Submission No 542

SYDNEY'S NIGHT TIME ECONOMY

Name:Mrs Claire EvansDate Received:2 July 2019

To The Joint Select Committee in relation to Sydney's lockout laws;

I am writing to express my thoughts as a rate-paying Sydney resident, regarding the approach to our nightlife. As a resident of lower Paddington/Darlinghurst (for 10 years until last Friday), I have seen a dramatic degradation of our local night-time economy and nightlife.

Once vibrant Darlinghurst, Potts Point and Kings Cross areas have become graveyards of failed restaurants, clubs and bars thanks to the reduction of foot traffic due to night-time restrictions in the area.

I'm concerned that the lock-out laws have compromised the night-time spirit that Sydney was known for. While I do not work in hospitality, I enjoyed Sydney's reputation for incredible restaurants - particularly concentrated in the Potts Point area. This has suffered greatly due to lockout laws because foot traffic has shifted and had a knock on affect to many local businesses.

I believe the greater impact of the lockout laws is not being considered. Yes, let's make our city safer, but I implore the NSW Government to implement an evidence-based approach to our nightlife and a willingness to admit when a 'solution' is not having the desired result or is greatly detrimental to a subgroup of people for whom the impact wasn't fully considered (musicians, restaurant owners, hospitality workers etc). Sensible, evidence-based measures must include:

- Running trains and other public transport for 24 hours on Friday and Saturday nights, like in London and Melbourne;

- strengthening the management of liquor licences to provide incentives for good management and penalties for poorly managed venues;

- and encouraging venues across the city to avoid concentrations in areas like Kings Cross or the city centre.

Sydney's night-time economy is worth more than \$4 billion to the NSW economy and employs over 35,000 people. The lockout laws have directly affected these people and the full impact should be considered moving forward.

Regards, Claire Evans