| $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEST YORRSHRE } \\ & \hline \text { POLICE } \end{aligned}$ <br> LEEDS DISTRICT LICENSING DEPARTMENT <br> LICENSING ACT 2003 <br> PREMISES - REGISTER OF CHRONOLOGICAL EVENTS <br> (Excluding PL Transfers / DPS changes / TEN's) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Divis ion: | NWL | NPT Area: | NWO |  |
| Premises Name (Previous Name/s) \& Address <br> TRINITY (f. Mode) <br> Wesley Square <br> Lowtown <br> Pudsey |  |  |  |  |
| Post Code: | LS28 7AB | Tel No: |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { PL/CP } \\ & \text { C No: } \end{aligned}$ |  | Time Limited: |  | Yes / No |
| Orig. Issue: |  | Date - WEF: |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { ALCOI } \\ \text { Yes } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | HOL PREMISES: | CONSUMPTION |  | On / Off / Both |
| Brief History / Previous authorisations: |  |  |  |  |


| Date: | Event / Meeting / Application / Formal Action / Letter etc: |
| :---: | :---: |
| 30-01-14 | Message left on DPS voicemail to make contact about arranging a meeting. |
| 02-02-14 | @ 0332 <br> Caller had been ejected from the premises and claimed a group of males were waiting for him. D/Staff phoned and claimed that he was 'off his head on drugs'. Officers locate him, confirmed that he did not appear under the influence of drugs but had upset the wrong people. |
| 03-02-14 | Spoke with Bob Thompson as unable to make contact with DPS BT explained that there were new owners and the DPS is due to changed. Scheduled meeting 25-02-14. |
| 12-02-14 | Confirmed that a meeting had been arranged via Bob Thompson from LTC. |
| 25-02-14 | Meeting Held. |
| 26-07-14 | Attended on an evening licensing visit; Paul Allen in charge. <br> Incident book in order <br> Part A out of date <br> CCTV operational, however unable to use the system and show 31 days. |
| August 14 | Boxing match which resulted in fighting outside of the ring. Police were not called to this incident however since the information was received CCTV footage was captured and viewed of the incident which showed a large disorder inside the premises where security staff had been head butted and a person thrown off the balcony. |
| 11-08-14 | @ 1439 <br> Caller reporting that he had been assaulted at the premises the previous Saturday. He had been punched in to head, fell to the floor and received further blows. Door staff did not apparently witness the incident and CCTV did not cover the incident. Complainant did not wish to take the complaint further. |
| 24-08-14 | $\square$ @ 1724 <br> Complainant had been on a night out on Friday evening drinking in the venue. She woke the next morning in an alleyway bruised and sore believing that she had been sexually assaulted. It transpired that she was heavily intoxicated and had no recollection of the events after leaving the premises so was unable to consent to any activity which took place. |
| 07-09-14 | — @ 0307 <br> Officers reported a fight and required an ambulance for an unconscious female. When female came round, she walked off and refused to give officers any details. <br> @ 0358 Further call received advising of an assault and theft. Female had been inside drinking and picked up the wrong glass in error, a verbal altercation started. Female is assaulted by 2 suspects. All 3 are removed from the club by security and the complainant is assaulted again outside and her phone is taken. Officer managed to locate the phone which had been left in a taxi by the suspects. Officers speak to the DPS in relation to CCTV and are informed that the incident occurred in a 'blind spot'. He was aware of a melee of people |


|  | but nothing other than CCTV showed that door staff escorted people out. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 07-09-14 | Email received from one of the officers that attended the above public order incident advising that customers were extremely heavily intoxicated. Comment was made that people were so drunk that they were unable to stand and were being carried by others. |
| 08-09-14 | Email received from an officer regarding CCTV, wanting to confirm whether it was a condition on the licence and enquiring as to the person to contact. |
| 12-09-14 | DPS variation paperwork received by WYP. |
| 01-10-14 | Email received from Paul Rix LCC Licensing Enforcement advising of a possible boxing event that was causing concern. |
| 11-10-14 | @ 0056 *S18 Wounding* <br> Reports of a fight outside, approx. 10 people involved - caller then believed that a fight was brewing rather than witnessed. <br> The club had been closed and customers thrown out. <br> This had caused arguing and issues with the customers. <br> Further log stated that there was a male with a head injury inside the premises. Officers reported that it appeared an implement had been used in the assault. This was also the opinion of hospital staff. <br> Door staff had allowed a banned person into the venue and refused to give officers a statement. <br> There was only one member of door team working on the evening as the second person had retired home sick. |
| 11-10-14 | Email received from an officer informing of his concerns surrounding the above assault. |
| 14-10-14 | Monthly meeting |
| 26-10-14 | @0252 *S18 Wounding* <br> Callers reporting that they had been assaulted. Customers were inside the premises when a female started to become argumentative. Both females involved were ejected from the club. Once outside the aggressive female assaults another female - kicking and punching her to the floor. A male tries to intervene and is also kicked and punched until he loses consciousness. It was suspected that the complainants may also have suffered from bone fractures during the attack. Door staff were aware of the incident inside as they knew and were speaking to the suspect as she was leaving the venue. Door staff advised officers that they were unaware of the incident which occurred outside. |
| 20-11-14 | Action Plan meeting |
| 09-12-14 | Email received from the premises advising that they would be utilising the additional hour over the Christmas period. |
| 07-12-14 | Email received regarding an event advertised at the premises; Bassline night until 0400hrs but premises licence only allow alcohol sale until 0300hrs and background music until 0330hrs. |
| 28-12-14 | $\square$ @ 0055 <br> Report of a male who had been assaulted outside the venue and had been knocked unconscious. <br> Officers attended and confirmed that there was a Bassline event on at |


|  | the premises with numbers in the region of 350 customers expected. Complainant refused to inform officers of what had occurred. Officers commented that the male was 'drunk'. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 09-01-15 | Action Plan Meeting |
| 09-01-15 | Email received from the premises asking for bullet points in relation to door staff issues. |
| 30-01-15 | Letter received from LTCS expressing their concern that they were no longer working at the premises |
| 22-01-15 | Email sent to officers attending pending licensing visit with details of what needed to be checked at the premises. |
| 24-01-15 | Protech employed to start work at the venue |
| 24-01-15 | Evening Licensing Visit: <br> DPS not on site, $M$ Thornton working. <br> Drug safe installed but not independent keys - all seized by officer <br> CCTV still displaying different times on monitors <br> Refusal book checked and last entry 31-10-14. <br> (Email received from officer 25-01-14) |
| 22-02-15 | @ 0212 *s18 Wounding* <br> Call received from Ambulance of a male with a head injury. Officers attended and confirm that the reporting person had been punched on the dance floor after a verbal altercation with another male. This has then erupted into disorder inside with people fighting. The door staff broke up the fighting, closed the venue and thrown all customers out other than the injured party. Male had sustained a broken jaw. <br> Libertas Security were employed as door staff working the evening and were looking after IP on officers arrival. <br> Spoke with M Thornton and M Neave after the Pubwatch meeting. Advised that they needed to submit the DPS change asap. <br> Serious consideration was being given to reviewing the licence and under the circumstances, if the form was submitted by $16^{\text {th }}$ March 2015 a meeting could be arranged to allow a minor variation with agreed conditions to go through, rather than a review process being instigated. |
| 25-02-15 | Disorder incident recorded on niche which occurred at the premises back in August. Boxing took place with known persons which ended up with fighting between parties (not the boxers) including someone being thrown over a balcony. Footage viewed, from elsewhere, of the incident but due to the timescale involved unable to check the CCTV from the premises. <br> Delay in allocating the crime to this location due to officers not knowing the whereabouts of the event. <br> *This was not what was advised by the PLH at the time* |
| 10-03-15 | Email received advising that boxing was due to take place at the premises which involved the persons from the disorder in August. |
| 12-03-15 | Call made to LCC licensing enquiring as to whether a TEN was in order for an U18 family event due to be held on 17/03/15. <br> LCC informed the caller that no TEN had been submitted and their |


|  | licence did not allow for under 18s on the premises after 2100hrs. LCC contacted myself to advise. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 15-03-15 | Boxing event took place with no incidents being reported to WYP |
| 15-03-15 | Complaint received in relation on an event being advertised at the premises on 17/03/15. Concern was raised into allowing children into a licensed venue after 2100 hrs , concerns in relation to fireworks and the capacity of the venue. |
| 16-03-15 | Spoke with WYFRS who attended at the premises and agreed with the initial assessment from the previous inspector that the capacity was 450. |
| 17-03-15 | Evening licensing visit @ approx. 2200hrs <br> Premises busy, no fireworks inside, young children running around the venue. S 19 issued in relation to children. <br> CCTV in order, office door badly damaged by the old DPS (allegedly). 3 members of door staff appeared to be working on the evening. $M$ Thornton was managing the evening and stated that WYFRS had attended earlier in the evening to reports of fireworks being set off inside the venue. |
| 18-03-15 | @ 0047hrs <br> Report of a fight outside the venue. Officers attended and confirmed that the premises were closed but groups of people making their way home. |
| 18-03-15 | @ 0127hrs <br> Call received from ambulance advising that a male had been assaulted. Officers located the male with a shoulder injury however due to his level of intoxication he refused to provide his details or confirm what had occurred. |
| 18-03-15 | Spoken with Robert Nowak from WYFRS who advised that he had arranged to send the unit last night on a visit due to the complaint which had been received. WYFRS found blocked fire exits, which they made the staff clear. There was no fire risk assessment and no certificates for emergency exits etc. Fire will be arranging a full inspection. |
| 18-03-15 | DPS application for Michael Thornton received. |

Steve Thomas - DPS
Sam Longfellow - LCC Licensing
Cat Sanderson - WYP Licensing
CS and SL apologised for the delay in monthly meeting, the last one had been September but due to ongoing issues in other areas, this had been on a back burner.

ST explained that the premises had changed the name to Trinity and were trying to return the venue to how it used to run when it was previously Trinity.

Derek the former DPS had been in charge until the end of January, the ST took over the running of the venue for the last 4 weeks. The venue had a new owner; Mark Neave who also owns Worlds End.

CS explained that there had been a few incidents since the last meeting and these were discussed but did not go into too much detail as there was a new DPS.

ST explained that on Boxing Day there was a fight inside the premises, CS confirmed that there was a log, however Derek closed the premises early to combat this.

CS explained that one of her concerns was in relation to being open until 0400 hrs . ST and CS had discussed this earlier when a TEN was submitted. ST was under the impression that the venue was licensed until 0400hrs however CS had corrected him in a telephone call, confirming that they had activities until 0300hrs.

CS wanted to discuss an advertisement which she had found on Facebook back in September - £10 and drink the bar dry.
ST explained that Derek had tried to run this promotion but it had failed resulting in a loss in business and did not continue. ST stated that he had advised Derek that it was not a promotion which would be allowed - irresponsible drinking; however Derek ran it stating that he would see if he could get away with it - until it was picked up on and he was forced to cancel it.

ST confirmed that the door staff were still West Yorkshire Security. Since he had taken over, he had increased the numbers to 3 . Derek was running on 2.

SL asked how many they employed for an event. ST confirmed that it was 8-9.

ST stated that he has kept the Fetish night running at the venue. SL asked what this entailed. ST stated that the customers come dressed up and someone sells whips etc. SL asked ST to clarify the details as this may require another Licence. ST would obtain some figures for her.
The event is held on the second Sunday of every month.
CS asked about the music the venue. Did they still play Bassline.
ST advised that they no longer wanted this sort of music and had moved to Funky Commercial music - one of the DJ's was Micky from the Shamrock.

ST confirmed that Martin Stockwell ran the Casa Loco nights at the venue on a Saturday, however once they had recruited a couple of new DJ's, they would no longer use Martin.

## Sanderson, Catherine

| From: | Burrow, David |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | 12 September $201407: 42$ |
| To: | Sanderson, Catherine |
| Subject: | RE: Casa Loco, Wesley Square, Lowtown, Pudsey [NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED] |

Cat,

Apologies, it was indeed the early hours of 7 September 2014.

Thanks,

Dave

David Burrow
PC 5552
Leeds District (North West)
Neighbourhood Patrol Team 3
$\boxed{\text { e-mail: david.burrow@westyorkshire.pnn.police.uk }}$
E Address: Pudsey Police Station, Dawsons Corner, Pudsey, LS28 5TA

WHST YORKSHIRE:
POLICE

From: Sanderson, Catherine
Sent: 08 September 2014 09:39
To: Burrow, David
Cc: Cox, Michael; Davey, Christopher
Subject: RE: Casa Loco, Wesley Square, Lowtown, Pudsey [NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED]

Morning Dave

Thanks for the information.
Please can I just confirm that it was 07/09/14?

I will arrange to attend and speak with the premises about the issues so that we can try prevent reoccurrences.

Thanks and regards

Cat

From: Burrow, David
Sent: 07 September 2014 06:31
To: Cox, Michael; Sanderson, Catherine; Davey, Christopher
Subject: Casa Loco, Wesley Square, Lowtown, Pudsey [NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED]

All,

We attended a public order incident at around 0300hrs at Casa Loco in Pudsey on 07/08/14.

The club was kicking out around this time and it was clear that a vast number of people leaving were not just in drink but extremely heavily intoxicated.

I saw at least 5 different people so drunk they were unable to stand and were being carried by others. Two unconnected people fell heavily down the steps of the club.

Clearly the club is serving people far beyond a normal level of intoxication and this is not helping public order at closing time.

I am informed there is a licensing meeting soon so I just wanted to make you aware.

Thanks,

Dave

David Burrow
A/PS 5552
Leeds District (West)
Patrol Team 3
$\Delta<$ e-mail: david.burrow@westyorkshire.pnn.police.uk
[E7 Address: Pudsey Police Station, Dawsons Corner, Pudsey, LS28 5TA
To report a crime, please ring 101. Always dial 999 in an emergency.

## HEST VORKSHIRH

## POLICE

For the latest news and updates visit our website - http://www.westyorkshire.police.uk/leeds

## Sanderson, Catherine

| From: | Rix, Paul [Paul.Rix@leeds.gcsx.gov.uk](mailto:Paul.Rix@leeds.gcsx.gov.uk) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | 02 October 2014 11:58 |
| To: | Sanderson, Catherine; Davey, Christopher; Cox, Michael |
| Cc: | Longfellow, Samantha |
| Subject: | RE: Boxing event Trinity LS28 |

## Morning All

Just spoken to the PLH and he advises that the event is actually a week on Sunday 12/10/14 and is not yet fully confirmed.

He has been told by the promoters that although there is no love lost between the boxers there should be no issues with the fans.

He is to confirm with Sam that the event is going ahead.

Mick / Cat

In Sumo's absence could you pass onto the relevant inspector this new information as the info passed by Sumo is now out of date.

Regards

Paul

Paul Rix
Senior Liaison \& Enforcement Officer
Entertainment Licensing
Leeds City Council
Tel: 01132474095
Fax: 01132243885
email: paul.rix@leeds.gov.uk
www.leeds.gov.uk

From: Paul.Rix(GCSx)
Sent: 01 October 2014 12:11
To: Sanderson, Catherine; 'Davey, Christopher'; michael cox
Cc: Longfellow, Samantha
Subject: Boxing event Trinity LS28

## Morning All

Info received indicates a boxing event to be held at Trinity this coming weekend 4 October, 6 while 9 pm ish.

It would appear that the combatants are not friendly and a local licensee has expressed concern that the main event may well take place between the fans of each boxer after the event has finished.

Cannot at present find any info on who is fighting or organising.

If I find anything further I will let you know.

Regards

Paul

Paul Rix
Senior Liaison \& Enforcement Officer
Entertainment Licensing
Leeds City Council
Tel: 01132474095
Fax: 01132243885
email: paul.rix@leeds.gov.uk
www.leeds.gov.uk

The information in this email (and any attachment) may be for the intended recipient only. If you know you are not the intended recipient, please do not use or disclose the information in any way and please delete this email (and any attachment) from your system.
The Council does not accept service of legal documents by e-mail.

The original of this email was scanned for viruses by the Government Secure Intranet virus scanning service supplied by Vodafone in partnership with Symantec. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) This email has been certified virus free.
Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

From: Davey, Christopher

Sent:
To:
C
Subject:

11 October 2014 17:28
Sanderson, Catherine; 'samantha.longfellow@leeds.gov.uk'
Wood, Dan; Davey, Emma; Cox, Michael
assault at mode [NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED]
sam - cat

I went to an section 18 assault at the mode nightclub this morning where a male suffered a bad head injury after being hit by is currently wanted for the offence.
my concern was that no one from the premises would glve a cja and that most people knew the suspect was they all appeared to be
frightened of him. the dps paul allan was more then helpful and helped get the cctv downloaded and showed me it so we could id him but he was too
frightened to say anythiong in fornt of other staff. he did however give me info about where he is living.
there were 2 door staff working but one went home sick.
its more for your info really if they are not strong enough to keep people like out and also will they bring him up for a ban on pub watch

Persons Present:

| Mark Neave | - PLH |
| :--- | :--- |
| Paul Allan | - DPS |
| Michael Thornton | - Manager |
| Sam Longfellow | - LCC Licensing |
| Cat Sanderson | - WYP Licensing |

CS opened the meeting by explaining that they used to have monthly meetings with the previous management but due to changes at the venue and few incidents, they had appeared to have slipped. $M N$ and MT were both happy to reinstate the meetings, to ensure that everything was running in order. It was agreed that the meetings would be held after the Pubwatch.

CS explained that she had been made aware of an incident which occurred at the weekend, a S18. Officers had spoken to her and advised that there was no warning that the assault was about to occur and the staff at the venue had been very helpful, closing the premises down, CCTV and preserving the scene. The only issue to arise was that the doorman had refused to give a statement, which was concerning.
MN advised that the suspect had been put up for banning on Pubwatch that morning.
He was actually already banned from the premises and was unaware how he had got in. It was believed that he had come in with a group which had attended a party earlier in the evening. However he had been made aware that the suspect was causing trouble at the venue as well. He had allegedly been into a premises, come out of the toilets and told staff that the floor was slippery - apparently he had hit someone in there and was making excuses.

SL stated that they needed to speak with their door staff as they had allowed a banned person in and refused a statement. PA stated that he had completed a report in the incident register and reported to officers that the suspect had informed him that he had hit someone. It was explained that a statement needed to be taken in case a suspect ever needed to be taken to court. CS reiterated that they needed to speak with the door staff to ensure that they are monitoring the customers entering the premises and must give a statement if required.

CS raised another incident which occurred in September. Officers had attended and emailed her advising that customers were so inebriated that they were witnessed being carried along by friends. This was unacceptable. PA stated that when he came across someone clearly intoxicated, he got door staff to ask them to leave. CS explained that this was not how to handle to situation. If they ejected a female, she needed to at least have her friends with her. They could not just leave a vulnerable person outside as anything could happen. CS and SL gave examples of situations which had occurred recently - lone female ejected and she was taken off and raped, one punch incidents were the victim is so intoxicated that they are unable to protect themselves. It was suggested that they needed to offer them a drink of water and find their friends; ring them a taxi and ensure that they get in safely. They could not just throw them out of the club on their own.

Discussion also took place about customers preloading. It was appreciated that this was an issue city wide and you would not necessarily know that someone had drunk alcohol before getting in the venue however once inside the effects start taking place.

SL asked how often they held boxing events at the venue. MN stated that it was not often, about every 2 months. They ensured that there was plenty of door staff after the incident several weeks ago. MN explained the circumstances, how a boxer was upset that he had not been able fight for the title and had attacked the other boxer, however police had not been called for this incident. SL asked that they emailed details of future events, so that NPTs can be warned.
$M N$ advised that the next one due to be held was $29^{\text {th }}$ November.

CS stated that she would be doing more licensing visits in the area on the run up to Christmas and she would be monitoring the level of intoxication of customers. If it was believed that they were serving to drunks she would highlight it to them and it would become an issue.

Trinity Monthly Meeting<br>$20^{\text {th }}$ November 2014

Persons present:

| Paul Allan | - DPS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Michael Thornton | - Manager |
| Sam Longfellow | - LCC Licensing |
| Cat Sanderson | - WYP Licensing |

CS opened the meeting by asking whether they knew that their licence was currently suspended. MT and PA were both aware, stating that it would be paid that afternoon.
SL provided the telephone number which they should call to make payment.

PA asked whether SL had any T.E.N. forms on her. CS asked when he was planning to put in for. PA said that he wanted to submit them for the Christmas \& New Year period. CS stated that they could submit them however they may want to think about it again after the meeting. MT advised PA that it may not be beneficial.

CS spoke about the recent incident which occurred at the premises; a section 18 wounding had been reported on $26^{\text {th }}$ October 2014. She explained the circumstances as she was aware. Female 1 had been inside the premises when female 2 started an argument. They had both been ejected and an argument started up again outside. Female 1 was punched and kicked on the floor, male 1 came to assist when he was punched and knocked unconscious, sustaining a cut to the head.
It was explained that the call to the police had been made at 0220 hrs .
MT stated that he was made aware that a female had entered the DJ booth, she claimed to be hiding from someone. PA stated that there had been an argument and he had separated the parties.
Female 1 was removed by the rear exit and female 2 left through the front. He stated that as far as he was aware the assault had occurred after they had closed and that the assault with took place outside was on another female, female 3.
CS pointed out that the incident had started in their premises and from reading statements, door staff were aware. Once outside the assault had occurred and it was at 0220hrs when WYP were called. PA stated that it was after they had closed. Again CS stated that the call was made at 0220 hrs , so they were open explaining that all incidents reported to the police are logged with date and time.
PA stated that he was not aware of that.

CS moved on to the door staff. Where were the door staff when all this occurred? PA did not have an answer. CS explained that they were aware of the incident inside so should have been monitoring outside as people were leaving, especially as female 2 was reported to be acting in an aggressive manor. PA had stated that he had ejected female 1 from the rear, CS asked where were the door staff? Reading the statements they were aware of the issue. Why were they not monitoring outside? Again PA was unable to answer, he stated that he had not been informed anything about the incident from the door staff, the first he heard about it was when the police turned up.

MT stated that they now employed 3 door staff, 2 on the door and one inside. CS was pleased to hear there was an additional one.

However CS stated that this lack of action by the door team was not acceptable and felt that they needed to change their door staff. She advised that she could not make them change company but
the staff needed to change. PA made mention that he had trouble with the door team working as they did not listen to him. SL commented that this was unacceptable, as they were being employed they needed to be told what to do. PA stated that he had tried. CS again commented that they needed to change the door staff. MT stated that they would contact the PLH and arrange to get a different company in. CS continued that the door team not only protect customers but also can affect their licence if they are not doing their job properly. Again CS explained that she could not make them change company but something needed to be done.

CS explained that if there was another incident relating to the premises, she would review their licence $-2 \times$ S18 woundings in as many months was not acceptable. SL further explained that CS did not just mean another serious incident, if any assault linked to the premises arose, then a review would be put in.

MT made mention that there was an issue with the door team, it had come to a head with them a few weeks earlier as they had not been performing their roles properly but since then they appeared to have taken heed.

PA commented that he was the DPS of the premises and he was ultimately responsible for decisions made.

CS commented that she had heard that there was a drugs issue at the premises, were they aware? MT believed that customers had been getting in and they were actively monitoring for drug use.

CS asked about searches, did the door staff do random searches on customers? MT explained that they had started to since the in house discussion. PA suggested that he would get the door staff to check 1 in 3 . SL pointed out that a ratio would be too obvious, PA suggested 1 in 5 , again SL stated it was too obvious and customers would become wise - they needed to do random searches. As long as they had a notice displayed that there was no issue with searches. CS asked whether they had a drug safe. PA said they had a safe so CS and SL explained the reason behind needing a specific drug safe. CS agreed to email PA details of drug safe providers.

MT advised that they had also implemented a refusals book which they record refusals for over inebriation.

CS moved onto the issue of over intoxication. She was still aware that it was ongoing. There had been a report of a rape recently, and whilst the rape had not occurred by the premises, the female had been in the venue and was heavily intoxicated. This was a serious issue. They needed to be monitoring as it was unacceptable to allow customers to get in that state.

SL asked what time last entry to the premises was. MT stated that it was 0200hrs.

SL asked whether the door staff used hand held metal detectors. PA did not believe so and was not aware that it was a condition. MT stated that he was aware it was a condition on the licence and would ensure that door staff would be using them.

As SL was looking through the licence, PA made comment that he was going over and above what he was required to do on the licence. SL continued reading through. PA again repeated that he was doing more than was required, ie hiring door staff, as it was not a condition on the licence.
CS immediately stopped the conversation at that point and told PA that it was not a statement he should be making. Even though there was not a specific condition, it was not over and above what was required to be a responsible operator. A responsible operator does what is required, whether it
was a condition or not, to ensure the safety of their customers and staff. If they decided to withdraw the door staff, which they were entitled to do, something would inevitably happen at the premises and a summary review would follow!

MT brought the conversation back round to boxing. He confirmed that they were holding a boxing event on $29^{\text {th }}$ November, however PA was unable to advise who the promoter or boxers were. CS asked PA or MT to let her know. MT believed it was Daz Rads who promoted the event.

Actions agreed:

- Door staff to be changed with immediate effect
- Random searches to be implemented
- Drug safe to be installed
- Continual monitoring of customers intoxication


## Sanderson, Catherine

| From: | Longfellow, Samantha [Samantha.Longfellow@leeds.gcsx.gov.uk](mailto:Samantha.Longfellow@leeds.gcsx.gov.uk) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | 17 December $201411: 13$ |
| To: | Sanderson, Catherine |
| Cc: | Davey, Christopher |
| Subject: | Trinity (F. Mode) Nightclub Pudsey |

## Hi Cat/Sumo

Just to make you aware;

I have heard on the grapevine that Trinity are having a Bass Line event (casa loco) on $27^{\text {th }}$ December 2014. They have already sold 350 tickets.

I have also been advised that they are going to operate longer than their licence permits. Their current licence states that all alcohol sales will stop at 3am on a Saturday. They should have a cooling down period between 3am \& 4 am allowing for customers to finish off drinks and leave without just being thrown out. They are also allowed to have background music between 3am \& 3.30am.

Can you advise NPT that there could be possible issues that weekend and that if they do have any issues to let you and/or us know so that we can look at some sort of action.

Hope this all makes sense.

Thanks

## Sam

Samantha Longfellow
Senior Liaison \& Enforcement Officer
Entertainment Licensing
Leeds City Council
Tel: 01132474095
Fax: 01132243885
email: samantha.longfellow@leeds.gcsx.gov.uk
www.leeds.gov.uk

The information in this email (and any attachment) may be for the intended recipient only. If you know you are not the intended recipient, please do not use or disclose the information in any way and please delete this email (and any attachment) from your system.
The Council does not accept service of legal documents by e-mail.


The D.'s will be faking you back to reminisce the good old days playing there favourite...

## Funky Vocal House, Speed Garage, Classics \&r Nu-Skool Tunes

Mick Tole, Dj Jordz, Tom Garnett Simone Kelly Roe \& Liam Jay, Andy Magill...

Witstbands s10 // VIP 51507968809559 For wrisfiband drop off
Formally Mode, Wesky Street, Pudsey, Leeds, LS28, 7AB // Party starls: IIpm-4am
Dress code: Sunclay Bost ploase, trainers yes - keop them smorl \& funkyl


Trinity Meeting<br>Friday $9^{\text {th }}$ January 2015

Persons present:

| Mark Neave | - PLH |
| :--- | :--- |
| Paul Allan | - DPS |
| Michael Thompson | - Manager |
| Sam Longfellow | - LCC Licensing |
| Cat Sanderson | - WYP Licensing |

Prior to starting the meeting, MN stated that MT was going to go through his personal licence course and would then be taking over as DPS at the premises. This was not to be mentioned to the current DPS as he had not been made aware at that point.

CS explained that due to advertisements found on the internet, she would like to check CCTV. They had advertised an event on $27^{\text {th }}$ December into the $28^{\text {th }}$ until 0400hrs, however the premises were only licensed until 0300hrs. MT and PA both stated that they had closed on time and had not run until 0400hrs; they had asked the promoter to change the advertisement but it had not been done. CS stated that because they had run an event, advertised until 0400hrs and there was an incident that evening, she wanted to make sure that they had abided by their hours. The CCTV showed that the premises had closed at 0400hrs as staff were cleaning, however the time was out on the cameras, which was pointed out to all and were told to rectify. PA stated that it had not changed with the clocks being altered. CS pointed out that they changed in October and it was unacceptable that they had not altered them. SL stated that they were and had been breaching their licence since this time. MT tried to amend the time, but it had not applied to all the screens so was going to get someone out to look at it.
MN commented that it was a new system as they did not used to have CCTV at the premises. CS and SL pointed out that there was a system previously as they had seen/checked it. There was an old VHS system in place at one point which was updated to discs. MN believed that the old DPS must have taken it with him.

CS explained the context of the previous meeting to MN as he was not in attendance. She explained that there had been another serious assault and that during the meeting she had been extremely unhappy about a comment made by the DPS - "going over and above what they were required to do on their licence". CS pointed out to MN that you could not go over and above when they were supposed to be looking out for the safety/welfare of customers and staff. She also explained that during that meeting, they were informed that if another incident occurred at the premises then she would be looking into reviewing their licence.

CS went on to explain that there had been an incident on the $27^{\text {th }}$, the Bassline event night. She explained that the incident had occurred outside the venue. The call to the police had been made by a third party reporting that a male had been assaulted and was unconscious. Officers attended and the male was conscious upon arrival; they stated that he was heavily intoxicated (an issue which they had previously discussed). She had heard from another third party, that the door staff had subsequently banned the caller from the premises because they had called the police. This was unacceptable. SL checked the incident book and confirmed that the incident had not been logged in there.

CS was very unhappy that the DPS was unaware that the incident had taken place until she rang to arrange this meeting. The DPS needed to be made aware of any incident which took place at the
venue. It was not acceptable for CS to be informing PA of an incident occurring at the premises when he had been working and was aware that the premises were currently under an action plan. They needed to be aware of everything that was happening and getting updates from door staff to find out what is occurring at the premises.

CS asked MN how he was planning to rectify the current concerns in relation to the premises so that CS does not review their licence. MN stated that he would do whatever was required.

CS stated that the door staff situation needed to be looked at. Again they had failed to contact the police when an incident had occurred at the premises. The incident book was not completed with all incidents taking place, the signing in register was not filled in correctly, staff not being informed of incidents. Even though the people on the doors had changed they were still having the same issues. MN stated that he would change the door company. He would not reopen the venue until he had a new company employed.

CS asked about random searches, where the door staff doing these? PA believed they were checking 1 in 3 or 1 in 5 . CS pointed out that they needed to be random and not sequential, as discussed in the previous meeting.
CS then asked whether the door staff had been using the wand, as per the condition of the licence. PA thought that they had but had not checked.
CS asked about the drugs safe. MT stated that it was his fault that they had not installed one yet, he had been waiting to see whether he was able to obtain a spare one from another premises but he would get one ordered asap. CS advised that she had emailed PA the details of manufacturers after the last meeting.

CS then moved the discussion onto over intoxication of the customers. PA provided a refusals book. CS examined the book and pointed out that there had been no entries made since 31/10/14. PA could not explain this.

CS explained the issue with over intoxication at the premises.
SL advised that the DPS/staff needed to be walking the floor to monitor for over intoxication and proxy sales, which they were not currently doing.

CS advised that the DPS and staff need to be communicating with each other and if there are any incidents at the premises, they need to make sure that they are contacting WYP about it.

## Sanderson, Catherine

From:
Sent:
To:
Subject:

Sanderson, Catherine
13 January 2015 07:21
'Michael'
RE: Trinity nightclub [NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED]

Morning

Sorry for the delay in reply.

Please find the bullet points as requested:

- Always stood in a pair on the door
- Do not appear to take appropriate action when an issue arises after customers have been agitated/ejected
- Have not been searching customers
- Stand watching instead of dealing with any incident outside
- Do not appear to assist DPS with ejection of customers
- Do not detain suspects
- Refusal to provide statements
- Do not complete the incident book
- Do not fill the signing in register correctly
- Do not listen to management

Hope this is sufficient.

Thanks and regards

Cat

Cat Sanderson
Licensing Officer
Leeds District
Elland Road, Leeds, LS11 8BU
Internal: 50216
External: 01133859416

To report a crime, please ring 101. Always dial 999 in an emergency.

For the latest news and updates:
Visit our website - www.westyorkshire.police.uk 'Like' us on Facebook - westyorkshirepolice | 'Follow' us on Twitter - @WestYorksPolice | 'Watch' us on YouTube www.youtube.com/999tv
-----Original Message-----
From: Michael
Sent: 09 January 2015 15:16
To: Sanderson, Catherine
Subject: Re: Trinity nightclub [NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED]

Yeah that's fine.

I am on the ball with a meeting for new door company, pro tech meeting this evening fingers crossed. Just ordering a drug safe from a\&r engineering - from Essex

## Regards

## Michael Thornton

> On 9 Jan 2015, at 14:26, "Sanderson, Catherine" [catherine.sanderson@westyorkshire.pnn.police.uk](mailto:catherine.sanderson@westyorkshire.pnn.police.uk) wrote:
$>$
$>$ Can do but wont be until Monday.
$>$
$>$ Thanks
$>$ Cat
$>$
> -----Original Message-----
$>$ From: Michael
> Sent: 09 January 2015 14:15
$>$ To: Sanderson, Catherine
$>$ Subject: Trinity nightclub
$>$
$>$ Hi cat,
$>$
> Just a quick one, is it possible for you to email me a bullet point or quick break down of major issues regarding door staff that you feel are a big issue.
$>$
> I am just trying to arrange a meeting with professional security and would like to basically say look this is the issue and then I will add too it how I want it to be run and how it has to be run. $>$
> I have jotted down what I can remember but would rather you send me it and then it's there in black and white and then the new door company can't say well this or well that if anything was to happen. They will know what I expect and how It will be run.
$>$
> Regards
$>$
> Michael Thornton
$>$
$>$
> Are You Interested In Being A Special Constable - Click this link to find out more.
> http://www.westyorkshire.police.uk/bespecial
$>$
$>$
$>$ This email transmission may contain confidential or legally privileged information and is intended for the addressee(s) only. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution, retention or reliance upon the contents of this e-mail and any attachment(s) is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.
$>$
$>$ If you have received this in error, please use the reply function to notify us immediately and permanently delete the email and any attachment(s) from your computer or electronic device.
$>$
> West Yorkshire Police reserves the rights to routinely monitor incoming and outgoing e-mail messages and cannot accept liability or responsibility for any errors or omissions in the content and, as internet communications should not be considered as secure, for changes made to this message after it was sent.
$>$
> Any views or opinions expressed in this message may not be those of the West Yorkshire Police.
$>$

## Dear Sir / Madam

I am writing with a great concern with regards to the events taking place on Tuesday $17^{\text {th }}$ March at the Trinity Club in Pudsey. (Trinity Night Club, Wesley Square, Pudsey, LS28 7AD).

This event is organised to celebrate the Iranian Bon Fire Night.
My concerns are as follow:

- On the leaflet indicates that Kids under 7 are admitted free of charge and those above the age of 7 ( 7 to 12 year) have to pay $£ 5$. Having the checked with the licensing department, it is understood that children are only allowed up until 9 pm and as long as accompanied by parents. It is also understood that the party will continue until early hours of the next morning.
- There is also mention of fireworks (this is written in Persian on the leaflet). Dose this venue have adequate facility in place in order to make sure that fire work will be carried out according to health \& safety regulation? Or in other word dose this venue has the license to allow fireworks? Or has an up to date risk assement been carried out?
- The leaflet also mentions that this venue has a capacity of 500 ? Is this correct? Or is the organiser trying to attract as many customers as they can in order to maximise their profit?

Would the authorities, kindly investigate the above concerns which are summarised as follow:

- Is this venue licensed to except children after 9pm?
- Is this venue suitable for fireworks? (in particular when children are allowed)
- Has this venue got authorised capacity of 500 people?

Attached (following page) copy of the leaflet advertising the event, so you can see the concerns I have.

Finally, I would like to take this opportunity to Thank You for consideration.

## Yours faithfully

Mr. Nejad

## Leaflet



## Read accompanying notes on reverse

This Closure Notice is served by the Police Offlcer named below if he/she is satisfied that the premises have been used for the unauthorised sale of alcohol for consumption on, or in the vicinity, of these premises within the last 24 hours. Each of the paragraphs below must be completed by the Police Officer.

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
The person (if appllcable) upon whom the Closure Notice has been served:
Name: \% RL: THORNTON Position: MANASAR

- A suitable Closed-Circuit Television (CCTV) system will be operational at the premises at all times when licensable activities are being carried out and at any other times where members of the public are present on the premises.
- The CCTV system will cover all areas of the premises occupied by the public under the terms of the licence, including corridors and stairways (excluding WCs and changing rooms).
- The CCTV system will cover all external areas of the premises occupied by the public, i.e. queuing areas, beer gardens, smoking areas and car parks.
- The CCTV system will contain the correct time and date stamp information.
- The CCTV system will have sufficient storage retention capacity for a minimum of 31 days' continuous footage which will be of good quality.
- A designated member / members of staff at the premises will be authorised to access the CCTV footage and be conversant with operating the CCTV system. At the request of an authorised officer of the Licensing Authority or a Responsible Authority (under the Licensing Act 2003) any CCTV footage, as requested, will be downloaded immediately or secured to prevent any overwriting. The CCTV footage material will be supplied, on request, to an authorised officer of the Licensing Authority or a Responsible Authority.
- The minimum number of door supervisors for the premises is 3 to work from 2200 hrs until all customers have vacated the premises.
- A suitable purpose-made receptacle for the safe retention of illegal substances will be provided and arrangements made for the safe disposal of its contents as agreed with West Yorkshire Police.
- Drinks, open bottles and glasses will not be taken from the premises at any time. Empty bottles and glasses will be collected regularly and promptly.
- Written notification will be given to West Yorkshire Police a minimum of 14 days prior to any event taking place at the venue e.g. Boxing.
- A minimum number of door staff as specified by WYP will be deployed at any boxing event.

