

LICENSING ACT SUB-COMMITTEE AGENDA



22 August 2012

at 1.30 pm

in Committee Room B, Civic Centre, Hartlepool

MEMBERS: LICENSING ACT SUB-COMMITTEE:

Councillors Hall, Sirs and Shields

- 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
- 2. TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS**
- 3. ITEMS FOR DECISION**
 - 3.1 Application for the Review of Premises Licence – The Showroom, 2 Victoria Road, Hartlepool – *Assistant Director, Regeneration and Planning*

LICENSING ACT 2003

Procedure for Review Hearings



Prior to the commencement of the meeting, a representative of the Democratic Services Section shall establish the identity of those present, who they represent and who intends, or wishes to speak.

1. The Chair's opening comments, including introduction of Members of sub-committee and officers present. Explanation of the decision to be considered.
2. Head of Public Protection and Housing outlines the application, any relevant representations and relevancy to Licensing Policy and statutory guidance.
3. Members ask any questions of the Head of Public Protection and Housing.
4. Applicant for Review presents their case (either personally or via legal representation) and introduces witnesses where appropriate.
5. Questions by Members to applicant and/or applicant's witnesses.
6. Representations by responsible bodies and/or interested parties and witnesses introduced where appropriate.
7. Questions by Members to responsible bodies/interested parties and/or their witnesses.
8. Licence/Club Certificate holder presents their case (either personally or via legal representation) and introduces witnesses where appropriate.
9. Parties may question and clarify issues raised with the consent of the Chair.
10. If required, applicant/responsible bodies/interested parties to be given opportunity to sum up.
11. If required, the Licence /Club Certificate holder to be given opportunity to sum up.
12. Members to have the opportunity to clarify any points raised. The Chair shall ask whether all parties are satisfied they have said all they wish to.
13. Members to go into closed session to deliberate.
14. Chair informs parties of their decision, with reasons.

Report of: Assistant Director, Regeneration and Planning

Subject: APPLICATION FOR THE REVIEW OF PREMISES
LICENCE – THE SHOWROOM, 2 VICTORIA ROAD,
HARTLEPOOL

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To consider an application for the review of a premises licence in respect of The Showroom, 2 Victoria Road, Hartlepool.

2. SUMMARY OF APPLICATION

- 2.1 Party requesting review: Cleveland Police

Premises to which the review relates: The Showroom
2 Victoria Road
Hartlepool

- 2.2 The current Premises Licence Holder is:

1st Leisure Limited
25 Park View Road West Industrial Estate
Hartlepool

- 2.3 The current premises licence authorises the following licensable activities during the following hours: -

1. Films
2. Indoor Sporting Events
3. Live Music
4. Recorded Music
5. Performance of Dance
6. Anything Similar to 3, 4 or 5 above
7. Provision of facilities for Making Music
8. Provision of facilities for Dancing
9. Anything Similar to 7 or 8 above
10. Late Night Refreshment
11. Supply of Alcohol

Monday to Sunday 10:00 – 04:00 (for all the above activities except Late Night Refreshment)

Monday to Sunday 23:00 – 04:00 (Late Night Refreshment)

- 2.4 A copy of the premises licence is attached as **Appendix I**.
- 2.5 A copy of the application for review, including Police witness statement, is attached as **Appendix II**.
- 2.6 The application for review refers to the following licensing objectives:
- The Prevention of Crime and Disorder
 - Public Safety
 - Protection of Children from harm

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 Cleveland Police have requested a review of the premises licence on the grounds that despite attempts by the Police to work with the licence holder to reduce the number of incidents associated with the premises, there has in fact been an increase in the number of incidents.
- 3.2 Cleveland Police have also raised concerns that the licence holder appears to be unwilling to communicate with them.
- 3.3 In particular Cleveland Police have the following concerns in relation to these premises:
- The number of violent incidents associated with the premises
 - The quality of the CCTV system
 - Access to the premises via the Beer Garden
 - Insufficient Door Supervisors
- 3.4 The application has been advertised in the prescribed manner and no additional representations have been received.

4. ISSUES

- 4.1 An application for the review of a licence is made under Section 51 of the Licensing Act 2003. The application must be made by either a Responsible Authority or Interested Party as defined by the Act. Cleveland Police are a Responsible Authority.
- 4.2 The application must also relate to at least one of the Act's 'licensing objectives'. These are: -
- i) The prevention of crime and disorder;
 - ii) Public safety;
 - iii) The prevention of public nuisance; and
 - iv) The protection of children from harm

4.3 Following consideration of the application, relevant representations and any comments of the licence holder, Members may take such steps as they consider necessary for the promotion of the licensing objectives.

4.4 The steps are: -

- To take no action;
- To modify the conditions on the licence (this may include altering or omitting an existing condition or adding a new condition);
- To exclude a licensable activity from the scope of the licence;
- To suspend the licence for a period not exceeding three months;
- To revoke the licence.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 That Members consider the representations made by the Cleveland Police and the licence holder and determine what action, if any, should be taken.

THE LICENSING ACT 2003
PREMISES LICENCE (PART A)

Premises licence number

HART/PS/342

Part 1 - Premises details

Postal address of premises or, if none, ordnance survey map reference, or description

2 Victoria Road

Post Town Hartlepool

Post Code TS24 7SD

Telephone number

Where the licence is time limited the dates

N/A

Licensable activities authorised by the licence. Any entertainment authorised by this licence is limited to indoors only, unless stated otherwise.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Films | 7. Provision of facilities for Making Music |
| 2. Indoor Sporting Events | 8. Provision of facilities for Dancing |
| 3. Live Music | 9. Anything Similar to 7 or 8 above |
| 4. Recorded Music | 10. Late Night Refreshment |
| 5. Performance of Dance | 11. Supply of Alcohol |
| 6. Anything Similar to 3, 4 or 5 above | |

The opening hours of the premises

Monday to Sunday 10:00 – 04:30

Where the licence authorises supplies of alcohol whether these are on and / or off supplies

On and Off Supplies

Name, (registered) address, telephone number and email (where relevant) of holder of premises licence

1st Leisure Limited
25 Park View Road West Industrial Estate
Hartlepool
TS25 1PE Tel: 01429 866448

Registered number of holder, for example company number, charity number (where applicable)

04490285

Name, address and telephone number of designated premises supervisor where the premises licence authorizes the supply of alcohol

Craig Wilkinson

Personal licence number and issuing authority of personal licence held by designated premises supervisor where the premises licence authorizes for the supply of alcohol

HART/PL/244
Hartlepool Borough Council

Date licence granted: 21st September 2009

ANNEX 1 – Mandatory Conditions

1. No supply of alcohol may be made under the premises licence-
 - (a) at a time when there is no designated premises supervisor in respect of the premises licence, or
 - (b) at a time when the designated premises supervisor does not hold a personal licence or his personal licence is suspended

Every supply of alcohol under the premises licence must be made or authorised by a person who holds a personal licence.

2. (1) The responsible person shall take all reasonable steps to ensure that staff on relevant premises do not carry out, arrange or participate in any irresponsible promotions in relation to the premises.
- (2) In this paragraph, an irresponsible promotion means any one or more of the following activities, or substantially similar activities, carried on for the purpose of encouraging the sale or supply of alcohol for consumption on the premises in a manner which carries a significant risk of leading or contributing to crime and disorder, prejudice to public safety, public nuisance, or harm to children—
 - (a) games or other activities which require or encourage, or are designed to require or encourage, individuals to—
 - (i) drink a quantity of alcohol within a time limit (other than to drink alcohol sold or supplied on the premises before the cessation of the period in which the responsible person is authorised to sell or supply alcohol), or
 - (ii) drink as much alcohol as possible (whether within a time limit or otherwise);
 - (b) provision of unlimited or unspecified quantities of alcohol free or for a fixed or discounted fee to the public or to a group defined by a particular characteristic (other than any promotion or discount available to an individual in respect of alcohol for consumption at a table meal, as defined in section 159 of the Act);
 - (c) provision of free or discounted alcohol or any other thing as a prize to encourage or reward the purchase and consumption of alcohol over a period of 24 hours or less;
 - (d) provision of free or discounted alcohol in relation to the viewing on the premises of a sporting event, where that provision is dependent on—
 - (i) the outcome of a race, competition or other event or process, or
 - (ii) the likelihood of anything occurring or not occurring;
 - (e) selling or supplying alcohol in association with promotional posters or flyers on, or in the vicinity of, the premises which can reasonably be considered to condone, encourage or glamorise anti-social behaviour or to refer to the effects of drunkenness in any favourable manner.

3. The responsible person shall ensure that no alcohol is dispensed directly by one person into the mouth of another (other than where that other

person is unable to drink without assistance by reason of a disability).

4. The responsible person shall ensure that free tap water is provided on request to customers where it is reasonably available.
5. (1) The premises licence holder or club premises certificate holder shall ensure that an age verification policy applies to the premises in relation to the sale or supply of alcohol.

(2) The policy must require individuals who appear to the responsible person to be under 18 years of age (or such older age as may be specified in the policy) to produce on request, before being served alcohol, identification bearing their photograph, date of birth and a holographic mark.
6. The responsible person shall ensure that—
 - (a) where any of the following alcoholic drinks is sold or supplied for consumption on the premises (other than alcoholic drinks sold or supplied having been made up in advance ready for sale or supply in a securely closed container) it is available to customers in the following measures—
 - (i) beer or cider: ½ pint;
 - (ii) gin, rum, vodka or whisky: 25 ml or 35 ml; and
 - (iii) still wine in a glass: 125 ml; and
 - (b) customers are made aware of the availability of these measures.

ANNEX 2 – Conditions consistent with the Operating Schedule

1. Children shall be prohibited from any adult entertainment, services or activities.
2. The maximum number of persons allowed in the premises shall not exceed 400 (four hundred).
3. Except with the prior written approval of the Licensing Authority and subject to any conditions which may be attached to such approval: -
 - (a) No special effects, naked flames, smoke production or any process creating a risk of fire, or the illusion of smoke or fire shall be used for the purpose of providing regulated entertainment on the premises.
 - (b) No explosives or highly flammable substances shall be brought into or used on the premises.
 - (c) No special effects shall be used or displays given on the premises, which consist of or include the use of lasers.

Applications for consent, giving detailed descriptions of the equipment to be used and details of the event, including dates and times must be made not less than 28 days before the date of the event.

4. The licensee must ensure that the electrical socket outlets in the licensed premises, which are used for the purpose of providing licensed entertainment are protected by a residual current device being a 30 MA tripping circuit.
5. In the event of the fire alarm being activated a suitable relay must be provided so that the electrical power supply to all sound amplification system in the licensed premises must be immediately intercepted so that the alarm can be clearly heard in all parts of the licensed premises.
6. There shall be maintained on the premises at all times an adequate and appropriate supply of first aid equipment and materials for use by patrons.
7. A drugs policy should be prepared and implemented. In preparing the policy regard should be had to the guidance document 'Safer Clubbing' – Guidance for licensing authorities, club managers and promoters, published by the Home Office and London Drugs Policy Forum in partnership with Release. (Copies of the document are available from www.drugs.gov.uk .
8. A CCTV system of a type and specification approved by Cleveland Police shall be operational during all trading hours and, where more than one camera is in operation, at least one shall be permanently directed at the sales counter so as to record all sales taking place.

Images recorded by the system shall be retained for a minimum of 28 days and shall be made immediately available to police officers or other authorised officers on request.

9. There shall be in place a written policy to prevent the sale or supply of alcohol to persons under 18 years of age. That policy shall require any person who appears to be under the age of 21 to produce a recognised proof of age card accredited under the Proof of Age Standards Scheme (PASS), a photo driving licence, a passport or official HM Forces or EU ID card bearing photo and date of birth.
10. At least one notice shall be displayed at the entrance to the premises where it can be clearly seen and read and shall indicate that it is unlawful for persons under 18 years of age to purchase alcohol or for any person to purchase alcohol on behalf of a person under 18 years of age.
11. A written record shall be maintained detailing the training provided to each member of staff authorised to sell or supply alcohol. Such a record shall be signed by the member of staff to confirm the date that such training took place.
12. The licence holder implement a policy of regular monitoring and review of all staff authorised to sell or supply alcohol. Such a policy shall include periodic analysis of CCTV footage to ensure sales and refusals correspond with till records.
13. There shall be a means of alerting staff to verify the age of a prospective purchaser whenever an age restricted product is presented for purchase.

ANNEX 3 – Conditions attached after a hearing by the Licensing Authority

NONE

ANNEX 4 - Plans

YOU ARE REMINDED THAT IT IS YOUR LEGAL OBLIGATION TO ATTACH THE CURRENT 'PLAN' TO THIS PREMISES LICENCE AND KEEP THIS LICENCE (OR A CERTIFIED COPY) IN A SECURE PLACE AT THE LICENSED PREMISES.

IT IS AN OFFENCE NOT TO PRODUCE YOUR PREMISES LICENCE (INCLUDING THE PLAN) UPON REQUEST BY A POLICE OFFICER, LOCAL AUTHORITY OFFICER OR AUTHORISED PERSON.

Application for Review of Premises
Licence



The Showroom
2 Victoria Road, Hartlepool

APPLICATION FOR REVIEW OF PREMISES LICENCE

<u>INDEX</u>	<u>PAGE NO</u>
1. APPLICATION FOR REVIEW OF THE PREMISES LICENCE	1 – 9
2. WITNESS STATEMENT OF PC ANDREW THORPE	10 – 33
3. EXHIBIT AT/1	34
4. EXHIBIT AT/2	35
5. EXHIBIT AT/3	36

**APPLICATION FOR THE REVIEW OF A PREMISES LICENCE OR CLUB
PREMISES CERTIFICATE UNDER THE LICENSING ACT 2003**

PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

Before completing this form please read the guidance notes at the end of the form.
If you are completing this form by hand please write legibly in block capitals. In all cases ensure that your answers are inside the boxes and written in black ink. Use additional sheets if necessary. You may wish to keep a copy of the completed form for your records.

I Marie Nevison

(Insert name of applicant)

**apply for the review of a premises licence under section 51 / apply for the
review of a club premises certificate under section 87 of the Licensing Act 2003
for the premises described in Part 1 below (delete as applicable)**

Part 1 – Premises or club premises details

**Postal address of premises or, if none, ordnance survey map reference or
description**

The Showroom
2 Victoria Road

Post town Hartlepool

Post code (if known) TS24 7SD

**Name of premises licence holder or club holding club premises certificate (if
known)**

First Leisure

Number of premises licence or club premises certificate (if known)

HART/PS/342

Part 2 - Applicant details

I am

Please tick yes

1) an interested party (please complete (A) or (B) below)

a) a person living in the vicinity of the premises

☐

b) a body representing persons living in the vicinity of the premises

☐

c) a person involved in business in the vicinity of the premises

☐

d) a body representing persons involved in business in the vicinity of the
premises

☐

2) a responsible authority (please complete (C) below)

☒

3) a member of the club to which this application relates (please complete (A)
below)

☐

(A) DETAILS OF INDIVIDUAL APPLICANT (fill in as applicable)

Please tick

Mr ☐ Mrs ☐ Miss ☐ Ms ☐

Other title
(for example, Rev)

Surname

First names

I am 18 years old or over

Please tick yes

☐

Current postal
address if
different from
premises
address

Post town

Post Code

Daytime contact telephone number

E-mail address
(optional)

(B) DETAILS OF OTHER APPLICANT

Name and address

Telephone number (if any)

E-mail address (optional)

(C) DETAILS OF RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY APPLICANT

Name and address Chief Constable of Cleveland Police c/o Sgt Jonathan Wrigley Licensing Unit Hartlepool Police Office Avenue Road Hartlepool TS24 8AJ
Telephone number (if any) 01642 302162
E-mail address (optional)

This application to review relates to the following licensing objective(s)

Please tick one or more boxes

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| 1) the prevention of crime and disorder | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2) public safety | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3) the prevention of public nuisance | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4) the protection of children from harm | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Please state the ground(s) for review (please read guidance note 1)

Cleveland Police wish to make an application to review this premises for the following reasons:

This premises re opened after a period of being closed in September 2010.

Initially, the premises caused no real concerns to Cleveland Police, although the situation within Hartlepool was such that a number of premises were placed on an Action Plan in October 2010, including The Showroom. This initial Action Plan assisted most premises with reducing the incidents in their premises, but did not appear to assist The Showroom.

It became apparent in August 2011 that the situation was such that Cleveland Police found it necessary to meet with the Premises Licence Holders, Craig and Brett Wilkinson and Terry Hammond of First Leisure. This meeting took place on 18th November when further action was suggested in order to address the concerns of Cleveland Police. These concerns included:

- Violent incidents associated with the premises
- Poor Quality CCTV (which prevented Cleveland Police from detecting suspects of the violent incidents)
- Problems with persons refused entry accessing the premises via the beer garden perimeter.
- Insufficient Door Supervisors to cover a two floor building, namely three.

The premises agreed with the suggested actions by police, which included the premises contacting Cleveland Police with an update of any incidents or concerns.

Up until November 2011, the premises failed to contact Cleveland Police apart from when they have requested to do so by PC Thorpe. This led to a further meeting on December 14th 2011 where the lack of communication and the above concerns were discussed.

To date the incidents at the premises have not improved in fact, they have increased

both in volume and seriousness since the meetings. In addition to these concerns, the situation now is that the premises is failing to contact PC Thorpe at all, despite e mails and telephone messages requesting that Craig Wilkinson contact him.

This situation and the lack of response from the premises has left Cleveland Police with no alternative but to make this application to review the Premises Licence. Failure to do so may result in serious injury to patrons or worse.

Please provide as much information as possible to support the application
(please read guidance note 2)

Please tick yes

Have you made an application for review relating to this premises before ☐

If yes please state the date of that application

Day Month Year

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

If you have made representations before relating to this premises please state what they were and when you made them

Please tick yes

- I have sent copies of this form and enclosures to the responsible authorities and the premises licence holder or club holding the club premises certificate, as appropriate ☒
- I understand that if I do not comply with the above requirements my application will be rejected ☒

IT IS AN OFFENCE, LIABLE ON CONVICTION TO A FINE UP TO LEVEL 5 ON THE STANDARD SCALE, UNDER SECTION 158 OF THE LICENSING ACT 2003 TO MAKE A FALSE STATEMENT IN OR IN CONNECTION WITH THIS APPLICATION

Part 3 – Signatures (please read guidance note 3)

Signature of applicant or applicant's solicitor or other duly authorised agent (See guidance note 4). If signing on behalf of the applicant please state in what capacity.

Signature



Date 28th June 2012.....

Capacity Solicitor on Behalf of Chief Constable of Cleveland Police

Contact name (where not previously given) and postal address for correspondence associated with this application (please read guidance note 5)	
Post town	Post Code
Telephone number (if any)	
If you would prefer us to correspond with you using an e-mail address your e-mail address (optional)	

Notes for Guidance

1. The ground(s) for review must be based on one of the licensing objectives.
2. Please list any additional information or details for example dates of problems which are included in the grounds for review if available.
3. The application form must be signed.
4. An applicant's agent (for example solicitor) may sign the form on their behalf provided that they have actual authority to do so.
5. This is the address which we shall use to correspond with you about this application.

Copies of this completed application form must be sent to:-

The Licensing Team (HBC),
Principal Trading Standards Officer (HBC)
Development Control Manager (HBC)
Principal Environmental Health Officer (Commercial Services) (HBC)
Principal Environmental Health Officer (Environmental Protection) (HBC)
Head of Safeguarding and Review (Licensing) (HBC)
Cleveland Police,
Cleveland Fire Brigade

Addresses for the above organisations are attached.

The Licensing Section
Public Protection and Housing
Hartlepool Borough Council
Civic Centre
Victoria Road
Hartlepool
TS24 8AY

LICENSING ACT 2003

If you are making an application to Hartlepool Borough Council for a new licence, or a variation to an existing licence, under the Licensing Act 2003, you must send a copy of your application to each of the following organisations.



✓ The Licensing Team
Hartlepool Borough Council
Bryan Hanson House
Hanson Square
Hartlepool
TS24 7 BT

✓ The Licensing Officer
Hartlepool Police Office
Avenue Road
Hartlepool
TS24 8AB

✓ Chief Fire Officer
Community Services Group
Fire Engineering Hartlepool
Fire Brigade HQ
Endeavour House
Stockton Road
Hartlepool
TS25 5TB

✓ Development Control Manager
Hartlepool Borough Council
Bryan Hanson House
Hanson Square
Hartlepool
TS24 7BT

✓ Hartlepool Safeguarding Children Board
Child and Adult Services Department
Hartlepool Borough Council
Level 4, Civic Centre
Victoria Road
Hartlepool
TS24 8AY

Principal Environmental Health Officer (Commercial Services)
Hartlepool Borough Council
Bryan Hanson House
Hanson Square
✓ Hartlepool
TS24 7 BT

Principal Environmental Health Officer (Environmental Protection)
Hartlepool Borough Council
Bryan Hanson House
✓ Hanson Square
Hartlepool
TS24 7 BT

Principal Trading Standards Officer
✓ Hartlepool Borough Council
Bryan Hanson House
Hanson Square
Hartlepool
TS24 7 BT

✓ Professor P.J.Kelly
Executive Director of Public Health
NHS Tees
Redheugh House
Thornaby Place
Thornaby
Stockton on Tees
TS17 6SG

For more information contact the Council's Licensing Team on (01429) 523354 or licensing@hartlepool.gov.uk or visit Bryan Hanson House, Hanson Square Hartlepool, TS24 7BT

RESTRICTED (when complete)**CLEVELAND POLICE****WITNESS STATEMENT**

(CJ Act 1967, s9 MC Act 1980, ss5A(3)(a) and 5B; Criminal Procedure Rules 2005, r.27.1(1))

URN	17			
-----	----	--	--	--

Statement of Andrew THORPEAge if under 18 Over 18 (If over 18 insert "Over 18") Occupation Police Constable 0894

This statement (consisting of 14 page(s) each signed by me) is true to the best of my knowledge and belief and I make it knowing that if it is tendered in evidence I shall be liable to prosecution if I have wilfully stated anything in it, which I know to be false, or do not believe to be true.

Signature _____

Date: 26/06/2012Tick if witness evidence is visually recorded ☐ (supply witness details on rear)

I am a serving police officer with Cleveland Police. I am currently stationed with the Hartlepool District Alcohol Licensing Unit.

Part of my role is monitor licensed premises within Hartlepool and ensure they are not undermining the four licensing objectives and abiding by the licensing conditions which have been attached to their license. If premises are not abiding by the conditions imposed then it is my duty to collate evidence of the breaches and inform the license holder of the relevant issues, and how to address them.

This statement is in relation to The Showroom Nightclub, 2 Victoria Road, Hartlepool and the following incidents/offences all occurred because of the premises being open to members of the public.

I have recently reviewed all police information and intelligence systems for the previous twelve months in order to compile this statement and provide a true reflection of the

Signature _____

Signature Witnessed by _____

Continuation of Statement of **Andrew THORPE**

behaviour of revellers and staff whilst associated to the premises.

The following are detailed incidents/ offences, which are associated to The Showroom nightclub, Victoria Road, Hartlepool.

In the early hours of Monday 4th June 2012 around 02:10 hours, which was part of the Jubilee Bank Holiday celebrations a young woman was out with friends in The Showroom Bar, Victoria Road, Hartlepool. She went to the restrooms and whilst she was waiting in the queue for the cubicles, the female had knocked on the cubicle doors to ensure they were all in use. While still waiting in the queue the female behind her, also knocked on the cubicle doors. One female from the cubicles took exception to this. Seeing the young female at the front assumed it was she who had knocked the second time. An argument ensued between the two parties. The female who came out of the cubicle grabbed the young woman by the throat. Frightened the young woman broke away and fled.

Due to the assault, the young woman suffered a nasty graze and bruising with broken skin to the throat area and a bump to her head when she had pulled away. The offender fled the scene and to date has not been identified. This was an unprovoked attack and is indicative of the clientele who attend The Showroom.

During the early hours of Monday 7th May 2012 at around 00:40 hours, a female reveller was out with her husband enjoying a night out. Two females and a male come over and one of the females starts to flirt with her husband. The female reveller remonstrated with

Signature _____

Signature Witnessed by _____

RESTRICTED (when complete)**CLEVELAND POLICE**

Page No 3

Continuation of Statement of **Andrew THORPE**

the group and was repaid by having a drink thrown over her. A scuffle breaks out and the female reveller is knocked to the floor after being hit in the nose with a glass.

When the female reveller gets to her feet, she discovers she has a small cut to her nose.

This has happened in a public area of the Showroom and yet no one was able to prevent the assault from happening even though it was preceded by a verbal disagreement. This again was reliant on CCTV, which proved negative and the assailant was not identified.

This would have been less likely to happen if regular, effective walkabouts were done by door staff.

On Sunday 22nd April 2012 at around 00:00 hours, a young female was enjoying a social night out with friends in The Showroom. She was at the upstairs dance floor when a fight broke out upstairs. Glasses were thrown by unknown persons and unfortunately, one of these glasses struck the young female in the face.

The young female suffered several cuts to the face some of which had to be treated and glued and bruising to the face. Although the premises were busy; no members of staff had witnessed this incident even though glasses were being thrown

Police Officers attended The Showroom twice on the 25th April 2012 and 27th April 2012 to obtain CCTV footage and were told by staff on duty that they were unable to download. The CCTV footage was sent on DVD to the police office on 3rd May 2012 more than a week after it had been requested, only to find that the CCTV cameras did not cover the area where the incident happened.

Signature _____

12
Signature Witnessed by _____

Continuation of Statement of **Andrew THORPE**

As stated by the Premises License for The Showroom Annex 2, Condition 8 which covers the premises CCTV system states:-

"Images recorded by the system shall be retained for a minimum of 28 days and shall be made immediately available to police officers or other authorised officers on request."

The CCTV was not produced either immediately or in a timely manner. This is a breach of their premises license conditions, and it could have hampered the investigation.

Again, on Sunday 22nd April 2012 at around 02:30 hours, police officers came across a male on Victoria Road, Hartlepool whose hand was covered in blood. They found he had a laceration to his right index finger. When asked how it had happened, the male stated he had been in The Showroom earlier when he noticed a friend's girlfriend being chatted up by a male he did not know. The injured male had gone across to speak with the friend's girlfriend and give her a friendly warning. He pointed at the male she was speaking to when without warning the male lunged forward and sank his teeth in to the injured male's right index finger puncturing it.

The staff were unaware of the assault and the assailant was never traced. Whilst there is no guarantee that the assault could have been prevented regular and effective floor walking by door, staff could dissuade people from random acts of violence such as this. It also again demonstrates the sort of clientele The Showroom attracts.

Signature _____

Signature Witnessed by _____

13

RESTRICTED (when complete)**CLEVELAND POLICE**

Page No 5

Continuation of Statement of **Andrew THORPE**

During the early hours of Saturday 14th April 2012 at around 03:00 hours The Showroom was one of the last licensed premises to close and in the proximity of Victoria Road was the last to close. As people were coming out a small group of males and females gathered at the front of the premises. There appeared to be conflict between a small group of males, and one male was held back by a second male. While the male was being held a third male ran up and threw punches at the restrained male. Council CCTV operators were monitoring the scene whilst officers travelled to the incident and reported that both males were now fighting. When police attended, they found that both males were very intoxicated, argumentative and aggressive. As a result, not only of their actions but also their demeanour both males were arrested and a female was detained.

All parties were heavily intoxicated in the opinion of the officers attending which only exacerbated the incident. The main questions would be if they had stopped serving these people earlier in the night could this incident have been avoided?

On Friday 6th April at around 01:15 hours an adult male is in The Showroom enjoying a night out with friends when he gets in to a verbal argument with another male. Without warning or physical provocation, the other male raises his arm and with a clenched right fist punches the adult male to the left jaw area. Both parties are ejected from the premises and the injured male reports the matter to police officers who were outside the venue.

Once again, could this have been avoided by regular and effective floor walks by door staff? By the injured males own admission he had argued with the male and this could

Signature _____

Signature Witnessed by 14 _____

RESTRICTED (when complete)**CLEVELAND POLICE**

Page No 6

Continuation of Statement of **Andrew THORPE**

have been seen by vigilant staff walking through the venue. It also indicates again the level of clientele who are attracted to the venue.

It is around 02:00 hours on Sunday 1st April 2012, a young adult male is in The Showroom with friends enjoying a night out drinking. From the injured parties account we know he went to the bar to be served and while there, he gets into an argument with two other males. Without warning one of the other males head-butts the young male. The young male remains standing and the other male head-butts him to face again. Then the other male's friend punches the young male in the face. At this a member of the public who frequents the bar regularly is asked by the bar staff to escort the males outside. The member of public did and the manager of The Showroom alerted the police to what had happened.

As a result of the incident, the young male sustained a bloody and swollen nose. Disregarding the fact for just a moment that the bar staff had to ask a member of public for assistance, one of the males who perpetrated the assault was 17 years old. The premises has a clear and unequivocal condition in their license Annex 2 Condition 9 which states "There shall be in place a written policy to prevent the sale or supply of alcohol to persons under 18 years of age. That policy shall require any person who appears to be under the age of 21 to produce a recognised proof of age card accredited under the Proof of Age Standards Scheme (PASS), a photo driving licence, a passport or official HM Forces or EU ID card bearing photo and date of birth." I believe this is self explanatory and if it had been adhered to as the two males responsible appeared to be together if one had been refused

Signature _____

15
Signature Witnessed by _____

RESTRICTED (when complete)**CLEVELAND POLICE**

Page No 7

Continuation of Statement of **Andrew THORPE**

entry the other most probably would not have gone in to the premises either. There appears to be little if no communication between the staff inside the venue and the door staff or the management, which meant this incident, was dealt with neither as effectively or as quickly as it should have been.

On Sunday 25th March 2012 at approximately 01:00 hours, a 19 year old has been out with friends having a few drinks. The victim was in The Showroom when a male he does not know approaches him. The male has hit the victim in the face causing injury to the victim's nose and has then run out of The Showroom. The victim has been taken to the One Life Centre by his father and possibly has a fractured nose.

The injured party did not know his assailant and CCTV interrogation proved negative. Without a significant suspect description or name the investigation has not been carried forward pending any further evidence coming to light.

There seems to be a spate of stranger assaults which premises will only have any impact on if they are carrying out regular and pro-active walkthroughs of the club.

Also on Sunday 25th March 2012 after 04:00 hours when the only nightclub on Victoria Road left open is The Showroom. Two females were seen by police officers, fighting at the side of The Showroom. One of the females was arrested by officers for assaulting the second female.

Although this has not happened within The Showroom, this goes to illustrate the incidents that occur in and around The Showroom especially towards the end of the night.

Signature _____

Signature Witnessed by _____

RESTRICTED (when complete)**CLEVELAND POLICE**

Page No 8

Continuation of Statement of **Andrew THORPE**

On Friday 9th March 2012 at around 02:15 hours in the early hours of the morning an eighteen year old female was assaulted outside The Showroom after a verbal altercation inside the premises. The female had come out on a Thursday night and had attended The Showroom towards the end of the night, when she had become involved in an altercation with another female. To avoid trouble she left, but was followed out by the female. Whilst she was outside the verbal argument started again which quickly dissolved into a physical confrontation between the two girls. The girls had fallen to the floor when a male kicked the victim in the head.

This incident according to the victim took place directly outside The Showroom yet it was not reported by anyone from the Showroom who would and should have door staff at the front of the premises to control ingress/egress to and from the premise. The incident was reported by the victim herself some 30 minutes later.

On Sunday 4th March 2012 at around 02:20 hours a 26 year old female reported she had been assaulted in the beer garden at the front of The Showroom. The victim had been for a night out on Saturday 3rd March into the early hours of Sunday morning. Just after 2am while she was in the beer garden at the front of The Showroom she has been embroiled in a verbal altercation with a female known to her. This has escalated to the point where the female has slapped the female across the face.

Signature _____

Signature Witnessed by _____

RESTRICTED (when complete)**CLEVELAND POLICE**Page No **9**Continuation of Statement of **Andrew THORPE**

Again, this is another case where an incident has happened in a place, which should have been visible to the staff of The Showroom. Yet again, the victim reports the incident some 15 minutes later.

On Saturday 11th February 2012, a 24-year-old male was enjoying a drink in The Showroom on a social night out with a friend. While they were in The Showroom towards the end of the night, they were standing watching the dance floor while drinking. The victim and a male have had a dispute leading to some pushing and shoving but fearing for his safety the victim has backed off and walked away. The male has approached the victim and brought his clenched hand down on the back of the victim's head, a clenched hand, which held a glass. The male ran out of the Showroom unmolested leaving the victim with a 4-inch laceration to the head, narrowly missing a main artery and bleeding heavily with his scalp partially exposed. The injury required three staples.

If there was a member, of door staff, carrying out regular floor walks inside the premise the chances of the initial altercation, being seen and acted upon would have been greatly increased and this could have prevented the final assault from occurring.

Again on Saturday 11th February 2012 at around 03:35 hours, an extremely drunk male is ejected from The Showroom after causing problems inside. The police approach the male who is being abusive towards the door staff. The male, who is known, continues to be abusive towards the door staff and the officers present. This resulted in the male being

Signature _____

Signature Witnessed by 18 _____

RESTRICTED (when complete)**CLEVELAND POLICE**

Page No 10

Continuation of Statement of **Andrew THORPE**

arrested and a violent struggle ensuing between officers and the male before he was taken away. The male was also later found to be in the possession of drugs.

My main concern is the drunken state of the male who had clearly had more than enough according to the officers statement. Should this male have been refused his last drink, this could have defused a potentially violent situation.

On Sunday 29th January 2012 at around 01:14 hours, police were outside The Showroom when one of the officers noticed a male and female talking. The male threw the female to the ground at which point a second male ran over to the pair and started to fight with the male. The officer jumped in between the two males to prevent them from injuring each other. The second male punched the officer in the face. The male was restrained and arrested for assaulting the police officer, along with the other male for assaulting the female.

This shows the type of clientele The Showroom is attracting and the problems that are occurring in and around the premise.

On Thursday 12th January 2012 at around 23:45 hours, a fight ensued outside The Showroom. Door Staff acted quickly to quell the fight and on police arrival, two males were arrested on public order offences.

Although there were no serious injuries this could have been a more serious incident and once again shows the calibre of clientele The Showroom is attracting.

Signature _____

19
Signature Witnessed by _____

RESTRICTED (when complete)**CLEVELAND POLICE**

Page No 11

Continuation of Statement of **Andrew THORPE**

In the early hours of Christmas Eve Saturday 24th December 2011 at around 01:00 hours, a fight broke out inside The Showroom between two males near to the bar. The fight resulted in a completely innocent reveller not connected with the incident being knocked to the ground because of the fracas. The victim is then, whilst on the floor, punched in the face by one of the males. The victim was left with a bruised and swollen left eye and various other scratches and bruises from the fall.

My main concerns with this incident is that although the bar staff admit to knowing there was "some sort of disturbance", and the incident happening INSIDE the premises, no one from the premises reported any incident. There are also ongoing issues with the quality of the CCTV footage inside the premise, which made it impossible for any sort of identification from the footage.

On Friday 23rd December 2011 at around 02:30 hours an 18 year old male reveller was having a drink in the bar, when he is approached by another male. Without warning or provocation, the other male punches the reveller once to the top of his nose with his right fist. Door staff intervene and the male is ejected from the premise.

Once again, there was no report of the incident by the premise to the police even though they knew it had happened and the male's injuries were enough to justify a visit to the One Life medical centre. Also on reviewing the CCTV footage, the investigating officer found it to be below any reasonable standard and of no evidential value due to its poor quality.

Signature _____

20
Signature Witnessed by _____

RESTRICTED (when complete)**CLEVELAND POLICE**

Page No 12

Continuation of Statement of **Andrew THORPE**

In the early hours of Monday 19th December 2012, at around 01:25 hours, the council CCTV operators directed police to an ongoing assault happening outside The Showroom. When officers arrive, they are told by a female that she has been assaulted by another female who she knows, who has punched her in the face. The second female was located and arrested by the investigating officer.

This is, again, another incident that has occurred outside The Showroom, which is seemingly a magnet for this sort of trouble.

On Sunday 27th November 2011 at around 03:10, hours a disturbance was reported from The Showroom. On police arrival, a male was being ejected by door staff and whilst being escorted out a knife dropped from one of the males hands. The male was detained by police.

The door staff on this occasion has acted decisively and correctly and the male was dealt with quickly.

On Sunday 20th November 2011 at around 02:00 hours a 31 year old female is out for a social night out with her brother. Whilst at The Showroom her brother is involved in a verbal argument with another male. The female (victim) tries to intervene, but is restrained by door staff. Whilst the female is being restrained by the door staff, another female hits her whilst she is defenceless. The female is escorted to the front door whilst she is trying to tell the member of door staff he is hurting her. The member of door staff keeps telling her to calm down and leads her to the front door ejecting her from the premises. The female is in

Signature _____

Signature Witnessed by 21 _____

RESTRICTED (when complete)**CLEVELAND POLICE**

Page No 13

Continuation of Statement of **Andrew THORPE**

pain from her arm and attends the One Life clinic where she is informed her left arm humerus has been broken.

This incident raises a series of serious questions. The incident occurred on 20th November 2011 and considering the seriousness of the assault the investigating officer was at 25th November 2011 still unable to obtain a copy of the CCTV footage. It again calls in to question the clientele frequenting the premise. This was an ongoing incident, which if the floor walks were carried out properly should have been seen and dealt with quickly. When the victim was punched whilst being restrained by the door staff there does not seem to have been any reaction from that member of door staff. Why this incident was again not reported by the premise themselves, it was not reported until the following day when after the victim had been treated she contacted police herself.

On Sunday 13th November 2011 at around 03:30 hours an unknown male has entered the front beer garden in what appears to be an effort to circumvent the door staff. Door staff have seen the male and approached him intending to eject him from the premises. Eight to ten males have gathered and the incident has escalated to the point where punches have been thrown. A 24-year-old male has been punched in the head and fallen to the ground. An ambulance has been called as it was suspected the male had been knocked unconscious and due to the injury, being a head injury the male was taken to hospital to be checked over.

This shows the necessity for the perimeter fence/wall to have its height increased to avoid this sort of incident happening again.

Signature _____

22
Signature Witnessed by _____

RESTRICTED (when complete)**CLEVELAND POLICE**

Page No 14

Continuation of Statement of **Andrew THORPE**

On Sunday 16th October 2011 at around 01:00 hours an 18 year old female is in The Showroom enjoying a night out with friends. When, in an unprovoked attack, an unknown female approaches and without provocation pulls her hair forcing her to the ground. Whilst on the floor the 18-year-old female has her face stamped on. She suffers cuts to the upper of her left eye and her upper lip is swollen.

This incident has again happened inside The Showroom and again does not appear to have been witnessed by any of the staff or anyone who is carrying out the floor walks. This again begs the question are the floor walks effective.

On Sunday 25th September 2011 at around 01:30 hours a 24 year old female was in The Showroom having a drink with friends. A female known to the victim accuses her of laughing at her. The victim is head butted by the female in the face. The victim sustained a swollen left eye, which she was unable to open.

On Sunday 11th September at around 01:15 hours a 28 year old female is In The Showroom with friends when she is approached by a known male. They argue and as this escalates, the male throws the female victim to the floor where she bangs her head. The female gets back up, but is knocked down again. The door staff intervene and both parties are ejected from the premises. The female victim sustained bruising to both legs and soreness to her back and neck.

Signature _____

23
Signature Witnessed by _____

RESTRICTED (when complete)**CLEVELAND POLICE**

Page No 15

Continuation of Statement of **Andrew THORPE**

On Saturday 20th August 2011 at around 00:30 hours, a 22-year-old female is enjoying a drink in The Showroom. A known female approached the victim and an argument commenced. The female punches the victim in the face. Door staff intervene but the suspect female is ejected from the premises and allowed to walk away. The victim sustained swelling to the cheekbone and the forehead.

Apart from the assailant being allowed to walk away from the incident after being ejected, The Showroom again failed to notify anybody of the incident.

Unfortunately, the majority of these events were not reported at the time by the premises themselves but were reported by the injured parties either at the time or some time after the incident. This appears to indicate that The Showroom is unaware that these incidents have occurred and calls in to question the effectiveness of the door staff and the management of the premises. However, this is more preferable to thinking that they are aware of these incidents but have failed to do anything about them.

As a result of the incidents, occurring in and around The Showroom on Friday 18th November 2011 the owners Craig Wilkinson and Brett Wilkinson and the Manager Terry Hammond were invited in to Hartlepool Police Station to discuss the issues that The Showroom was having. This was facilitated so we could offer advice, guidance and help to enable them to combat these issues. We discussed the fact that whilst the Hartlepool Night Time Economy as a whole was showing a reduction in violent crime The Showroom was showing no reduction in fact it was showing a slight increase. During the meeting, which

Signature _____

24
Signature Witnessed by _____

RESTRICTED (when complete)**CLEVELAND POLICE**

Page No 16

Continuation of Statement of **Andrew THORPE**

was also attended by PS1814 Wrigley and me, we discussed the issue of poor quality CCTV footage, which was making it difficult for officers to successfully identify people and have any evidential value at all. We also discussed the fact the people were climbing over the fencing on the perimeter of the beer garden in order to gain access to the premises without passing the door staff. Craig, Brett and Terry were asked to think about anything else that they could do to try to improve matters.

On the 8th December 2011, I spoke with Terry Hammond in person (regular weekly contact is maintained with all town centre premises). I asked Terry about the weekends events and then asked him how they were progressing with the advice we had given regarding the CCTV and the raising of the perimeter boundary of the beer garden. Terry said they had had someone out to look at the CCTV and that he would ask Brett or Craig to phone us and advise how everything was progressing. On the same day at 13:39 hours I received a three line e-mail from Brett Wilkinson stating they were "in the process of resolving all of the problems which arose at our meeting such as the CCTV" and that they were waiting for quotes back on the CCTV and hoped to have it installed quickly. The following day I e-mailed the 1st Leisure e-mail box expressing my disappointment at the short and inadequate e-mail and asking for more detail on what they were doing to solve the issues.

On Wednesday 14th December 2011 at 11:00 hours Craig Wilkinson attended Hartlepool Police Office to speak with me regarding the issues at The Showroom. Craig was advised that he should be in regular contact with us to let us know how things were going and what

Signature _____

25
Signature Witnessed by _____

RESTRICTED (when complete)**CLEVELAND POLICE**

Page No 17

Continuation of Statement of **Andrew THORPE**

they were putting in place to alleviate the issues. Craig was also advised that on the early hours of Sunday 4th December 2011 there was another incident where a male had tried to get over the fence to gain entry into the beer garden and subsequently the premise. Craig was advised that for a long while during the busy time in the premise there had only been one member of door staff on the front entrance and that there were no signs of counters ensuring they did not exceed their 400-person limit. Craig stated that the door staff kept the counters in their pockets and clicked them there. I asked how they could therefore tell how many people were in without looking at the counters. Craig had no answer. Craig was asked about the CCTV and stated he had had quotes and as a result, he foresaw that the CCTV would be rectified by Christmas weekend. He had also had quotes for raising the area around the beer garden but that he would not be able to get that sorted due to financial constraints prior to Christmas. Craig was informed at this time I did not feel that they were working with us and that it was we chasing them for updates.

After the festive period attempts were made to speak with Craig Wilkinson (4th January 2012) and Terry Hammond (6th January 2012), unsuccessfully. On Tuesday 24th January, I spoke with Craig Wilkinson for an update on their progress. Craig gave assurances that they were only waiting on new sensors for the CCTV system, which were out of stock currently. Craig also advised that they needed planning permission for the wall and intended to submit this shortly. Craig was asked about an impromptu 'Challenge 21' check. Craig was advised that whilst the door staff had checked for ID at no point did bar staff ask for any ID. It was stressed to Craig the necessity for Bar Staff to ask for ID as it only took

Signature _____

26
Signature Witnessed by _____

RESTRICTED (when complete)**CLEVELAND POLICE**Page No **18**Continuation of Statement of **Andrew THORPE**

one person to get in past the door staff, be served with a drink to see the premise and its owners facing a fine.

On the 6th March 2012 I was informed by Hartlepool Borough Council licensing team that 1st Leisure had applied for planning permission for an extension to the beer garden facilities outside the premises including a serving hatch from the inside from a small bar area to the beer garden. This included reclaiming a disused area to the Avenue Road side of the premises. On looking at the plans, I could see no mention of the raising of the perimeter fence/wall, which we suggested might help.

On Thursday 22nd March at 11:00 hours Craig Wilkinson contacted me because of an e-mail I had sent him on 6th March 2012 outlining my concerns at the lack of communications and action from the management at The Showroom. Craig raised concerns that they were being singled out amongst all of the licensed premises in the Town Centre Night Time Economy (NTE). I assured Craig that no premises were under more scrutiny than any other was. The incidents we had found were because of work we do after every weekend where we, the District Licensing Unit, will review all of the incidents from the NTE for the weekend. This has given us a clear picture of the reported incidents from each of the premises. It shows us quite clearly that The Showroom was previously and is still now having issues with violence and anti-social behaviour. Craig was also asked about the lack of progress with the CCTV and the beer garden perimeter wall. There was no satisfactory answer to these questions. Craig was advised of our concerns and the fact that these

Signature _____

27
Signature Witnessed by _____

RESTRICTED (when complete)**CLEVELAND POLICE**Page No **19**Continuation of Statement of **Andrew THORPE**

incidents were continuing unabated. Craig promised to look into the matters personally and to keep us apprised of the situation. Craig was told that this had been going on for over 4 months now and that this may be too little too late. Subsequently after this discussion over the weekend, The Showroom had another assault inside the premises and another assault occurred outside the premise just after it closed.

This may all seem to be negative rhetoric however; on Sunday 8th April 2012, Terry HAMMOND from The Showroom was spoken to by PC2086 HUSSAIN and was praised for the way he had run the premises that night. He had stationed a member of door staff by the beer garden fencing to ensure that no one was getting in over the fence, there was a queuing system in place to control numbers and the door staff were using counters to ensure they were not above capacity.

Unfortunately, this was partly undone on Thursday 19th April 2012 when between 00:30 hours and 01:30 hours a group of males left The Showroom with bottles and glasses still in hand. Due to their intoxication, they were refused entry to YATES WINE BAR, next door to The Showroom. Unfortunately, they then used their glasses and bottles, which they brought, from The Showroom to throw around and cause nuisance with and police were called to help deal with the situation.

On Wednesday 9th May 2012 at 10:00 hours, I attended The Showroom to meet with Craig WILKINSON and Terry HAMMOND to discuss ongoing issues and how they were coming

Signature _____

28
Signature Witnessed by _____

RESTRICTED (when complete)**CLEVELAND POLICE**Page No **20**Continuation of Statement of **Andrew THORPE**

along with the improvements, they had promised to make. WILKINSON happily showed the new CCTV system, which had been up, and running the past couple of weekends, which was a marked improvement on the previous system (nearly six months after the initial suggestion for improvement). However, nothing had transpired as to the raising of the fencing surrounding the beer garden and WILKINSON stated that as his planning for the beer garden extension had been declined that this had held up the improvements. It was suggested to WILKINSON that he concentrate on the necessary improvements first to provide a safer environment. WILKINSON and HAMMOND were also asked about the worrying trend of assaults using glasses and bottles, which had occurred in their premises. Three incidents in the past month had involved glasses and bottles. WILKINSON was asked to consider changing to some other form of drinking vessels and bottles other than glass. It was reiterated to WILKINSON, to fully understand the issues facing The Showroom he should attend the premises during the busier periods Friday/Saturday nights between 1am and 4am, and that it had been suggested to him each time we had met since November 2011 nearly 6 months ago.

On Wednesday 16th May 2012 at 10:31 hours, I sent an E-mail to WILKINSON after trying to phone him without reply. I suggested in that e-mail that he speak with the council about his extension plans first and advised him that I had spoken with Ian Harrison the Senior Licensing Officer for Hartlepool Borough Council about replacements for glasses and bottles. I also mentioned complaints about having the outside speakers blasting out music, which they had agreed not to use on the grounds of public nuisance previously. I asked

Signature _____

29
Signature Witnessed by _____

RESTRICTED (when complete)**CLEVELAND POLICE**

Page No 21

Continuation of Statement of **Andrew THORPE**

that they should voluntarily stop using them again and expressed the hope that I would not have to take it further. To date I have not had a reply from WILKINSON to this e-mail. I have included a copy of the e-mail for evidential purposes and exhibit it as AT/1.

I sent another e-mail on Thursday 24th May 2012 at 14:08 hours, to Craig WILKINSON after I was again unable to gain a reply from his mobile number. I had been on Night Time Economy patrols the previous weekend and had been told by numerous people that the current door staff were leaving and that there were no replacements as yet. I was enquiring to the situation, as, although they do not have a specific licensing condition for door staff, with the issues at the premises and the popularity of it they would be foolhardy not to have door staff on at the same levels they have had previously if not more. I have included a copy of this e-mail for evidential value and exhibit it as AT/2.

On Wednesday 30th May 2012 at 11:40 hours, I attended The Showroom having had no reply from WILKINSON to my past two e-mails. I spoke with the manager Terry HAMMOND. I had found out that they were changing door staff due to unforeseen circumstances. HAMMOND confirmed this to be the case and stated a firm from Darlington had taken over last weekend and they seemed very capable. HAMMOND also told me he has tendered his resignation and intended to leave at the end of July to the beginning of August 2012. He stated the post of manager had been advertised. I again expressed my concern that it was still me that was initiating all of the contact with The Showroom considering the ongoing issues and that I had not had a reply to my past two e-mails to

Signature _____


Signature Witnessed by _____

RESTRICTED (when complete)**CLEVELAND POLICE**Page No **22**Continuation of Statement of **Andrew THORPE**

WILKINSON, nor could I get him on his mobile number. I expressed concern that I was seeing no improvement in the issues at The Showroom and that apart from the CCTV equipment we did not seem to be making any other headway. I asked HAMMOND to ask WILKINSON to contact me as soon as possible to advise me how things were going.

On Tuesday 12th June 2012 at 09:16 hours, again after a failed phone call to WILKINSON I sent another e-mail as I wished to discuss the departure of HAMMOND, their search for a replacement and issues from the past month. I have included a copy of this e-mail for evidential purposes and exhibit this as AT/3. To date I have not had a reply from WILKINSON to my past three e-mails and I have been unable to contact him on his mobile.

As a licensing department, we feel we have tried continuously to help The Showroom with our weekly visits, phone calls, meetings and openness. We have made suggestions when we have been asked for advice we have indicated possible issues, giving them more than adequate time to address them. We have been speaking with The Showroom on a regular basis since 20th September 2011, which allowed them to tell us about any issues they had identified and vice versa.

For the Five months prior to our meeting with The Showroom on 18th November 2011 there, were eight offences of a violent or serious anti-social nature directly connected to the premise. In the five months after our meeting there were 11 violent offences directly connected to the premise. This statement does not include the anti-social and purely

Signature _____

31
Signature Witnessed by _____

RESTRICTED (when complete)**CLEVELAND POLICE**Page No **23**Continuation of Statement of **Andrew THORPE**

disorderly incidents, which have also occurred during the above periods and would increase the overall incidents by at least the same numbers again. Whilst we cannot blame the premise or the management for all of these offences, we can ask the question, if our recommendations had been followed would they have helped. We unfortunately now cannot answer this question with any certainty

The bulk of The Showrooms incidents occur between 01:00 hours and 03:30 hours with an equal weighting between 01:00 to 02:00 hours and 02:00 hours to 03:00 hours. We are now able to show CCTV and extra door staff alone cannot resolve the issue. We cannot show or evidence whether more robust challenging at the bar would work. I feel the only reasonable solution is to restrict their opening/serving times to 01:00 hours. This would ensure that they did not have the issues that are inherent to the 01:00 to 03:00 hours time.

We could ask for the conditions to be amended on their license ensuring they would have reasonable CCTV coverage with adequate images, a reasonable number of door staff (five would be optimum) and the increase in height of the beer gardens perimeter wall. Since we have already asked two have been implemented, only one of them fully and the problems are still occurring and I do not feel confident that implementing the third will have enough of an impact although I believe it would help. It seems that the issues for The Showroom are more deeply entrenched and lie with the clientele they are allowing in to the premises and the way the premise is run. Whether better staff training would help, enabling the bar staff to recognise when someone has had too much or recognising problem individuals before

Signature _____ 32 Signature Witnessed by _____

RESTRICTED (when complete)**CLEVELAND POLICE**Page No **24**Continuation of Statement of **Andrew THORPE**

they cause problems. Door staff could be more usefully utilised, carrying out effective walkthroughs, identifying problem individuals, dealing with argumentative persons and verbal altercations before they escalate. Other premises have members of door staff permanently situated inside the premises primarily for this reason and it works for them.

Reviews are a last resort for us as a licensing unit, which we will do our utmost to avoid and work hand in hand with the licensees, however there has to be a line.

Signature _____ **33** Signature Witnessed by _____

AT/1
From: THORPE, Andrew (P0894)
Sent: 16 May 2012 10:32
To: Craig Wilkinson/Brett Wilkinson/The Showroom
Cc: WRIGLEY, Jonathan (P1814)
Subject: The Showroom
Craig,

I spoke with Sgt Wrigley as promised about your plans for extending the premises. While we have no issues with you serving food you will need to speak with the council (I would suggest Ian Harrison or Dave Barnfather) as to whether you will need to change your license as you will be making major structural changes to the premises. In addition, it would be wise to run your ideas past them and they might be able to tell you if you need/should speak to anyone else first. Planning is not my forte so please be advised by them. It might be a good time to go through your license as a whole to ensure it is all relevant.

We have spoken with Ian Harrison regarding replacements for glasses and glass bottles. Ian has said he get in touch with the contractor they used last time and will organise something with them. We'll let you know as soon as that happens. I've had complaints that the outside speakers are being used again especially on Thursday nights. I would expect the same courtesy to be afforded on the nights police are not outside the premises. The speakers must make it difficult for your door staff to deal with people who are trying to get into the premises, especially when trying to check ID's or refusing entry. I would prefer not to take the official route but this isn't the first (or even second) time I've had to mention this.

Haven't heard of anything major happening over the weekend but equally I'm told it wasn't particularly busy. If you know of something I might have missed let me know.

Cheers,

Andy Thorpe (PC894)
District Licencing Unit
Hartlepool
01642 302567

AT/2

From: THORPE, Andrew (P0894)
Sent: 24 May 2012 14:02
To: Craig Wilkinson/Brett Wilkinson/The Showroom
Subject: European Championship
Craig/Brett,

Numerous people told me, over the weekend ([REDACTED]/[REDACTED]/[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]/your door staff), that Ellwood is removing his door staff from The Showroom after this Friday, is this correct? Do you have anyone lined up as a replacement? I was grilled by the area manager from Phoenix Security about it, but I told them it was nothing to do with me and told them to contact you if they wanted answers to their questions. I don't want to come across officious but I think it would be wrong of me not to bring this to your attention. Although you do not have any specific requirement in your license to have door staff, a number of your conditions (maximum number of patrons/Under 21 policy) and the number of incidents that do occur at the premise show the need for you to have door staff. Since we have talked about this previously and you have agreed to the number of door staff the premises need as a minimum I hope I can trust you will stay good to your word and ensure that there are sufficient door staff on for the next weekend. Please let me know in due course, what you are putting into place for the weekend.

Lastly, is The Showroom planning on screening the England matches during the European Championship and/or have organised events in conjunction with these games?

Please let me know,

Andy Thorpe (PC894)
District Licencing Unit
Hartlepool
01642 302567

THORPE, Andrew (P0894)

From: THORPE, Andrew (P0894)

Sent: 12 June 2012 09:16

To: Craig Wilkinson/Brett Wilkinson/The Showroom

Subject: Meeting

Craig,

I was on this weekend and informed that Terry has now gone. Can we arrange a meeting some time this week to discuss this and any other issues?

Many Thanks,

Andy Thorpe (PC894)
District Licencing Unit
Hartlepool
01642 302567