served.

The Commission considered whether, if the appeal were withdrawn, the Secretary could re-set the date of suspension. It considered that, applying section 16(1) of Interpretation Act 1999, he could do so. As withdrawal would therefore not produce an anomalous or abusive result, Pub Charity's withdrawal was accepted, bringing the appeal to an end.

**Appeal by Bluegrass Holding Limited
– Decision GC10/14**

The Commission's decision to uphold a decision of the Secretary to cancel the Class 4 operator's licence of Bluegrass required the Commission to settle important principles relating to the burden and standard of proof required to establish different grounds of cancellation and for the exercise of the discretion to cancel. The cancellation decision had invoked three of the four possible grounds for cancellation, namely a section 52 ground (suitability of key persons) no longer being met, failure to comply with a requirement of the Act, and supply of false information to the Secretary on the application for a Class 4 licence. The circumstances of concern related to statements made to the Department by Patrick O'Brien, the original Chairman of Bluegrass, that the source of the society's original funding had been a South Canterbury Finance loan and a personal loan by him when, in fact, the entire funding had come from racing clubs via his son, Mike O'Brien. Patrick O'Brien had also assured the Department that Mike O'Brien had no involvement with the society but, in addition to providing its funding, he appeared to have been heavily, but covertly, involved in its operation.

After the licence was cancelled, Patrick O'Brien resigned and Mr Gurr assumed the role of Chairman. The Secretary produced internal papers written by Mr Gurr, recording that, as the society was dependent on revenue from venues for its income, it was necessary to

treat favourably applications for grants from applicants who had the support of venues, in apparent breach of the statutory prohibition on involvement by venues in grant decisions. The pattern of grants indicated that grants had been made to applicants associated with venues.

The Commission confirmed that different standards of proof apply to different issues under the Act. The grounds of cancellation for non-compliance and provision of false information require satisfaction on the balance of probabilities. The ground that the key person suitability criterion is no longer met requires a different standard. For the licence criterion to be met, the Commission must be satisfied about the suitability of every key person, something that includes satisfaction about who the key persons are as well as their suitability.

As past non-compliances do not invariably result in cancellation, Bluegrass chose not to contest the historical aspects of the Secretary's case (relating to the actions of the O'Briens) but argued that the later change in governance meant that the historical breaches no longer supported cancellation.

The Commission was not satisfied about the suitability of Bluegrass or its current chairman, Mr Gurr, and was also not satisfied that Mike O'Brien was no longer a key person (in the light of his history of covert involvement) or that he was suitable. It also found that Bluegrass had provided false information in its licence application and not complied with the statutory obligations to disclose its key persons.

Three grounds for suspension or cancellation were established and, both individually and in combination, they justified a decision to cancel, rather than suspend. Not meeting a criterion for obtaining or renewing a licence (key person suitability) supports cancellation (as, even if not cancelled, refusal of renewal would be inevitable). As the non-compliance (failure to list all key persons) relates to a critical licensing criterion, it also supports cancellation. Providing false and misleading information in a licence application, in circumstances where the true position would likely have resulted in refusal, similarly supported cancellation as it is important to deter dishonest applications, especially when detection of dishonesty is frequently difficult.

Appeal by The Southern Trust (Riversdale Hotel) – Decision GC05/15

In this appeal, the Commission reviewed its earlier decisions on conditions requiring the closure of entrances of Class 4 venues out of concern about the possibility of persons under 18 years of age gambling. The prospect of such conditions being imposed typically arises where gambling machines are placed in an area of the premises which bar staff cannot easily observe in the course of their normal duties and where entrance to the gaming machine room is possible without passing through the main body of the premises. The Commission had previously confirmed the imposition of conditions requiring such external entrances to be closed, leaving entrance to the gaming room only from the main body of the premises. The Commission had not been persuaded in those appeals that the possibility of monitoring by CCTV meant that requiring entrance closure was not justified.

In this appeal however, the Commission reversed the Secretary's decision to impose a condition requiring a rear entrance to be closed and instead imposed a condition requiring the installation of high quality video monitoring, which the appellant had proposed. It found a number of important differences from earlier decisions which meant that, while closure of the entrance would reduce an already modest risk of unobserved underage gambling, the accompanying detriments made its imposition unreasonable, especially when high quality video monitoring had been proposed. The following differences were particularly important:

- (a) The premises were located in a very small rural town. The rear door was, in practice, the main entrance because it was the sole entrance from the car park.
- (b) If closed, all patrons using the car park would need to walk about 150m around the building to the front of the premises.
- (c) Patrons with mobility difficulties would be particularly adversely affected as only the rear entrance had been designed to allow wheel chair access.
- (d) Closing the rear entrance would require the venue owner to undertake costly alterations but, even in that event, patrons would still be inconvenienced.

- (e) The detriments were so adverse that, if the condition were confirmed, the venue operator would remove the gaming machines.
- (f) The large HD video system proposed offered a significant improvement on the old CCTV systems considered in the past.

Having regard to the modest benefits and the substantial detriments of a condition requiring the rear door to be kept closed, and the proposal to provide high quality video monitoring of the door, the Commission considered the imposed condition to be unreasonable and replaced it with the video monitoring condition proposed by the appellant.

Appeal by Air Rescue Services Limited – Robbies Sports Bar and Bistro, Belfast – Decision GC14/15

The Commission confirmed the test to be applied for assessing suitability of key persons of Class 4 venues and applied it in an appeal related to the Bluegrass appeal referred to above.

The venue, Robbies Sports Bar and Bistro, Belfast, had been a Bluegrass venue at the time that Bluegrass Holdings had lost its appeal against cancellation of its Class 4 operator's licence. The Secretary had later refused to grant a Class 4 venue licence to Air Rescue Services for the venue because he was not satisfied that the criteria in section 52 were met, namely the suitability of the venue's sole shareholder and manager. The Secretary considered that the manager had been unlawfully involved in decisions about the application of grants by Bluegrass Holdings and had agreed with Bluegrass to be paid the equivalent of its site rental in cash if Bluegrass's operator's licence were cancelled. The evidence supporting his view was principally email communications between Mike O'Brien (a covert key person of Bluegrass Holdings) and Ray McIntyre (acting as liaison for the venue), an internal Bluegrass document written by the Bluegrass chairman, the pattern of grants made by Bluegrass and some of the managers answers given in an interview with a Department Inspector.

The Commission rejected a submission that it should adopt a different approach to assessment of suitability than in the past. It confirmed that the test is whether the material before it causes it not to be satisfied about suitability. The test does not require a breach to be established to a particular standard and establishing a

breach is not conclusive. The Commission's satisfaction will balance a number of matters, including the strength of the evidence, the likelihood of detection and likely availability of evidence, the seriousness of the non-compliance and the likelihood of repetition.

In hearing the appeal, the Commission supplemented the usual exchange of affidavit evidence and submissions with an oral examination of the subject key person. He was cross-examined by counsel for the Secretary, examined by counsel assisting the Commission and re-examined by counsel for the appellant.

Although several of the documents before the Commission had been material to earlier Commission assessments adverse to the suitability of Mike O'Brien, Ray McIntyre (associated with the Phoenix Trust, for which the refusal of a Class 4 operator's licence had been upheld by the Commission), Mr Gurr and Bluegrass, in the case of the present appeal, the manager had been neither an author nor recipient of any of the documents. He gave evidence that the references to him in the documents of others were false. His evidence, including his oral examination, satisfied the Commission regarding his suitability and it reversed the decision of the Secretary and directed the Secretary to issue a venue licence with a commencement date of 17 February 2015 (in order to preserve the section 92 status of the venue).

Miscellaneous

In the year ended 30 June 2015, the Commission completed reviews of the Host Responsibility Programmes for the Hamilton, Queenstown, Wharf, Dunedin and Christchurch casinos. The Commission commenced its review of the Host Responsibility Programme for the Auckland casino.

The Commission maintained regular contact with stakeholders throughout the year, including representatives from all six casinos, the Class 4 sector, the Department, Ministry of Health, researchers and treatment providers. The Commission also met with gambling regulators in Australian jurisdictions and briefed them on the Commission's work.

The Commission continues to keep abreast of relevant gambling issues at both governance and management levels.

Procedures

In exercising its functions, the Commission has wide powers to determine its own procedures, to engage experts and to receive evidence. The policies and procedures developed by the Commission, and the decisions which it makes, are all published on its website.

Appeal proceedings are run along judicial lines. Procedures involve filing of submissions and affidavit evidence by the appellant, submissions and evidence in response by the respondent Secretary, and submissions and evidence in reply from the appellant.

The Commission consults on applications to amend licence conditions with the casino licence holder, the Secretary and affected persons.

The Commission can, and does, obtain independent legal advice in relation to matters under consideration – both casino applications and appeals.

Apart from its decisions, the Commission (mainly through the Commission Secretariat) communicates on an ongoing basis with stakeholders.

Administration

Under the Act, the Commission has no power to acquire, hold or alienate property, or to employ staff. Instead, the Act requires the Department to service the Commission, by arranging the administrative services necessary for the Commission to perform its functions.

The Act also requires the Commission to make decisions independently of the Minister and the Secretary, and to have a stand-alone office. This is located in Auckland.

The Commission is funded from the Department's vote, but, as noted above, is functionally independent. The Commission's annual budget for 2014/2015 was \$1,127,254, which was under-spent by \$320,845. The Commission notes that its annual expenditure is variable; depending upon the volume of applications and appeals before it, and any litigation with which it is involved.

Commission Meetings

The Commission met 11 times during the year under review: 11 July, 15 August, 12 September, 10 October, 7 November, 5 December 2014; and 13 February, 13 March, 10 April, 8 May and 12 June 2015.

Divisions of the Commission met on 11 July and 15 August 2014 and 13 February, 13 March and 8 May 2015.

Commissioner Reeves attended the annual Australasian Gambling Commissioner and Board Member Forum in November 2014, and the full Commission attended the annual Australasian Gambling Regulators' Conference in Sydney in May 2015.

Future Directions

The primary focus of the Commission in 2015/2016 will be the following activities:

- the ongoing effective discharge of its licensing and appeal functions
- continue to meet with the sector
- complete the review of the Host Responsibility Programme for the Auckland casino
- advise Ministers and facilitate consultation on the setting of the Problem Gambling Levy
- keep the Minister informed of developments relating to the Commission's functions.

COMMISSION MEMBERS

Graeme Leonard Reeves

Chief Gambling Commissioner
Barrister and Solicitor
Wellington
Appointed June 2004
Term expiring August 2018

Lisa Mary Hansen

Barrister
Wellington
Appointed March 2011
Term expiring December 2016

Russell Duncan Bell

Accountant and Business Consultant
Whanganui
Appointed July 2011
Term expiring August 2018

Donna Matahaere-Atariki

Consultant
Dunedin
Appointed June 2014
Term expiring June 2017

Wendie Harvey

Professional Director and Business Consultant
Napier
Appointed July 2014
Term expiring August 2018

CONTACT DETAILS FOR COMMISSION

65 New North Road
Eden Terrace, Auckland 1021
PO Box 3310
Shortland Street, Auckland 1140

Tel: (09) 300 1113
Fax: (09) 300 1118

Blair Cairncross

Executive Director

Website

www.gamblingcom.govt.nz

Email

info@gamblingcom.govt.nz

APPENDIX 1

Duties and Functions of the Commission under the Act

The Commission is an independent decision-making body with the powers of a Commission of Inquiry. Its functions are wide-ranging, and include the following:

- specifying, varying and revoking casino licence conditions
- considering and determining applications for casino operators' licences and the renewal of casino venue licences (the first of the existing six venue licences expires in 2019)
- approving agreements and changes to agreements between casino operators and casino venue licence holders
- considering and determining appeals against regulatory and licensing decisions made by the Department in respect of Class 3 and Class 4 gambling. Class 3 gambling involves prizes of more than \$5,000, but does not take place at a casino or involve gaming machines. Class 4 gambling relates to non-casino gaming machine operations
- considering and dealing with complaints about the way the Department has handled complaints in relation to Class 4 gambling
- advising the Minister of Internal Affairs on matters relating to the performance of the Commission's functions and the administration of the Act, either at the Minister's request or on its own initiative
- advising Ministers and facilitating consultation on the setting of the problem gambling levy.

APPENDIX 2

Decisions of the Commission: 2014/2015

Decision		Status
GC09/14	Rehearing of an appeal by Pub Charity against a decision suspending its Class 4 operator's licence	Withdrawal accepted
GC10/14	Appeal by Bluegrass Holdings Limited	Declined
GC11/14	Decision on appeals by Bluegrass Holdings Limited and Stanmore Star Investments Limited	Declined
GC12/14	Decision on the amendment by the Gambling Commission of the Host Responsibility Programmes for the Hamilton, Queenstown and Wharf casinos	
GC13/14	Decision on applications by SCML and SHL for approval of construction and design changes, and to exceed the 15:1 ratio of gaming machines to gaming tables at the Hamilton casino	Approved
GC14/14	Application by SCAL and SCML for approval to open an overseas bank account	Part Approved and part Declined
GC15/14	Application by SCAL to redesignate the Gambling Area at the Auckland casino	Approved
GC16/14	Application by SCML for approval of new game mixes for the Auckland casino	Approved
GC17/14	Appeal by a Corporate Society	Allowed
GC18/14	Application by SCML for approval of new game mixes for the Wharf casino	Approved
GC19/14	Application by CCL for approval of new game mixes	Approved
GC20/14	Application by SCML for approval of new game mixes for the Wharf casino	Approved
GC21/14	Application by DCML for approval of a new floor plan and game mixes	Approved
GC22/14	Application by OCL to amend the Deed of Trust for the Wharf casino and to vary a licence condition	Approved
GC23/14	Application by SCML for approval of a new game mix Annex for the Auckland casino	Approved
GC24/14	Application by SCML for approval to introduce new surveillance technology to the Wharf casino, and to amend the Surveillance Standard	Part Approved and part Declined
GC25/14	Decision on the amendment by the Gambling Commission of the Host Responsibility Programme for the Dunedin casino	
GC06/15	Application by SCML for approval of new game mixes for the Auckland casino	Approved
GC07/15	Application by CCL for approval of a new game mix Annex	Approved
GC08/15	Application by SCML for approval to relocate an EFTPOS terminal at the Auckland casino	Approved
GC09/15	Application by SCML for approval of a new game mix Annex for the Queenstown casino	Approved
GC10/15	Appeals by EFX Holdings Limited and Francis Gardiner	Declined
GC11/15	Application by SCML for approval of a new game mix Annex for the Hamilton casino	Approved
GC12/15	Decision on the amendment by the Gambling Commission of the Host Responsibility Programme for the Christchurch casino	
GC13/15	Application by SCAL to redesignate the Gambling Area at the Auckland casino	Approved
GC14/15	Appeal by Air Rescue Services Limited	Allowed

Delegated Approvals allowed by the Commission: 2014/2015

1 July 2014	Application by SHL for approval of signage at the Hamilton casino
1 July 2014	Application by OCL for approval of signage at the Wharf casino
3 July 2014	Application by SCAL for approval of signage at the Auckland casino
3 July 2014	Application by SHL for approval of signage at the Hamilton casino
8 July 2014	Application by CCL for approval of a new floor plan for the Christchurch casino
8 July 2014	Application by SCAL for approval of signage at the Auckland casino
9 July 2014	Application by SCAL for approval of signage at the Auckland casino
16 July 2014	Application by SCAL for approval of signage at the Auckland casino
16 July 2014	Application by QCL for approval of signage at the Queenstown casino
21 July 2014	Application by SHL for approval of signage at the Hamilton casino
21 July 2014	Application by SHL for approval of signage at the Hamilton casino
22 July 2014	Application by SCML for approval of new floor plans for the Auckland casino
22 July 2014	Application by DCML for approval of a new floor plan for the Dunedin casino
23 July 2014	Application by SCAL for approval of construction and design changes to the Auckland casino
4 August 2014	Application by SCML for approval of new floor plans for the Auckland casino
8 August 2014	Application by SCAL for approval of signage at the Auckland casino
8 August 2014	Application by SHL for approval of signage at the Hamilton casino
18 August 2014	Application by SHL for approval of signage at the Hamilton casino
26 August 2014	Application by SCML and SHL for approval of construction and design changes and a new floor plan for the Hamilton casino
27 August 2014	Application by SHL for approval of signage at the Hamilton casino
27 August 2014	Application by SHL for approval of signage at the Hamilton casino
28 August 2014	Application by SHL for approval of signage at the Hamilton casino
28 August 2014	Application by SCAL for approval of signage at the Auckland casino
4 September 2014	Application by CCL for approval of construction and design changes and a temporary floor plan for the Christchurch casino
23 September 2014	Application by SCAL for approval of signage at the Auckland casino
24 September 2014	Application by SCML for approval of new floor plans for the Auckland casino
24 September 2014	Application by SHL for approval of signage at the Hamilton casino
25 September 2014	Application by SHL for approval of signage at the Hamilton casino
25 September 2014	Application by SHL for approval of signage at the Hamilton casino
30 September 2014	Application by QCL for approval of signage at the Queenstown casino
3 October 2014	Application by SCAL for approval of signage at the Auckland casino
8 October 2014	Application by SCAL for approval of signage at the Auckland casino
9 October 2014	Application by SHL for approval of signage at the Hamilton casino
10 October 2014	Application by SCML and SHL for approval of construction and design changes and a new floor plan for the Hamilton casino
10 October 2014	Application by SCML for approval of new floor plans for the Auckland casino

10 October 2014	Application by CCL for approval of construction and design changes and a new floor plan for the Christchurch casino
15 October 2014	Application by SHL for approval of signage at the Hamilton casino
16 October 2014	Application by SCML for approval of new floor plans for the Auckland casino
17 October 2014	Application by SCAL for approval of signage at the Auckland casino
17 October 2014	Application by SCAL for approval of signage at the Auckland casino
3 November 2014	Application by SHL for approval of signage at the Hamilton casino
3 November 2014	Application by SCAL for approval of signage at the Auckland casino
4 November 2014	Application by SCAL for approval of signage at the Auckland casino
5 November 2014	Application by SCAL for approval of signage at the Auckland casino
10 November 2014	Application by SHL for approval of signage at the Hamilton casino
11 November 2014	Application by SCML for approval of new floor plans for the Auckland casino
13 November 2014	Application by SHL for approval of signage at the Hamilton casino
14 November 2014	Application by SHL for approval of signage at the Hamilton casino
17 November 2014	Application by SCAL for approval of signage at the Auckland casino
20 November 2014	Application by SCML for approval of new floor plans for the Auckland casino
21 November 2014	Application by SCAL for approval of signage at the Auckland casino
21 November 2014	Application by SHL for approval of signage at the Hamilton casino
24 November 2014	Application by SHL for approval of signage at the Hamilton casino
26 November 2014	Application by SCAL for approval of construction and design changes to the Auckland casino
28 November 2014	Application by SHL for approval of signage at the Hamilton casino
8 December 2014	Application by SHL for approval of signage at the Hamilton casino
9 December 2014	Application by SCAL for approval of signage at the Auckland casino
16 December 2014	Application by SCAL for approval of signage at the Auckland casino
17 December 2014	Application by SHL for approval of signage at the Hamilton casino
18 December 2014	Application by SCAL for approval of signage at the Auckland casino
22 December 2014	Application by SCAL for approval of signage at the Auckland casino
24 December 2014	Application by SCAL for approval of construction and design changes to the Auckland casino
20 January 2015	Application by SCML for approval of a temporary floor plan for the Auckland casino
20 January 2015	Application by SHL for approval of signage at the Hamilton casino
23 January 2015	Application by SCAL for approval of signage at the Auckland casino
28 January 2015	Application by SHL for approval of signage at the Hamilton casino
29 January 2015	Application by SCAL for approval of signage at the Auckland casino
29 January 2015	Application by SHL for approval of signage at the Hamilton casino
9 February 2015	Application by SCAL for approval of construction and design changes to the Auckland casino
9 February 2015	Application by SCAL for approval of signage at the Auckland casino
11 February 2015	Application by SCAL for approval of signage at the Auckland casino

12 February 2015	Application by SCAL for approval of signage at the Auckland casino
12 February 2015	Application by SHL for approval of signage at the Hamilton casino
13 February 2015	Application by OCL for approval of construction and design changes to the Wharf casino
13 February 2015	Application by SCML for approval of new floor plans for the Auckland casino
13 February 2015	Application by SHL for approval of signage at the Hamilton casino
13 February 2015	Application by SCAL for approval of signage at the Auckland casino
16 February 2015	Application by OCL for approval of a new floor plan for the Wharf casino
20 February 2015	Application by SCAL for approval of signage at the Auckland casino
4 March 2015	Application by SHL for approval of signage at the Hamilton casino
5 March 2015	Application by SCML for approval of new floor plans for the Auckland casino
20 March 2015	Application by SCAL for approval of signage at the Auckland casino
23 March 2015	Application by SCAL for approval of construction and design changes to the Auckland casino
24 March 2015	Application by SCAL for approval of signage at the Auckland casino
27 March 2015	Application by SHL for approval of signage at the Hamilton casino
31 March 2015	Application by SCAL for approval of signage at the Auckland casino
1 April 2015	Application by SCML for approval of new floor plans for the Auckland casino
1 April 2015	Application by SHL for approval of signage at the Hamilton casino
8 April 2015	Application by SCAL for approval of signage at the Auckland casino
21 April 2015	Application by SCAL for approval of signage at the Auckland casino
21 April 2015	Application by SCAL for approval of signage at the Auckland casino
24 April 2015	Application by SCML for approval of new floor plans for the Auckland casino
24 April 2015	Application by SHL for approval of signage at the Hamilton casino
4 May 2015	Application by SHL for approval of signage at the Hamilton casino
15 May 2015	Application by SCAL for approval of signage at the Auckland casino
19 May 2015	Application by SCAL for approval of signage at the Auckland casino
20 May 2015	Application by SHL for approval of signage at the Hamilton casino
22 May 2015	Application by SHL for approval of signage at the Hamilton casino
25 May 2015	Application by SCML for approval of new floor plans for the Auckland casino
5 June 2015	Application by SHL for approval of signage at the Hamilton casino
9 June 2015	Application by SHL for approval of signage at the Hamilton casino
10 June 2015	Application by SCAL for approval of signage at the Auckland casino
12 June 2015	Application by SCAL for approval of signage at the Auckland casino
22 June 2015	Application by SHL for approval of signage at the Hamilton casino
26 June 2015	Application by SCAL for approval of construction and design changes to the Auckland casino
29 June 2015	Application by SCAL for approval of signage at the Auckland casino

